

Misleading claims about Brexit

Extract of a recent report by Christopher Howarth, who is a former Conservative Special Advisor.

Claim 1) Brexit has damaged UK GDP

Claim from CER “the economy is now 5.5% smaller than it would have been if the UK had remained part of the EU.”

Why it is misleading:

This claim is based on comparing the UK’s actual performance since 2016 with a ‘doppelganger’ created by the CER for the prior period 2009Q1-2016Q2. The doppelgangers are weighted growth rates for a selected group of countries. The weighting for GDP is United States (31%), Germany (15%), New Zealand (14%), Norway (8%), Australia (5%) and Iceland (5%) etc. These comparisons are different to ones they used by their earlier studies. These comparator countries are *not* those which individually had a growth performance similar, to the UK. Instead, the doppelganger indices are statistical artifacts which combine disparate countries in a complex way to match the UK over a short period. The studies, then wrongly assume that these indices provide a reliable benchmark of what would have happened in the UK after the Brexit referendum. The flaws in this approach can be seen in that countries like Germany and Japan perform equally as badly as the UK when compared to the same doppelganger benchmark. Even Greece is included in the GDP doppelganger even though the Greek economy was declining between 2009-16 while the UK was growing.

The doppelganger comparison to the UK is calibrated over the short

period 2009-2016 which was one of cyclical economic recovery in the UK from the deep banking crisis recession of 2008/9 and thus comparatively fast growing. Attempting to match other countries with the UK over this period with that after 2016 will naturally select faster growing economies. The doppelganger studies essentially assume that a cyclical upturn in the UK would have lasted indefinitely in the absence of Brexit. The technique identifies a large negative impact for Brexit even before the UK left the Single Market in 2021. The technique makes little sense, and the technique should be dropped.

Claim from Mark Carney: “in 2016 the British economy was 90% the size of Germany’s. Now it is less than 70%.”

This claim is based on the following widely reported interview the former Bank of England Governor made with the *FT* claiming the UK had lagged, behind Germany since the referendum.

Why it is misleading:

It measures the size of the two economies in current prices including inflation, and not in the conventional constant prices.

Even on its own terms the statistic is incorrect. ONS data on nominal GDP estimate that the UK economy has “shrunk” from about 87 per cent the size of Germany’s before the EU referendum to about 76 per cent now. Carney incorrectly mixed the use of ‘real’ GDP and ‘nominal’ GDP incorrectly ignoring inflation.

It chooses the referendum date not the date of EU or Single Market exit.

Carney ignores the effects of Foreign Exchange movements. Sterling had risen sharply before 2016

and has decreased since, giving a misleading comparison with his selected economy.

The use of constant price data based on Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) exchange rates, which strip out the effect of foreign exchange, gives a different picture...

Leading the left-wing and pro-remain economist Jonathan Portes, professor of economics and public policy at King’s College London, to described it as a “zombie statistic” and “nonsense”.

Claim 2) Brexit has damaged the Union

Scotland: It was claimed by William Hague Alex Massie and others that a vote for Brexit would increase the possibility of Scottish independence, with many Scots being persuaded to vote to stay in the EU to help preserve the Union. Scotland voted 62 per cent to remain. Since 2016 nationalist politicians have argued that Scotland joining the EU is a reason to leave the UK.

Why these claims were (and are) misleading:

There is no polling evidence that the EU referendum has affected Scottish views on independence.

With the UK outside the EU and the Single Market, advocates of Scottish independence have, to contend with the issue of the Scotland/UK border. There are no easy solutions for them. While the UK was a member of the EU nationalists could argue that ‘independence within the EU’ would allow independence without a border with the rest of the UK and so be independent in the manner of other smaller EU states.

Continued on page 2

Misleading claims about Brexit

Continued from page 1

It remains unclear whether Scotland could even join the EU on UK exit and what terms they would have to accept. They would have to fulfil the Copenhagen criteria and answer questions as to their currency and fishing resources.

The 2016 referendum was a national UK referendum and unionist Scots (like those in England) could vote to remain in the EU yet also chose to accept the result and not seek independence.

Northern Ireland

Northern Ireland voted to remain in the EU yet despite the problems caused by the Northern Ireland Protocol support for a 'United Ireland' remains static and influenced by other factors.

Claim 3) Brexit has reduced UK trade (with thanks to Lord Lilley for input)

The Office for Budget Responsibility: Brexit "will result in the UK's trade intensity being 15 per cent lower in the long run than if the UK had remained in the EU."

Why this claim is (and was) misleading:

UK exports to the EU have recovered from a downturn during covid in line with exports to the Rest of the World.

The OBR claim was not based on its own research but is based instead on studies by other organisations. It cites two studies claiming they "provide evidence that Brexit has had a significant adverse impact on UK trade ... via reducing overall trade volumes ..."

The first of these studies; actually, reaches the opposite conclusion: "We estimate that the new TCA trade relationship led to a sudden and persistent 25% fall in relative UK imports from the EU. In contrast, we find a smaller and only temporary decline in relative UK exports to the EU". So, the UK balance of trade with the EU improved during the first year outside the Single Market.

The second study confirmed that the first study was correct to conclude that UK exports to the EU have not declined relative to UK exports to the

Rest of the World. So, it decides that this must be the wrong comparator. Instead, it compares recovery in UK exports to the EU with recovery of EU exports to the Rest of the World. This is frankly bizarre. No-one suggested that this comparator should be used. There is no cogent justification for using it – other than it gives the answer the Irish researchers clearly wanted.

Actual UK exports and imports to the EU and rest of the World:

...contrary to the OBR forecasts that UK exports to the EU and the rest of the world have increased over all and largely in line with each other.

Given the new trade agreements outside of the EU and our departure from the Customs Union, (allowing the lowering of tariffs on UK imports from states such as Australia, and New Zealand) it would not be surprising if UK trade, free from the trade diversion inherent in a Customs Union, grew faster with the rest of the world as it readjusted to a new trading environment.

Source: www.briefingsforbritain.co.uk

Jam - UK or EU rules?

Why is DEFRA consulting on following the EU's new formula for jam?

Trade specialist Catherine McBride exposes the fruity facts about our love for jams and preserves.

In, this article for CIBUK and Brexit Facts4EU, Catherine McBride exposes the facts and questions why the government continues to be reluctant to diverge from EU rules.

About the author: Catherine McBride is an economist and a member of the Trade and Agriculture Commission (TAC). The TAC is an independent expert committee which advises the government. It comprises specialists in:

UK animal and plant health standards

UK animal welfare standards

UK environmental standards as they relate to agricultural products.

International trade law and policy

Catherine McBride points out that:-

"The beauty of Brexit is that we can decide for ourselves what we want to eat.

The EU is proposing to change the formula of jam – it must now contain at least 45g of fruit per 100g. Some are proposing that the UK must follow suit in order, to protect our tiny EU jam exports, which amount to one seventh of our EU jam imports.

But both exports to and imports from the EU are a fraction of total UK domestic jam consumption. Defra plans to consult UK 'interested parties' about following the EU's rules but isn't it time that the UK population reminded the government that they can

make up their own mind about what they want to eat and how much they want to pay for it.

The Telegraph appears to believe that jam is a big UK export, and that the EU is a big market for UK jam and so it published an article implying that the UK should be following the EU's rules.

The Telegraph article claims the UK exports 10.6 million kilos, (10.6 thousand tonnes), of jam but this appears to include citrus marmalades and nut purees which aren't affected by the EU's proposed rule changes. ITC COMTrade figures show the UK exported only 6 thousand tonnes of HS 200,799 jams jellies and (non-Citrus) marmalades in total, of which about two thirds went to the EU, and half of this went to Ireland. As usual, continental EU just doesn't like UK food.

Jam - UK or EU rules?

But that's OK, because the UK's biggest jam market is the UK itself. In 2021, UK sales of UK manufactured jams, jellies and fruit or nut purees and pastes were 117,692 tonnes. *The Telegraph* also forgot to mention that the UK imported 43 thousand tonnes of jam, jellies, (non-citrus) marmalades and fruit purees in 2022, and 88% of this came from the EU. About ten times more than we exported to the EU.

Why is the Government even thinking about this?

So why would Defra even consider changing the labels or the fruit content of UK made fruit jams in order, to align with the EU? The EU bought a mere 4,262 tonnes of non-citrus UK jam exports in 2022.

Also why does the EU want to regulate the ingredients of jam and the ridiculously named EU-English product – 'Extra Jam'? Is this yet another non-tariff trade barrier to protect EU jam producers or is it another way to subsidise EU fruit growers? If the EU's technocrats think increasing the fruit quantity would reduce the amount of sugar added to the jam, they will be disappointed, that isn't the way jam works. The quantity of sugar really determines how set or how runny the jam is. MacKay's Scottish Strawberry Preserve and Duchy Organics Strawberry preserve extra both have 65 grams of sugar per 100 grams, but their fruit quantity varies from 35g for MacKay's to 58g for Duchy.

By the way, there is no such thing as 'Extra Jam', it is simply jam. Producers could perhaps call it 'extra fruity jam' if they like, but there is no definitive amount of fruit or sugar required for jam, it depends on the sweetness of the fruit being used and the desired consistency of the end-product: Set jam verses runny jam. For example, French import, St Dalfour's 100% fruit, Strawberry Fruit Spread is almost liquid. Even the EU has accepted that jam made with citrus fruit, generally called marmalade in the English-speaking world, only needs 20% fruit.

In general, most UK jams appear to

already comply with the EU's proposed ruling, although ironically some French jams may need to change their labels. The EU has suggested that jams with less than 45g of fruit will be downgraded from jam to 'fruit spread'. The marketing people at St Dalfour will surely be outraged that their 100% fruit product's name will now be synonymous with low fruit jam under the proposed EU ruling.

But why should the EU be determining the contents of jam? The US dominates the global market, importing 262,366 tonnes of HS 200,799 jam, jellies and (non-citrus) marmalades in 2022 and its largest supplier was Chile who exported 62,139 tonnes of fruit jam to the US in 2022. This was more than total US imports from the whole of the EU of only 53,908 tonnes. The largest EU supplier to the US was France, but it was only 4th after Chile, Mexico, and Colombia and just ahead of Canada, Egypt, India and Argentina. *The Telegraph* believes the EU is the world's largest importer of jam, but this is almost all imports from other EU countries, not imports from countries outside the EU's Customs Union.

The fruit content of the strawberry jams sold by Waitrose and Tesco range from 35g of fruit to 71g per 100g – all but three would already make the 'new' EU imposition of 45 grams of fruit, and the fruit content is clearly displayed on the label as well as on the store websites. So why would the EU, or Defra, believe this type of legislation is even necessary?

The other important consumer choice issue determined by the amount of fruit in jam, is of course price. The jams with less fruit and more sugar are generally cheaper per 100 grams. The price difference between the cheapest and most expensive jams was over 10x in my short survey of strawberry jams sold in only two UK supermarkets. This is not an insignificant difference.

There is also the suggestion that jam makers in Northern Ireland will have to follow the EU rules, but while I was not able to survey all of Northern Ireland's jam makers, they appear to

produce SME artisan high fruit jams that already use more fruit in their products than the EU's proposal so they should be able to export to the EU without Defra changing the rules for all UK manufactures. While the Green Lanes should allow Northern Ireland shops to continue to import jam made to British standards in Great Britain.

But the main point is that UK shoppers must be allowed to decide for themselves if they like set jam or runny jam or extra fruity jam or expensive jam or cheap jam. The information is already on the label, but this will mainly be a personal preference. Most certainly the EU should have nothing to do with determining UK standards, especially of a product the EU hardly imports from any country outside its customs block, including the UK.

The UK's Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) has published a memorandum about the changes. They intend to *'engage with UK interested parties to assess the merits of the proposals and reach a view on whether it is in the best interest of the UK to consider similar changes'* Isn't, it time that we reminded our politicians that we know how to read a product label and can make up our own minds about what we buy?

Now the UK is out of the EU, we have, to let the market determine these things. Shoppers know what they like and more importantly how much they are prepared to pay for it."

Observations

Brexit is about choice

The point here is choice. Brexit gives us choices which are not available in the authoritarian empire of the European Union. We are a country of over 70 million people (according to the supermarkets, who we think have a better idea than the Home Office). Surely, we can make simple decisions about the products we buy without having a supranational foreign entity deciding for the UK?

Source: cibuk.org and facts4eu.org

Rejoining the EU?

The politicians, civil servants, lobbyists and disgruntled Remainers who want to pull us backwards into the EU now have a spring in their step.

Every day, another one tells us - defying the facts - that Brexit has failed. They think if they repeat it often enough people will believe it. They want us to go cap in hand to “our friends” in Brussels, who might, if we ask nicely, forgive us for our democratic vote in 2016. They might let us rejoin (on their terms) or simply allow us to obey all their changing and unpredictable rules - what Keir Starmer now calls ‘dynamic realignment’. They must be laughing!

Rejoiners have complained for years that Leave voters didn’t understand what they were voting for. Well, now is their chance to change that: let them tell the country just what they are proposing. We ask them these ten questions so that we can all make up our minds based on fact.

How much would Britain pay into the EU budget if it rejoined?

During our last year of membership in 2020, we paid £17.4 billion to the EU, and at that time we had a rebate of £4.2 billion, which would not continue if we rejoined. Since then, the EU budget has ballooned. Some of the budget would be spent in the UK, but they would decide, not us. Our payment into that budget could hardly be less than France’s, which is now 24 billion euros. So roughly twice as much as before 2016: over £1,000 - and rising—from every British family every year forever.

What would annual net migration be after Free Movement is restored?

When the EU expanded into Eastern Europe, the government estimated a maximum of 13,000 people a year might come to Britain. By 2016, EU immigration was over 300,000 per year, and since Brexit it has fallen substantially. If Free Movement is restored, it would apply in due course to new members, including Albania and Serbia. How many people in total would Rejoiners expect to come? How

would this flood of cheap labour affect wages, housing, public services, and our low productivity problem - which means that while our population shoots up, we get no richer?

What proportion of the global economy and of British trade will the EU represent in twenty years’ time?

When we joined the EEC in 1973, it was 20 percent of the global economy. It was only 8 percent when we left and is constantly falling. We had a permanent trade deficit with the EU, as we were effectively a captive market: this deficit had reached an unsustainable £100 billion a year when we left, though since Brexit it has been improving. When we were members, our exports to the stagnant EU barely increased for 20 years despite being in the Single Market. But exports *outside* the EU grew four times faster. The OECD forecasts that 94% of world economic growth to 2040 will be *outside* the EU.

What would be the effect on future trade of abandoning negotiations for closer relations with the Pacific region?

The Indo-Pacific region is booming and is expected to account for more than half of the world’s total growth to 2050. By 2030, around half of the world’s 2.3 billion middle class consumers will be there. Its share of our exports is growing too and reached £95 billion in 2022. And we have a trading surplus. We have signed trade agreements with Australia, Singapore, and Japan, and are close to a deal with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a huge free trade area of 500 million which with the UK would be economically bigger than the whole EU. Going back towards the EU - what Labour is calling ‘dynamic alignment’ - would mean throwing this away and turning our backs on future trade growth.

What would be the economic cost of our eventually joining the Eurozone?

New EU members are required to join the Eurozone. As many economists warned from the beginning, the Euro has been

economically damaging. It has helped to turn the EU into a zone of slow growth, and this has cost most member countries a huge amount of wealth. A German think-tank has calculated that since adopting the Euro every Frenchman has lost on average 21,000 euros, and every Italian has lost 74,000 euros. How much would the average British family stand to lose when we eventually adopted the Euro - a condition of EU membership?

Will the UK rejoin the Common Fisheries Policy?

The Common Fisheries Policy was sprung on Britain just as it was applying to join the then EEC. It was so bad that Norway refused it and has never joined. Certainly, progress on fisheries has been too slow since 2016. But by 2026 we shall regain full control over our fishing waters, to the great benefit of the North of England and Scotland. Rejoining the EU, on whatever terms, would give this away.

As we already have a Free Trade Agreement with the EU, what precisely would be the advantage of rejoining its Single Market and Customs Union?

The Free Trade Agreement signed in 2019 facilitates trade between the UK and the EU. Despite unscrupulous scare stories, official statistics show that our exports to the EU have not been damaged by leaving. They even broke all records in July 2022: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/nationalaccounts/balanceofpayments/bulletins/uktrade/july2022>.

Foreign investment in the UK is higher than in any EU country. So why rejoin the Single Market and the Customs Union? It would be costly, burdensome, undemocratic, divisive - and for what?

The Customs Union is the founding pillar of EU membership, not an optional bolt-on to minimise border paperwork, as its proponents seem to think. It is designed to promote tariff-free trade within the EU while pricing out competitors in the rest of the world through high tariffs. The most critical and immediate casualty of rejoining

Rejoining the EU?

the Customs Union would be our independent trade policy. We would be unable to join the Trans-Pacific trade partnership, for example, because we could not deviate from EU tariffs. The EU alone would decide who we trade with and on what terms. For the United Kingdom, with global supply chains and an expanding export market outside the EU, it would be a step back into Fortress Europe, higher prices, and policies to benefit EU companies rather than British ones.

Before 2016, we had a huge deficit and stagnant exports with the EU. To join it as a non-EU member would put our whole trade policy under the control of Brussels without our having any say.

Will Brussels lawmakers have priority over the UK parliament, and will the European Court of Justice be superior to British courts?

When we joined the EEC in 1973, European law became superior to British law, and our courts had to apply it irrespective of Parliament. We voted in 2016 to regain control over our laws.

The government is trying to disentangle us from thousands of regulations we did not choose. If we rejoin the EU in whatever 'hard' or 'soft' form ('dynamic alignment') we will again have to accept all its laws - along with hundreds of new ones adopted since we left - interpreted by a European Court that makes up its own rules.

Would Rejoiners agree to the EU being in overall charge of foreign and security policy?

The EU aims to be a federal state with a foreign policy and armed forces under its control. Even in the present dangerous wartime situation, it is meddling in what is NATO's job, and some British civil servants, despite Brexit, are quietly entangling us in EU defence arrangements. Yet the EU's divisions and feebleness over the invasion of Ukraine - in contrast to Brexit Britain's rapid and decisive aid - prove that it cannot be trusted with our security.

Will Rejoiners commit to a referendum to approve the terms

negotiated for a new relationship with the EU?

The largest democratic vote in our history decided in 2016 that we should leave the EU. Remainers in parliament, the courts and the civil service tried to block this decision. They demanded a second referendum to reverse the first. Will they now commit to a second referendum after they have renegotiated new arrangements with the EU, whether for a soft or a hard 'Brentry'? Will they let the people decide? Or do they want to do it behind our backs?

If you are tempted to think that Brexit was a mistake, ask yourself these ten questions. Ask them of your Remainer friends. Ask them of your MP. And finally ask yourself why Rejoiners are still trying to put the country into reverse after only three years of freedom.

[This is a wake-up call for all those who want to go back into the EU - Ed]

Source: www.briefingsforbritain.co.uk

A suggested Immigration Policy

According to the web site of Britain First, it has a very robust immigration policy that many in the UK would welcome considering the current influx levels.

"Deport all illegal immigrants, no exceptions. Reject and deport all so-called 'asylum seekers' who do not originate from countries bordering the United Kingdom. Asylum seekers who travel through a peaceful country will not be eligible to claim asylum. Any asylum seekers who travel back to the country they claim to have been forced to flee from will be automatically rejected for asylum. As a general rule if granted asylum in the UK, asylum seekers will be expected to return to their country of origin within 12 months once peace is established in that country.

* Deport all foreign-born criminals who are currently incarcerated in UK prisons once their prison terms expire.

Immigrants to the UK will be expected to abide by our laws, no exceptions. This retroactively includes all foreign-born criminals currently serving prison terms or have served prison terms in the past.

Completely halt any further immigration except in special cases such as genuine marriages where strict citizenship criteria, has been met. Britain as a nation is overpopulated and therefore cannot accept any further immigration. The former Dominions of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand - and current Crown Dependencies - will still be permitted the right to settle in the UK if certain criteria is met, such as the absence of a criminal record. Citizens of other states will have to prove their British ancestry to be able to settle in the UK.

* Short term visas to work in specific cases will be granted only after strict criteria is met. The criteria will

include proof of employment, medical insurance, criminal record checks, and the absence of native labour to fill the void in question.

* Make it an act of treason to implement any policy or measure, or sign any political agreement, that facilitates and/or results in significant numbers of foreigners entering the sovereign territory of the United Kingdom with the aim of settling. Any attempt to alter the demographic makeup of the British Isles will result in stiff prison terms.

* Britain First will establish a system of voluntary repatriation whereby immigrants, or citizens of overseas origin, will be assisted financially to return to their country of origin, or a new country of their choice, if they wish to do so. This system will be entirely voluntary.

Source: www.Britainfirst.org

Advantages of CPTPP membership

Brian Monteith

Unlike the EU, the CPTPP leaves countries and consumers to choose. Finally joining the CPTPP (Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership) will be a great moment for our Global Britain. As our research has shown over more than two decades of studying the ONS export data, the real economic growth the UK has, to tap into and benefit from is already outside the EU and primarily in the trading nations of Asia and the Pacific. This trend will only accelerate.

Joining the CPTPP will open-up huge opportunities for commerce that were simply not available while we remained inside the EU.

The CPTPP is different from the EU because it is all about trade – and encouraging more trade. It is not a political union and as such it does not carry a huge deadweight of costs and bureaucracy. Nor does it seek to tell its member nations what labelling its goods should have, how the cork of a bottle of fizz should be constructed or how bent (or straight) a particular fruit (or vegetable) should be.

These issues are left instead to competitive markets and the trading nations to decide for themselves (if at all). This in part explains why such countries are enjoying higher growth than the EU – the other (larger) part being their drive towards free trade rather than erecting trade barriers. If they wish to increase the size of state intervention through welfare and government regulations it is to *their* cost – and risk to *their* economic growth.

You can therefore imagine that in the coming months opponents of the UK's entry into the CPTPP will throw everything – including the CE-marked Brussels-approved kitchen sink – to lobby against its accession. This lobbying will happen not just in the UK but also in the ten CPTPP member nations, reflecting the fact that each has a veto to the UK's accession.

Naturally each of those member

nations will take the opportunity to look at any impediments to open and free trade the UK has erected in the past – most likely bestowed upon us from those days when our colonial masters in Brussels determined our tariff arrangements and regulations to suit other countries' producer interests (like Olive and sunflower oil farmers).

We can then expect the full force of producer interests in the UK to lobby the media and MPs to put a spanner in the final accession process so consumers cannot benefit from competition, lower prices – and yes, often higher standards.

Many exaggerated claims about maintaining standards in livestock husbandry, environmental conditions or health and safety etc will be heard on the *Today Programme* and be all over the *Financial Times*, *Guardian* and other supporters of Fortress Europe. Indeed, the carping, whinging, and gnashing of teeth has already started when it was reported in the *FT* (where else) that the UK is expected to remove its existing import duties, ranging up to 12%, on Palm Oil imported from Malaysia.

Quicker than you could reach for the Peanut Butter the advocates of Water Melon* environmental politics were describing it as a singular reason to not join the CPTPP at all. It would surely mean greater deforestation as 'more' natural forest is cleared to grow Oil Palm plantations – and the survival of the Orangutang would undoubtedly be threatened. All of it oblivious to the truth and how vegetable oil markets work.

As usual the facts are an inconvenience. Why, because growing Oil Palms is better than growing Soybean, Sunflowers, Rapeseed or Olives (among the many sources of vegetable oil). Why? Because the oil yield of the Oil Palm is significantly higher than all the others. Using Palm Oil makes sense because the other sources of edible oils for cooking and food manufacture would need greater

amounts of land to be cleared for cultivation (see below). *More* Orangutangs or other species would be put at risk through the enormous amount of clearance required were Malaysia to change its crop.

Secondly, Malaysia is a shining example of a country encouraging *sustainable* Palm Oil production, it has been reducing its deforestation as a result and it makes sense to reward its farmers by giving them our trade.

Surprise, surprise the EU is responding to its big vegetable oil farmers' lobby by introducing new, higher barriers to Palm Oil imports – ignoring the advances in Malaysia and punishing its consumers at a time of high food inflation. The UK has no need for such indulgences through tariff barriers and hidden subsidies and can instead let the market decide. Which oils it should buy.

When it comes to protests about saving the environment the reality is that rather than being demonised by Water Melon NGO's for rewarding Malaysia's farmers who have turned to sustainable farming, the UK should be applauded for showing leadership in tackling deforestation and protecting precious habitats of endangered species. Getting into the CPTPP will be a Brexit bonus – on top of helping save the Orangutang.

[*Water melons – Green on the outside but bright Red on the inside]

Inconvenient truths for Water Melons to consider:

1. 90% of the palm oil imported into the continent of Europe (including the UK) is sustainable and does not cause deforestation.

2. Oil yields for palm per hectare is almost 6-10 times that of other oilseeds such as rapeseed, soybean, olive, or sunflower.

3. Because of its high yield, palm oil requires around *one-ninth* the land of substitutes like rapeseed, olive, and soybean. To keep pace with growing food demand would require 36 million

Advantages of CPTPP membership

hectares of additional Oil Palm land, whereas soybean, the second most popular oil crop, would need 204 million more hectares.

4. According to Global Forest Watch, primary forest loss in Malaysia decreased by almost 70% between 2014 and 2020. According to the WRI, 2020 is the fourth straight year that palm oil deforestation has been trending down.

5. World deforestation from palm oil has fallen to a four-year low: Deforestation in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Papua New Guinea attributed to the development of oil palm plantations has fallen to its lowest level since 2017, according to satellite analysis published from risk analysis group Chain Reaction Research (CRR).

6. NGO, Global Canopy, has singled out palm oil supply chains as doing a

better job than others in providing deforestation commitments: 72% of Palm Oil companies compared to the “pulp and paper (49%), soy (40%), beef (30%) and leather (28%)” sectors.

7. University of Bath scientists recently showed in *Nature Sustainability* that banning palm oil could drive greater rates of deforestation, by switching demand to less efficient edible oils like sunflower or rapeseed which use more land, water, and fertiliser.

8. According to Global Forests Report 2020 by Carbon Disclosure Project, palm oil companies have the highest levels of rigorous no-deforestation commitments (20%), comprehensive risk assessments (25%) and integration of forest-related issues into all parts of their long-term strategic business plans (57%).

9. Malaysia’s Sime Darby

Plantation, the world’s largest producer of certified sustainable palm oil, received, recently a clean bill of health from US Customs, and has committed to being net-zero by 2050. The company also plans to *reforest* a 400-hectare (ha) area of peat plantations in Sabah and Sarawak, and to date, it has forest set-aside programmes of more than 40,000ha, with over 1.9 million forest trees planted.

Brian Monteith has worked in public relations for forty years, initially in the City, then Scotland and finally as an international consultant in Africa, the Caribbean and South Asia. A former member of the European and Scottish parliaments, he is Director of Communications at Global Britain and editor of ThinkScotland.org.

Source: www.globalbritain.co.uk

New think tank

The Centre for Brexit Policy (CBP) is a think tank backed by cross-party voices who support the UK leaving the EU. The CBP was formed to propose the critical policy changes enabled by Brexit that will boost national prosperity and well-being in years to come, as well as help ensure that Britain fully ‘takes back control’ after leaving the European Union. The CBP aspires to trigger a deep and wide debate about what Brexit should mean for the UK over the next decade or two. By providing a focus for the development of post-Brexit public policy, the CBP hopes to help formulate an overarching framework for the UK that maximises the opportunities Brexit affords. This will be promoted to government,

Parliamentarians, and the public welcoming contributions from those who want to see Brexit open a new and fruitful chapter in our country’s life. The CBP has three core objectives:

- Identify the benefits and opportunities of Brexit across the full spectrum of economic, trade, social, foreign, defence and security policy areas proposing new policies for the government’s agenda

- Continue to make the intellectual, evidence-based case for a ‘real’ Brexit and provide the government with clear and constructive advice on how to deal with ongoing negotiation and implementation issues. A ‘real’ Brexit means regaining full control over our laws, borders, seas, trade, and courts.

- Check any attempts to dilute

Brexit, as well as serving as a catalyst and rallying point for positive news stories that, over time, will be able to persuade and demonstrate the many substantial advantages of Brexit. Delivery of these objectives is based on professional, substantive fact-based research by experts in their fields leading to authoritative reports, short papers, OpEds, events, and briefing meetings - both within and without government. The CBP is supported by a cadre of expert CBP Fellows drawn from multiple disciplines to provide additional expertise and experience in developing an agenda for policy change that will ensure the British people benefit from Brexit.

Source: centreforbrexitpolicy.org.uk

European exposure to chemicals

Earlier this year, an investigation revealed that there are more than 17,000 sites contaminated by forever chemicals around Europe.

There is widespread human exposure to so-called ‘forever chemicals’ — technically known as

PFAS — in Europe, with growing hotspots identified in Germany, Belgium, Sweden, Italy, and Denmark, according to the results obtained by Europe’s largest-ever biomonitoring programme.

Industrial sites, airports, firefighting

training centres, waste disposal facilities, and wastewater treatment plants have been identified as the sources of PFAS contamination in these hotspots.

Source: www.euobserver.com

How to restore government in Stormont

Restoring devolved government in Northern Ireland (NI), the bedrock of its peace and prosperity, requires getting the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) back into Stormont. The way to do that is through implementing Mutual Enforcement across the North-South Irish border.

Mutual Enforcement, under which the UK and European Union take on the enforcement of each other's import and export regulations and standards, is based on existing international trade practice and endorsed in the government's July 2021 Command Paper. It protects both the UK and EU trading blocs, returns sovereignty to NI

as part of the United Kingdom, and enables the return of the invisible border on the island of Ireland. It cuts through NI's Gordian knot of post-Brexit sovereignty, trade, and governance issues. It unlocks the return of the DUP to Stormont.

The NI Protocol (Protocol) is the cause of that Gordian knot. Successive governments have tried to amend it, but ultimately only added to its complexity. The latest iteration of this approach, the "Windsor Framework" (Framework), has already failed the governance test: the DUP (supported in their position by a significant number of Westminster MPs) have not returned to Stormont. And the growing clamour

from NI businesses suggests that the much-hyped trading arrangements – Green and Red Lanes – are failing their first contacts with reality.

Mutual Enforcement removes all the negative consequences of the Protocol/Framework yet achieves the stated broader objectives of the Protocol. Unless all parties agree to move to such an alternative, Stormont cannot be re-opened. The UK government should set out to agree Mutual Enforcement with the EU and, with or without the EU's agreement, abandon the Protocol and Framework as soon as possible.

Source: Extract of a report by www.centreforbrexitpolicy.org.uk

Turning things around

According to Rolf Norfolk writing for the Bruges Group, the UK must not listen to declinists and defeatists. It is amazing how fast things can be turned around, and I've seen it in education, where the material we work with is often difficult.

In the late Seventies I taught in an inner-city multiracial secondary school neighbouring Handsworth, where the first riots were to come three years later. The building was Sixties brutalist and across the street was a vista of derelict, burnt-out houses. The area was transitional: anybody with initiative was planning to move on. However, the lowest stratum in the school was a proportion of its whites who didn't have that aspiration; their behaviour wasn't challenging but they were inert and would simply mature, remain and reproduce.

The middle group were sparky and disorderly as puppies in the younger forms, tending to negative and surly as they grew older. Yet even then the latter responded well to an old-fashioned teacher who governed them with iron rule (in pin-drop silence) but spoke and listened to them with respect; and another sweet old man nearing the end of his 42-year career. A young and inspirational Head of English had pupils running to get into

her class; so, there was quite a bit of good teaching and learning going on. It had a small but thriving sixth form.

Nevertheless, generally the corridors were like a social club. As some youngsters entered class others would slide out and chat with peers; it could take fifteen or twenty minutes to start.

For the children knew the school was not in overall control; the management had given up on a firm lead. The Head was closeted in his office, ignoring the old wisdom that 'the best fertiliser is the farmer's foot.' Two of the deputies had colonised a stock cupboard, installed a kettle and when a child brought a message the door would open just enough for a hand to emerge and take the paper, then shut again, like one of those mechanical moneyboxes shaped like coffins.

The site was also entered occasionally by toughs; one dreadlocked character said a word I couldn't catch but it cleared the aisle like magic - there's discipline for you. In relation to this, it wasn't just the school that abdicated responsibility: an Authority legal adviser was called in to hear the staff's concerns about these incursions; he said the site was public property so was open to the

community. When a teacher responded that Council House was too but was guarded by security people at the door, the lawyer looked down at his papers, circling a forefinger on them, and said 'That is... a point of view.'

About a year later, in came a new boss, definitely not, 'same as the old boss.' He'd been part of the senior management team in an outstanding comprehensive and grasped the nettle firmly from the outset. All that larking about stopped and lessons started on time. School diaries, book inspections, assemblies to remind everyone what the program was. When a couple of community do-littles entered the place with a camera, he invited them to take pictures of him in his lair and then saw them off. The institution started to earn its corn, even in this challenging and economically, deprived environment; without caning or mass expulsions.

Should our politicians receive training like prospective school leaders in how to run things, instead of 'going with the flow' and dreaming up PR stunts to make it look as though they have some idea what they are doing? Can you think of public issues of today that could be solved by a systematic and resolute approach?

Source: www.brugesgroup.com

LETTERS

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

Homelessness

Dear Editor,

While I applaud the new five-year campaign spearheaded by Prince William to end homelessness in the UK, we should first look at the causes.

Poverty and often drug related reasons are the main ones, but why?

The constant increase in population due to immigration both legal and illegal has caused an even greater housing and employment problem for all UK citizens.

Currently the UK clearly priorities those not born here over those that are. A perfect example of this is the spending of UK taxpayer money to provide housing and even financial help to those arriving illegally.

The UK has thousands more jobs available than the number of homeless people, so surely a way can be found to employ these people. Companies used to provide homes for the workers they needed. Companies could be given ample tax breaks to assist this process.

It is a fact that some homeless people will be unable to work due to medical or other problems but, that is a small number and rest homes could be provided by the state to help those people get better or at least have a basic lifestyle. Many in this group would probably be able to provide some help themselves in those running these rest homes.

During the covid outbreak all those who wanted accommodation - even those born in the UK - were given help to get it. So, it can be done it just requires the will.

DOROTHY SPEARS
London

Green taxes

Dear Sir,

Why can't the politicians understand that the public cannot especially at this time be forced into paying even more money into the green agenda.

While many may argue the pros and

cons of going green the reality is that the cost is affecting the number of children and adults that are now going hungry, and whose medical requirements will increase to levels that the NHS already under pressure will be unable to deal with.

The push to electric vehicles could well create a bigger problem during the winter months when electricity is needed for heating homes. Choices will then be made over keeping their homes warm or providing power to get to work especially in the countryside.

However, the extra demand for electricity will most likely result in the UK buying electricity from the EU at vastly inflated prices.

Sadly, those UK elected politicians and those in the green lobby appear more concerned with creating a global image that they are saving the planet.

THOMAS GREEN
Leicestershire

Pollution

Dear Sirs,

The fanatical drive to remove pollution in the air above the UK regardless of the cost to the downtrodden taxpayers', is yet again a sign of politicians and pressure groups lack of reality.

The UK maybe an island but it cannot control the levels of pollution that are carried over by the global wind currents that come from around the world.

While the UK is reported to be responsible for 1% of the global problem, other countries like India, China, and Russia, that create much high levels of pollution, are paying lip service to the environmental concerns raised. In many cases they are clearly increasing the levels they produce.

Germany - a leading EU member - has increased the level of coal fired power stations over the last year with little concern about what they may do to the pollution levels.

RUPERT EVANS
Monmouthshire

Gender identity

Dear Sirs,

The idea that appears to be on the agenda today is that any human being in the UK can decide to pick any gender identity, this could well lead to some interesting legal cases.

For instance, cats and dogs like other animals do not have to pay tax or are legally responsible for their actions or, even have to produce any form of identity documentation on demand by the police or HMRC.

Maybe we should all identify as a horse or some other animal and no longer pay taxes or obey any form of regulation that we don't like.

Clearly this is madness and should be prevented especially in schools where the idea appears to have started.

DEBRA GRAHAM
Yorkshire

Gibraltar

Dear Editor,

Yet again we hear Spanish voices picking on Gibraltar, this time over its very strategically important airport.

The EU will always side with Spain against Gibraltar's right to be an independent country, even though it has democratically clearly expressed its wish to remain so.

Their wish to remain outside the EU and bonded to the UK (Let's not forget that Gibraltar is a British Overseas Territory) this has always frustrated the undemocratic EU organisation. This time the battle is over who owns the land the airport is on.

Many workers cross the Spanish Gibraltar border every day both ways, quite happily, but the Spanish government has never given up its fight to reclaim Gibraltar.

The UK should fully support Gibraltar and its people over their fight with the EU and its member states.

RONALD STEVENS
Hampshire

LETTERS

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

A future suggestion

Dear Sirs,

I keep wondering about *Eurofacts*.

I don't mean to be impolite, nor ungrateful, when I suggest this but, although Brexit needs a lot more work done on it in terms of achieving a proper separation from the EU, a fight in which the magazine continues to do a great job, aren't there other important topics that need covering, many of which have either developed or worsened since 2016?

While I want to keep supporting *Eurofacts*, I have been trying to think of a way in which the magazine might become (dare I say this?) more relevant in terms of addressing the simply terrible state of the modern world. And I keep dwelling on the thought that either it should be transformed into a periodical that tries to tackle all the lying propaganda that has been foisted on us since we voted to leave the EU, or we, its subscribers, try to persuade the publishers to consider producing a second magazine to tackle this urgent task.

Behind this thought lies the fact that the mainstream media singularly fail to address these issues, which we, their readers are all too consciously aware but find no sympathetic ear in the outlets of normal publishing businesses. Accordingly, I would say that there is a huge gap in the marketplace for a vehicle that addresses (tells the truth about) topics like Climate Change, Wokery, Transgenderism, The Great Reset, Net Zero, the Covid disaster, ESG, International Debt, 15-Minute Cities, the worrying increase in excess deaths since the launch of the Covid vaccine - that's ten key topics for starters. The EU would be added to the list, as might a whole host of other topics.

Further to this suggestion, I suspect

that we readers might enjoy it if more space were given to readers' letters. I recall when *The Western Morning News* increased its letters page from one to four, I thought that was a splendid idea since it gave letter writers a much greater chance of seeing their contributions in print. I believe that a large space devoted to readers' letters would increase circulation - that page is just about the only page I ever read in a newspaper - and it would help to stimulate public debate about these vital subjects.

If there were such a periodical, we, as individuals, would find it much easier to raise the subject of our concerns about the aforementioned topics; topics that are currently seldom volunteered in general conversation for fear of being ostracised.

Of course, such a magazine would need a different name. To set that ball rolling, might I suggest something to summon up the blood like *The Fight Back*?

I offer these suggestions with a sense of deep gratitude for what the proprietors of June Press have done for its readers like me. Thank you!

HUGH WILLIAMS
Wiltshire

NATO

Dear Sirs,

The push by the US president Joe Biden for the appointment of Ursula von der Leyen as the next Secretary General of NATO should be worrying for all Nato members.

She had been a failure when in charge of the German defence department and has been hell bent on creating a European Defence organisation to compete with NATO. It appears that she could well destroy the NATO alliance from within if appointed, or even worse turn it into a

European Union Defence Structure. No longer would the NATO organisation be in safe hands but a danger to all.

Her push to get Ukraine inside the EU and NATO, would cause a problem for Russia and make it impossible to break the Ukraine-Russia conflict by negotiation.

The NATO members must wake up to the threat this kind leadership would create.

Will our weak prime minister Rishi Sunak stand up and be counted or will he bow down to Biden and not oppose Ursula von der Leyen's appointment?
SARAH DONALDSON
Yorkshire

EU rules and regulations

Dear Editor,

We see yet again that our weak pro-EU Conservative government supported by the pro-EU Labour party are backing down on making the UK a truly independent country. They appear happy to allow significant rules and regulations that we inherited from our EU membership to remain in force regardless of the will of the electorate.

Clearly as they wish to be governed by the EU, then they should stand down as MPs, and allow those who truly want the UK to be ruled by the UK to take their place.

MARY HISCOCK
West Midlands

Military destruction

Dear Sirs,

Time has come for the UK to improve the numbers of the army, navy, and air force members available to maintain our freedom and military machine!

JUSTIN JEFFERIES
Cornwall

**Wishing you a happy summer recess.
The next *eurofacts* will be on the 8th September.**

MEETINGS

Reform Party Autumn Conference

Awaiting date and
venue details
not yet announced

www.reformparty.uk

Liberal Democrats Autumn Conference

23rd - 26th September

Bournemouth

www.libdems.org.uk

Conservative Party Autumn Conference

1st - 4th October

Manchester Central

www.conservatives.com

Plaid Cymru Party Autumn Conference

6th - 7th October

Prifysgol Aberystwyyn University

www.partyofwales.org

Green Party Autumn Conference

6th - 8th October

Brighton

www.greenparty.org

Labour Party Autumn Conference

8th - 11th October

Exhibition Centre Liverpool

www.labour.org.uk

UK Independence Party Autumn Conference

14th October

The Dragon Hotel, Swansea

www.ukip.org

FREE Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of the UK-EU relationship, or know of one upcoming, please inform us so that we can hopefully include the information.

Contact:

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175

or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

2023

UK Parliament 20th July
Summer Recess starts

Spanish General Election 23rd July

UK Parliament 4th September
Summer Recess ends

UK Parliament 19th September
Party Conference Recess starts

UK Parliament 16th October
Party Conference Recess ends

2024

Belgium takes over 1st January
EU Council Presidency

Hungary takes over 1st July
EU Council Presidency

2025

Poland takes over 1st January
EU Council Presidency

Final Date for UK
General Election January

Denmark takes over 1st July
EU Council Presidency

USEFUL WEB SITES

Brexit Watch
www.brexit-watch.org
Briefings For Britain
www.briefingsforbritain.co.uk
Britain First
www.britainfirst.org
British Future
www.britishfuture.org

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Weights & Measures Assoc.
www.bwma.org.uk
Bruges Group
www.brugesgroup.com
Campaign for an Independent Britain
www.cibuk.org
Centre for Brexit Policy
www.centreforbrexitpolicy.org.uk
Civitas
www.civitas.org.uk
Democracy Movement
www.democracymovement.org.uk
EU Observer
www.euobserver.com
EU Truth
www.eut ruth.org.uk
European Commission (London)
www.ccc.org.uk
European Foundation
www.europeanfoundation.org
Facts4EU
www.facts4eu.org
Fishing News
www.fishingnews.co.uk
Freedom Association
www.tfa.net
Freenations
www.freenations.net
Futurus
www.futurus-thinktank.com
Global Britain
www.globalbritain.co.uk
June Press (Publications)
www.junepress.com
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
www.eurosafeguards.com
Migration Watch
www.migrationwatch.org.uk
New Alliance
www.newalliance.org.uk
Policy Exchange
www.policyexchange.org.uk
The Reform Party
<https://www.reformparty.uk>
The Red Cell (Think tank)
www.theredcell.co.uk
Statewatch
www.statewatch.org
The Taxpayers' Alliance
www.taxpayersalliance.com
United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org
Veterans For Britain
http://www.veteransforbritain.uk

The End Of The English

The European Superstate
by David Brown

£6.99 - Pbk 2008 - 111 pp

Written as an apology to all grandchildren, it analyses how the EU planned for control of UK democracy.

Reflections on the Revolution in Europe

by Christopher Caldwell

£14.99 - Pbk 2009 - 363 pp

How mass immigration affects European and UK culture and religious values extending to democracy itself.

[Special Offer £10.00]

Elephant in the Room

by David Challice

£6.50 - Pbk 2015 - 300 pp

Bite-size nuggets of information regarding the UK/EU situation.

[Special Offer £4.00]

Living In A Fascist Country

by Vernon Coleman

£15.99 - Pbk 2006 - 346 pp

An account of the conspiracies, greedy politicians, endless religious wars and disappearing freedoms and privacy.

[Special Offer £10.00]

All Books plus 10% P&P (UK Only)
Cheques to June Press Ltd
PO Box 119, Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Why Did Britain

Take The Wrong Path?

by Christopher Hoskin

£9.99 - Pbk - 2009 - 270 pp

How and why the UK lost its way and ended up with a fear of self-government resulting in democracy being traded for life inside the EU without any understanding of what it would really be like.

[Special Offer £5.00]

Worlds Apart

by Mica Jay

£7.99 - Pbk -2017 - 111 pp

An intriguing novel about how a cosmic explorer who crashes to earth in the Amazon jungle becomes a cosmic celebrity and his effect on a remote tribal community.

The Shadow Liabilities of EU States

by Bob Lyddon

£15.00 - Pbk -2023 - 278 pp

The EU/Eurozone participate in the rules-based international order, but break its financial rules in both letter and spirit posing a threat to global finance.

Climate Eco-Socialism

by Jeremy Nieboer

£15.00 - Pbk - 2023 - 107 pp

How the dogma of eco-socialism global warming over science has created a drive to reduce CO₂ at any cost.

Climate - CO₂ natures gift

by Jeremy Nieboer

£15.00 - Pbk -2022 - 77 pp

Why CO₂ is not a pollutant and does not form a blanket to trap heat radiated by Earth's surface. It is not causing global warming as the doom merchants say.

Counter Attack

Montgomery and the Battle of the Bulge

by Robert Oulds

£8.00 - Pbk - 2022 - 65 pp

A previously untold and hidden story of Monty and his British led victory of Hitler's ruthless counteroffensive. Known today as the Battle of the Bulge.

Corbyn's Britain

Land of the Superwoke:

A Travel Guide to Corbyn's Britain

by Lee Rotherham

£13.99 - Pbk - 2019 - 265 pp

With a foreword by Jacob Rees-Mogg MP, a look into the past and possible future of a Hard Left Government.

Global Conspiracy

Evidence, Examples and Explanations

by Hugh Williams

£15.00 - Pbk- 2022 - 207 pp

Covid, Climate change and more, the author questions them all, and explains how the politicians and the media silence all those who dare speak out.

Online from www.junepress.com or Tel: 08456 120175 email info@junepress.com

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£30
Europe (Airmail)	£42/€50
Rest of World	£55/\$95
Reduced rate (UK only)	£25

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.

Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

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

I enclose my annual payment of £.....
to The June Press Ltd, PO Box 119
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

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

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403 741736
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	01738 783936
Business for Britain	0207 3406070
CIB	0116 2874 622
Conservativesforbritain	
www.conservativesforbritain.org	
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
New Alliance	020 7385 9757
Fishing Association	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

British Future	www.britishfuture.org
Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Futurus	www.futurus-thinktank.com
Global Britain	www.globalbritain.org
The Red Cell	www.theredcell.co.uk

POLITICAL PARTIES

Brexit (Reform) Party	0800 414 8525
Richard Tice	
Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rishi Sunak MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Co-leaders: Carla Denya and Adrian Ramsey	
Labour Party	020 7783 1000
Sir Keir Starmer MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Sir Ed Davey MP	
UK Independence Party	020 3476 9564
Neil Hamilton	

ISSN 1361-4134

