

My contribution to the debate on the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (Exit Day) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 2019

John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con): This is a travesty of proceedings. This is a major debate about the future of our country. This is a massive bill, committing us to making huge payments to the European Union, which we voted not to make anymore. It of course warrants a debate on the Floor of the House and a full vote of this House. I am grateful to my hon. Friend the Member for Stone for the enormous work that he has put in. His case stands completely unanswered today by the hapless Minister asked to represent the Government on this occasion. My hon. Friend made it clear why he thinks the statutory instrument is defective, and why the proceedings pursued by the Government did not live up to the constitutional standards that we expect. There may well be a serious legal challenge in the courts following these proceedings.

I urge the Minister to go back to the Prime Minister and to think again. We did not vote in the referendum to delay our exit beyond two and a bit years, which was forced upon us by the rules and regulations of the treaty we were leaving. We did not vote to leave one treaty in order to sign up to two new and even worse treaties, the first of which has singularly failed to get through this House on three separate occasions and is universally condemned by most voters, remain and leave.

We need a Government that understand the mood of the British people. We need a Government that believe in democracy. We need a Government that understand that the British people voted with good purpose to leave. Almost three years on, they are appalled that we, their elected and collective representatives in this place, have collectively done everything in our power to delay, prevent and impede a proper leaving of the European Union.

The Committee should vote the statutory instrument down. It should unite in condemning the procedures being pursued. It should recognise that it has been packed to do the Government's work, which the public do not want it to do. I hope that the Committee does the decent thing and surprises us all. I fear it will not, but I trust that people outside this House will note that some of us came to make the case they wish us to make. Some of us stand up for democracy, and we are appalled by the proceedings.

[A short Committee meeting with a big consequence](#)

Sir William Cash, I and others opposed the delay to our exit from the EU when the government embarked on it. We complained about the way the government agreed to the delay on the terms offered by the European Council and rushed it through in UK law by a Statutory Instrument that was not even debated. Yesterday, after much delay and argument, the government allowed Sir William a ninety minute debate in a committee where there was a secure opposition and government majority to approve the Statutory Instrument anyway. I am grateful to him for securing this debate and for submitting an important legal case about the way the government pushed through delay to our exit.

Many of us attended the Committee though we had not been included as members of it because we wished to put the case against delay, and to support Sir William's legal case concerning the imperfections of the Statutory Instrument which in his view made it void. In the Commons any MP can attend and speak at a committee, though only those made members of the committee can vote. Time did not permit speeches from most of those wishing to speak, though a series of lively interventions made sure the case for exit did not go unheard. I was allowed a couple of minutes at the end of the proceedings.

I said that it was sad day for Parliament when something of this magnitude fell to be debated in a small committee over just 90 minutes, As it entails the spending of additional £7bn or more on EU contributions, and submits us for many more months to EU laws and requirements, it should be debated by the whole House and voted on by every MP. I drew attention to the growing gap between many members of the public and Parliament over honouring the referendum decision. Many voters believe MPs should keep their pledges from the 2017 General Election when both Conservative and Labour promised to get us out of the EU by 29 March 2019 in accordance with the laws Parliament passed and the wording of the EU Treaty. I explained why our democracy needs us just to get on with it, to leave. When we voted to renounce the EU Treaty we did not vote to lock ourselves into two new Treaties.

The conventional media decided to ignore these heated and important exchanges between pro Brexit MPs and the combined ranks of the Conservative and Labour establishments. Labour simply failed to speak up for leaving and would not oppose the government.

[Safer junctions and better traffic](#)

flows?

I had a good meeting on Friday with Councillor Pauline Jorgensen of Wokingham Borough Council and her officers dealing with roads and traffic. She has ideas to cut congestion, improve safety and get the traffic flowing more smoothly. These things do take some time to design, plan and put into the budget.

I talked to her about various ideas for junction improvements as much of the delay and danger occurs at road intersections and where people need to cross the traffic as pedestrians. She is keen to make a difference to her portfolio as Executive member for roads and transport.

I would be interested to hear from constituents their ideas for how local roads and junctions could be improved, both by short term fixes and by longer term more substantial improvements. I have passed on some specifics to the Council for consideration. The general ideas that might help include

Short term/lower cost changes

Change light priorities to give more prominence to main roads with heavy flows

Change traffic light sets with single direction flows into sets allowing both direction flows for more of the time

Introduce good traffic sensors on all light sets, allowing reversion to main road as green for off peak, with red on the main road only when there is traffic on the side roads coming into the junction, and allowing flexed times for busy routes proportional to traffic.

Change road painting to allow segregated right turn lane where space permits

Indicate left turning on red by filter light where possible

Extend two lane queues where space permits rather than one lane

Ensure there is plenty of parking, avoiding parking on main roads in ways which impede flows. .

Encourage schools to make safe arrangements for car drop off and pick up of pupils off the main road

Short term dearer proposals

Replace light sets by roundabouts where possible

Create safe bike and pedestrian routes off the main highways

Have sufficient safe pedestrian crossings geared to light phases at light controlled junctions.

Longer Term proposals

Extra road bridge over east west railway line in Wokingham as on the current plans

Improved capacity on Earley peripheral and at Loddon roundabout

More by passes of villages as with Shinfield, Arborfield and Winnersh.

Completion of a good east -west vehicle route for local traffic

Extra capacity on A 329M/A3290

[The reign of experts and the “post democratic”age](#)

<http://johnredwoodsdiary.com/>



I like good experts. Modern science and technology has delivered some great advances which improve our lives. If I fell ill I would of course consult a doctor and seek expertise.

The problem is the present age is cursed with some experts especially in economics and government who keep getting it wrong yet they still expect the rest of us to accept their verdicts however damaging or daft they may be.

Lord Mandelson summed up the direction of travel when he talked about transition to a post democratic age. Modern governments try to give away their powers and responsibilities to international and national so called independent bodies full of alleged experts. They seek to prevent elected governments changing things by locking future governments into the system by binding International treaties. For years our budgets and economic policy were first dictated by the European Exchange Rate Mechanism and then by the Maastricht debt and deficit requirements. Our energy policy is governed by Climate Change Treaties.

Some people want us to be democratic so they oppose locking ourselves into

the rules and decisions of national and international bodies in principle. Other people would not mind if those bodies made wise decisions and did well, but understandably get cross when they lead us to disaster.

The truth is you cannot say you live in a democracy if crucial parts of government are under independent expert control with no democratic accountability. In practice in a democracy like the UK Parliament and government are held responsible for big decisions even if they are taken by so called independent experts. In a later post I will look again at how the Bank of England is not in fact independent and how wrong it has been on major issues of economic and financial policy over my adult lifetime. It is crucial that fallible expertise is subject to criticism and influence by elected officials and can be overturned if necessary by the votes of the people. The EU has threatened this important part of our democratic settlement with its rigid legal structure. Those in the Eurozone suffer even more from its defects.

Our aim should be helping people out of poverty and into better paid jobs

One of the main arguments between socialists and conservatives is over the main aim of economic policy. Conservatives want to raise living standards, to help people be better off. Socialists usually want to lower or remove inequality.

These two varying aims require different policy responses and achieve different results. Of course all sensible socialists would also want higher living standards, and all democratic conservatives agree the tax and benefit system should remove some of the inequalities market economies generate. Nonetheless deciding based around a primary aim of betterment for the many or a primary aim of cutting inequality produces different results.

Mr Osborne adopted more of the socialist preoccupation in his budgets, worrying about measures of inequality more than about sluggish rises in average real incomes. He worked out how to administer a bigger tax hit to the wealthy and how to get rich people out of the country or to stay out of the country. One of the easiest ways to cut inequality is to offshore the richest people by having a hostile tax regime towards them. This may then reduce investment and job creation for everyone else as these people live and invest in a more friendly climate elsewhere. Both France and Italy are now wooing the rich with a better tax deal for that reason.

A test of which motivation predominates in a policy maker is that of the Laffer curve. If a Chancellor insists on imposing a tax at a rate that reduces the tax take, we can assume he does so to create more equality at the cost of less income and lower living standards. The decision of Mr Hammond

and Mr Osborne to levy Stamp duties that cut the revenue must be based on this, and their persistence with a 45% higher rate of income tax which also lowers revenue.

I want a policy based on a more rapid reduction in low incomes and no incomes. That requires a policy which allows entrepreneurs, footballers and great entertainers to keep more of their earnings so they stay here and pay tax here. They then also buy more things here, invest more here and employ more people here. Jealousy is a nasty emotion, and not a good policy. It makes us all worse off, with less money to spend on public services. As you achieve more growth you can then also lower tax rates on the rest of us, where lowering the rate cuts the revenue for any given level of economic output.