

National Income, wealth and taxes

The UK's national income per head is higher than France, Italy and Spain, but a bit lower than Germany. All are massively lower than Ireland's. The Republic of Ireland has a per capita income more than twice the UK's and three times Spain's. The main reason is Ireland has held its company tax rates down to 12.5%, far lower than the other larger European countries. As a result large US and other overseas companies have wanted to set up in Ireland and book more of their activities through Ireland to take advantage of the lower tax rate. Far from collecting less company tax through lower rates, Ireland collects far more company tax as a percentage of the economy than the countries setting higher rates.

President Biden's success in getting leading countries to approve his idea of a minimum level of corporation tax worldwide will mean Ireland will lose a little of its advantage, being persuaded to put its rate up to 15%. This will still leave it below most of the other larger European countries.

The UK should use this opportunity to increase its company tax receipts by lowering the rates. The UK could now match Ireland with a 15% rate. This would doubtless be a good draw for large companies to locate more to the UK, and would remove the big competitive advantage Ireland gives herself by her current very low rate. Why don't the Treasury want to increase the tax take from companies and boost National Income? How much more evidence do they want that lower rates are successful?

Figures in US \$ from World Bank Per capita GDP

France 39,030

Germany 46,208

Ireland 85,267

Italy 31,676

Japan 39,538

Spain 27,063

UK 40,284

USA 63,543

The EU has clearly broken its UK Agreement and Northern Ireland Protocol

The EU has as it would say “broken the law”. They have reneged on the UK Agreement.

Article 1 of the Northern Ireland Protocol states

“This Protocol is without prejudice to the provisions of the 1998 Agreement in respect of the constitutional status of Northern Ireland and the principle of consent which provides that any change in the status can only be made with the consent of the people”

The loyalist community sees that the Protocol has cut them off from important parts of the UK state and placed them under EU rules and controls. They are losing their right to import from GB and to have the same laws as GB without their consent.

The Article affirms that “This Protocol respects the essential state functions and territorial integrity of the UK”. Not the way the EU is interpreting it.

Article 6 of the Protocol states

“having regard to Northern Ireland’s integral place in the UK the Union and the UK shall use their best endeavours to facilitate trade between Northern Ireland and other parts of the UK”

Instead the EU has gone out of its way to disrupt GB to NI trade and to divert trade to NI/EU.

The opening to the Protocol sets out the overarching aims for help in interpreting the text. These include:

Having regard to the importance of maintaining the integral place of BI in the UK’s internal market

Recalling that NI is part of the customs territory of the UK

Determined it should impact as little as possible on the everyday life of communities in both Ireland and NI...

All of these have been violated badly by the EU

Article 16 allows the UK or the EU to take unilateral action to remedy issues where there are “serious economic, social or environmental difficulties” or where trade is diverted. These tests are clearly met.

The EU would be wise to apologise for breaking the Agreement, and should take action to correct the difficulties it has created for NI and the UK single market.

The EU has clearly broken its UK Agreement and Northern Ireland Protocol

The EU has as it would say "broken the law". They have reneged on the UK Agreement.

Article 1 of the Northern Ireland Protocol states

"This Protocol is without prejudice to the provisions of the 1998 Agreement in respect of the constitutional status of Northern Ireland and the principle of consent which provides that any change in the status can only be made with the consent of the people"

The loyalist community sees that the Protocol has cut them off from important parts of the UK state and placed them under EU rules and controls. They are losing their right to import from GB and to have the same laws as GB without their consent.

The Article affirms that "This Protocol respects the essential state functions and territorial integrity of the UK". Not the way the EU is interpreting it.

Article 6 of the Protocol states

"having regard to Northern Ireland's integral place in the UK the Union and the UK shall use their best endeavours to facilitate trade between Northern Ireland and other parts of the UK"

Instead the EU has gone out of its way to disrupt GB to NI trade and to divert trade to NI/EU.

The opening to the Protocol sets out the overarching aims for help in interpreting the text. These include:

Having regard to the importance of maintaining the integral place of BI in the UK's internal market

Recalling that NI is part of the customs territory of the UK

Determined it should impact as little as possible on the everyday life of communities in both Ireland and NI...

All of these have been violated badly by the EU

Article 16 allows the UK or the EU to take unilateral action to remedy issues where there are “serious economic, social or environmental difficulties” or where trade is diverted. These tests are clearly met.

The EU would be wise to apologise for breaking the Agreement, and should take action to correct the difficulties it has created for NI and the UK single market.

Global government, elite restrictions

The Brexit vote was above all a vote to take back control from an unaccountable international body. People were fed up with rules and taxes that we had little influence over, that were then imposed against our wishes and enforced through a foreign political court.

Brexit voters want to see the promise that our votes would be respected and implemented seen through. We still have not taken back control of our fishing grounds, nor of Northern Ireland trade and NI market rules and laws. This is unfinished business that the government needs to get on with.

Meanwhile some parts of the UK establishment, the senior civil service, the courts and the big quangos seem to thrive on the idea that they can still get the UK signed up to international Agreements or Treaties to bind future governments and where necessary to thwart the wishes of UK voters.

It is untrue to say the 2018 Global Compact for Migration signed by Mrs May is another such binding Treaty, as it expressly says it is not legally binding and claims to respect the sovereignty of nations over border matters. It is however part of a wide patchwork of international Agreements and more importantly human rights law which is used by some to make it difficult for the Home Secretary to implement the public wish to see lower migration. The Home Secretary needs to come up with a strengthening of UK migration law to allow us to have sustainable and fair immigration.

Some are similarly seeking to sign us up to as many international agreements under COP 28 as possible. These could then be used to limit UK freedom in making policy in everything from agriculture through transport to energy and industry, despite the fact that the world's largest CO₂ producers like China, Russia and India have not similarly committed. The UK needs to ensure that all the actions we take to cut carbon dioxide output cut the global output at the same time. International Agreements must be signed by those who produce most CO₂ as well as by us. Ending up importing more from countries that do not control CO₂ in the same way damages our economy whilst failing to tackle the CO₂ totals.

An independent country needs to limit the amount of autonomy it signs away. Getting out of the EU is a huge step in the right direction, but we need to watch out for steps back again from a clever world establishment which does not trust the people nor the politicians who want to represent their views. Some in the global Establishment prefer to deal with politicians that they call grown ups, which means politicians who will ignore the public will or mislead the public over what is actually going on and who is in charge.

The most serious sacrifice of sovereignty was to the EU, with its binding legal structure and its own supreme court. Other international Agreements are subject to independent arbitration where there are disputes, and are best where there is a provision to allow a country to leave should circumstances alter.

Global government, elite restrictions

The Brexit vote was above all a vote to take back control from an unaccountable international body. People were fed up with rules and taxes that we had little influence over, that were then imposed against our wishes and enforced through a foreign political court.

Brexit voters want to see the promise that our votes would be respected and implemented seen through. We still have not taken back control of our fishing grounds, nor of Northern Ireland trade and NI market rules and laws. This is unfinished business that the government needs to get on with.

Meanwhile some parts of the UK establishment, the senior civil service, the courts and the big quangos seem to thrive on the idea that they can still get the UK signed up to international Agreements or Treaties to bind future governments and where necessary to thwart the wishes of UK voters.

It is untrue to say the 2018 Global Compact for Migration signed by Mrs May is another such binding Treaty, as it expressly says it is not legally binding and claims to respect the sovereignty of nations over border matters. It is however part of a wide patchwork of international Agreements and more importantly human rights law which is used by some to make it difficult for the Home Secretary to implement the public wish to see lower migration. The Home Secretary needs to come up with a strengthening of UK migration law to allow us to have sustainable and fair immigration.

Some are similarly seeking to sign us up to as many international agreements under COP 28 as possible. These could then be used to limit UK freedom in making policy in everything from agriculture through transport to energy and industry, despite the fact that the world's largest CO₂ producers like China, Russia and India have not similarly committed. The UK needs to ensure that all the actions we take to cut carbon dioxide output cut the global output at the same time. International Agreements must be signed by those who produce

most CO2 as well as by us. Ending up importing more from countries that do not control CO2 in the same way damages our economy whilst failing to tackle the CO2 totals.

An independent country needs to limit the amount of autonomy it signs away. Getting out of the EU is a huge step in the right direction, but we need to watch out for steps back again from a clever world establishment which does not trust the people nor the politicians who want to represent their views. Some in the global Establishment prefer to deal with politicians that they call grown ups, which means politicians who will ignore the public will or mislead the public over what is actually going on and who is in charge.

The most serious sacrifice of sovereignty was to the EU, with its binding legal structure and its own supreme court. Other international Agreements are subject to independent arbitration where there are disputes, and are best where there is a provision to allow a country to leave should circumstances alter.