

LARK HARBOUR

THE

YORK HARBOUR

BLOW·ME·DOWNER

OF THE OUTER BAY OF ISLANDS, NEWFOUNDLAND

ISSUE 116: 2017-12-01

NEWFOUNDLAND & LABRADOR

2017 December 01 Friday

Editor: *Stuart L Harvey*

P.O. Box 17, Lark Harbour, NL, Canada, A0L 1H0

Tel: 709-681-2256

Email: blowmedowner@gmail.com

Web Page: www.blowmedowner.webs.com

Merry Christmas

and a

Happy

Healthy and

Prosperous

New Year

to Everyone

COMMUNITY CALENDAR

LH=Lark Harbour YH=York Harbour JB=John's Beach
 HC=Holy Communion MP=Morning Prayer EP=Evening Prayer
 P&P=Prayer & Praise HB=Baptism MHS=Mem Hymn Sing
 ● = Full Moon

The BMD is published on or before the first Friday of each month.

2017 DECEMBER 2017

3rd Sun LH, 11:00am, HC ● Full Moon, HC
 9th Sat 3:00pm, **Santa Claus Parade**
 10th Sun LH, 7:00pm, HC Memorial Bulb Service
 17th Sun LH, 6:30pm, **Christmas Pageant**, refreshments later
 21st Thur Winter Solstice - First Day of Winter
 24th Sun **Christmas Eve**, LH, 2:00pm, Christmas Eve Service
 25th Mon **Christmas Day**
 31st Sun New Year's Eve, LH, 11:00am, MP

2018 JANUARY 2018

1st Mon ● Full Moon
 31st Wed ● Full Moon

2018 FEBRUARY 2018

1st Thur

2018 ADVANCE DATES 2018

Mar 1st Thur ● Full Moon
 11th Sun Daylight Saving begins - clocks ahead one hour
 31st Sat ● Full Moon
 April 1st **EASTER SUNDAY**
 29th Sun ● Full Moon
 May 29th Tues ● Full Moon
 June 28th Thur ● Full Moon
 July 1st Sun **Canada Day**
 27th Fri ● Full Moon
 Aug 26th Sun ● Full Moon
 Sep 3rd Mon Labour Day
 24th Mon ● Full Moon
 Oct 24th Wed ● Full Moon
 Nov 4th Sat Daylight Saving ends - clocks back one hour
 23rd Fri ● Full Moon
 Dec 22nd Sat ● Full Moon
 25th Tues **Christmas Day**

The BMD is published on or before the first Friday of each month.

Local groups are invited to provide information about their activities. Personal announcements also accepted. **All at no cost.**

Include dates, times, locations, etc, of the event, and *name & phone number* of person providing the information.

To ensure timely publication, please submit information at least one week prior to the first day of the next month.

Call 681-2256 or email to blowmedowner@gmail.com

EVERY EFFORT IS MADE TO ENSURE ACCURACY, BUT THE EDITOR IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ERRORS EXCEPT TO CORRECT THEM IN A LATER ISSUE.

LETTERS AND ARTICLES BY READERS WILL BE PUBLISHED AT THE EDITOR'S DISCRETION, NAME WITHHELD IF REQUESTED.

ANONYMOUS INPUT WILL NOT BE PUBLISHED.

BUSINESS & ORGANISATION DIRECTORY

- **Byrne's Store, Main Street, York Harbour**
groceries, hardware, gas & diesel, souvenirs **681-2040**
wandastrickland@outlook.com
 ~~~~~
  - **Captain Cook B&B & Cottages, York Harbour**  
 Email: [info@captaincookbb.ca](mailto:info@captaincookbb.ca) **681-2906; 1-877-681-2906**  
 ~~~~~
 - **Captain Cook's Galley, 135 Little Port Rd, Lark Harbour**
 Restaurant - Seasonal - Call for information **681-2777**
 ~~~~~
  - **Creative Photography by Linda, 131 Main St, Lark Hr**  
 Email: [creativephotographybylinda9@gmail.com](mailto:creativephotographybylinda9@gmail.com)  
 131 Main St, Lark Harbour **709 681-2255**  
 ~~~~~
 - **Curling ONE Stop Service Station, Corner Brook**
 366 Curling Street, automotive repairs, servicing **785-2619**
 ~~~~~
  - **Drop In Lounge, 23 Main Street, Lark Harbour**  
*entertainment, food, licenced* **681-2103**  
 ~~~~~
 - **Eddie Joyce, MHA, Bay of Islands, Corner Brook**
Minister, House of Assembly, St John's. NL **634-7883**
 ~~~~~
  - **Gudie Hutchings, MP, Long Range Mountains, NL**  
*Member of Parliament, Canada.* **709 637-4540**  
 ~~~~~
 - **Marlaine's Tidewatcher Café, 59 Main Street, Lark Hr**
Enjoy a meal beside the Harbour **681-2140**
 ~~~~~
  - **Sheppard's Clover Farm Store, Lark Harbour**  
*groceries, hardware, gas, marine supplies* **681-2160**  
 ~~~~~
 - **The Roost, Gift Shop and Gallery, York Harbour**
sea glass, paintings, handmade glass beads **681-2341**
 ~~~~~
- ● ● *Please support our local enterprises* ● ● ●  
 Local business listings as above - **NO COST**  
 Please call 681-2256 for information.

### A Reader's Letter re Donald Trump

*Moses C Sheppard, Ontario, Canada, says:*

I am not as worried about Trump as I am about his base. Assume we survive Trump, we will at worst be rid of him in 7 years. They appear to have him somewhat under control at the moment. His base, now enfranchised, is not likely to go away. It is the base, presumably which Congress does not wish to tangle with at the moment.

It may well be that American politics have been permanently changed. It is the long-term impact of the base on the American political system that is the wild card.

This rogue elephant is loose and unpredictable.

The hemisphere needs stability. With 25-30% of the American voting public on the rampage, who can predict where we are headed?

*Thank you for your comments, Moses*

## CANADA NEEDS INCREASED POPULATION

| COUNTRY               | CANADA           | USA             | CHINA           | UK               | RUSSIA          |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Population            | 36,705,800       | 326,037,000     | 1,387,270,365   | 65,648,000       | 144,300,000     |
| Density per sq km     | 3.92             | 32.86           | 145.00          | 235.00           | 8.400           |
| World Density Ranking | 38 <sup>th</sup> | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 22 <sup>nd</sup> | 9 <sup>th</sup> |
| Land Area in sq km    | 9,984,670        | 9,833,520       | 9,596,961       | 248,532          | 17,075,200      |

*The above statistics were selected from Wikipedia for comparison purposes. They are official, and are the most recent available.*

**Comparisons:** Canada & USA have quite similar Land Area but USA has almost ten times the Population.

Canada & China have quite similar Land Area but China has almost 40 times the Population.

Canada has slightly more than half the Population of UK but has approximately 40 times the Land Area.

Canada has more than half the Land Area of Russia but only a quarter of the Population. Both have large Tundra areas.

### THE PREMISE

To provide a high standard of living for its people, any country needs a home population base sufficient to create a demand to stimulate development and use of resources. But other factors must also be present for the process to succeed. That is how the Industrial Revolution started in England, and the same process still applies everywhere today.

### AN EXAMPLE FROM HISTORY

In the 1600s England was predominantly a rural society. There were very few actual factories, and most manufacturing was done by hand in private homes as there were no machines. Coal was used for heating in the towns, but it was taken out of the ground by hand by miners whose lives were, to quote [Thomas Hobbes](#) (1588-1679) in *Leviathan*, “..... nasty, poor, brutish and short.” Miners were often drowned in the mines, poisoned by carbon monoxide, killed in explosions, or crushed by falling rock.

However in 1712 [Thomas Newcomen](#) (1663-1729) invented a steam engine which pumped the water out of a mine when it flooded, and although it may not have improved the miners’ lives by much, it made the process more efficient and demonstrated that steam could be harnessed for practical use. Incidentally it also increased the profits of the mine owners.

Although Newcomen’s engine was first used in coal mines to pump water out, it was soon improved and adapted by men like [James Watt](#), (1736-1819) who built the first steam locomotive. It was then possible to move coal much more quickly and over greater distances from the mine to the factories which soon began to appear, and small towns became large cities in a few decades.

The little town of Sheffield had existed for centuries near a range of hills which was the source of iron used for many items like knives. Sheffield iron founders had been producing knives all through the Middle Ages. The poet Geoffrey Chaucer (1340-1400) mentioned a Sheffield “thwitel”, a kind of knife or dagger, in *The Reeve’s Tale*, one of his *Canterbury Tales*. Production of almost everything at that time was done entirely by human or animal labour. It took an ingenious man to develop a method of using the water coming down a mountain stream to drive one of the huge round stones that were used to grind a sharp edge on a knife. Then the invention of the steam engine increased speed and production and reduced cost, and what had been a small cottage industry began to develop into an enterprise that sold its products all over England and eventually world-wide.

The key to it was a product that everyone needed—a knife available at an affordable price. There must also be a market for the

product within relatively easy reach. London was close enough, already a large wealthy city, and several other towns were even closer, first by land, then later by canal and railway. An industry had now been born out of the proximity of iron ore, available water power, an entrepreneurial skill, and a market. In a few decades it gave way to steam and revolutionised the resource, and Sheffield became known as a world-wide manufacturer of cutlery.

### NEWFOUNDLAND’S PROBLEMS

Compare Sheffield’s success with Newfoundland’s lack of it. Newfoundland owned a resource of inestimable value ever since fifteenth century fishermen discovered cod on the Grand Banks. But the workers were either seasonal and went back to Europe in the Fall when the product was shipped out as dried salt fish and never became more than a slightly value-added product on these shores. Permanent civilian residence in Newfoundland was forbidden for any reason other than protecting and maintaining the fishery installations over winter. Harsh laws made independent survival difficult or impossible.

A few local fishermen salted and dried their own catch on the borderline of illegality and at the mercy of the British and French navies and the American privateers who were no better. So most of the fishermen spent their lives working for a merchant and gaining no benefit themselves from “value added” by their work.

Newfoundland’s other handicap was that there was no local market ready to purchase the fish. Everyone was a fisherman himself, or a merchant who paid a minimal price to the man who caught the product, and there were no consumers except perhaps the military on the Island. Fish was shipped to Europe or the West Indies as an extension of the “[Triangular Trade](#)” which primarily served mainland America, but the Canadian/Newfoundland version followed a similar pattern. The merchants who bought the fish generally paid a pittance wage or paid in credit that had to be spent in a monopoly business for whatever the fishermen needed, and no free enterprise was permitted under that stranglehold. The same conditions existed throughout most of the Newfoundland fishery. By the time the system began to open up, other problems began to occur in the fishery, and it was too late. No business could develop and thrive in such conditions.

Most of Newfoundland’s population lived precariously along the coasts until a couple of large companies established the two paper mills, Corner Brook and Grand Falls, in the early 1900s. Again, control was from elsewhere, and employment available there to most Newfoundlanders was the hard and often dangerous work of logging, or shift work in the mills. The main market for the mills was either

*Continued on next page →*

the USA or Europe, and there was limited opportunity for the growth of entrepreneurship. A few enterprises developed in St John's and other centres like Corner Brook and Grand Falls.

Newfoundlanders volunteered eagerly in both World Wars where the pay was perhaps better than anything they could earn on the Island. Then after World War Two some entered the Korean War, and Confederation with Canada was achieved in 1949 on the second try by the Little Man from Gambo, Joey Smallwood. It is significant that the strongest opposition to Confederation was from St John's, the home of most of the mercantile class, and the greatest support was from the West Coast. Smallwood actually credited the voters of the West Coast with his success. However, aside from the two mills and a few other small local businesses around the new Province, control remained predominantly with the St John's merchants who bought the fish at minimal prices and imported most of the needs.

The result of this was that if Newfoundland and the thousands who had lived and worked and died on the Island had ever received even a modest fraction of their due, the Colony and later the Province would have been one among equals in the Atlantic Region, instead of the Cinderella of the four. But as well as these small hindrances, one immense obstacle began to make itself felt.

#### THE NEWFOUNDLAND DIASPORA

Over the last century or so, people have been leaving Newfoundland in thousands to find work elsewhere. Through the early years of the 1900s most of the emigration was to "the Boston States" as the northeastern states became known to Newfoundlanders. It included much more than Massachusetts alone, extending south to New York, where Newfoundlanders found work building the skyscrapers and other infrastructure. Then after World War Two another emigrant destination was added to the Boston States, as Newfoundlanders began moving west, first to Ontario, and then to Alberta's tar sands in response to the fisheries moratorium of 1992.

These various emigrations have pushed Newfoundland's population into gradual decline, further aggravated by the ageing of those who never left the Island. A population where seniors outnumber other age groups is not encouraging of general entrepreneurial development in the Province. Moreover, the population of Canada as a whole risks a similar age imbalance. The indigenous population is the only segment showing a population increase in Canada, and that segment is not large.

#### POPULATION INCREASE AS A SOLUTION

Population increase, once considered to be an event to be discouraged, has now taken on an important role in our society. It may be helped by offering incentives to families to have more children, but this is a slow and long-term process. Existing families have probably aged beyond the time when they will increase their families, and they are more preoccupied with ensuring themselves a reasonable retirement at an acceptable age. So the task falls to the next generation who are not yet ready to start a family due to educational and early career commitments. Meaningful incentives therefore are needed, and as is often the case, in matters like this they are slow and not as effective as hoped. So it becomes obvious that the most efficient and timely solution has to be immigration.

#### PROBLEMS OF IMMIGRATION CONTROL

The traditional source of immigrants has dried up, and it is most unfortunate, though understandable, that world opinion has already become sour on immigration from predominantly Moslem countries. Objections are becoming louder as terrorist threats become more numerous and difficult to prevent, making it tempting to introduce

blanket prohibitions on admission of specific religions or racial types and persons from certain countries. It is easy to see how such prohibitions, while not acceptable in our free democratic societies, may become a dominant feature in immigrant selection. Donald Trump has already announced "[extreme vetting](#)", which at a superficial glance might look like an appropriate action to take. However it would involve investigations into an applicant's religious beliefs and may violate Canadian human rights legislation relating to religious freedom. It could be argued that those rights apply only to Canadian citizens, which immigration applicants are not, but it could strongly affect our ability to welcome refugees who have increased alarmingly in the last few years, and it may also raise questions about our sincerity as champions of freedom and democratic values.

A [study conducted by Michael Donnelly](#), University of Toronto professor of political science, has concluded that "there is a potential for intolerant, anti-immigrant and anti-refugee sentiment to increase" in Canada. This attitude will have to be addressed. Europe, the traditional source of earlier 20<sup>th</sup> century immigrants, cannot satisfy Canada's need, so Oriental, African, South American, and Middle-eastern individuals must be included. This requires careful selection by thoroughly purpose-trained officers. We do not want the *extreme vetting* threatened in the Trump mode, which would only put our immigration program in disarray. There will inevitably be increased costs to adequately supervise the process, but we must look into the future for new ideas instead of trying to make a new system out of one that is inadequate and not as effective as the task requires.

#### CONCLUSION

While the numbers of immigrants compared with the total population sound quite large (e.g. in 2001, 250,000 immigrants relative to the total population of 30,007,094) it is less than 1% annually. The main concern may be that the immigrants naturally tend to choose to live in areas of similar language and culture to their own, which helps them become established but tends to create ghettos. Language training and effective monitoring to provide assistance as needed are also essential until the people become established.

The fact remains that Canada certainly needs a substantial increase in population if we are to develop further as an industrial nation. A suitable target for the next thirty or so years to 2050 could be an overall increase of about 15% to result in a total population of about 50 million by mid-century. However this may be difficult to achieve, given the political and social problems already identified. If timely remedies are not successfully applied, Canada may decline further in comparison with countries that already have adequate populations.

There is no shortage of ingenuity and ability in Canada. There have been successful developments in various high-tech electronics and aerospace fields for example. If we can improve markets at home for those and other products and services we will make it possible for them to reach export markets around the world. But along with making conditions favourable for successful and promising Canadian industries, we must also make it a priority to accommodate a much larger permanent population base. Canada's future depends on it.

It is not a matter of choice: it is an imperative. — SLH

*For further information and recent Federal Government policy changes on immigration, read :-*

<http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/immigration-canada-2018-1.4371146>

## WHEN A ONCE GREAT NATION LOSES ITS DIRECTION

A pair of news items appearing in the British newspaper *The Guardian* illustrate quite effectively what is likely to happen when a nation with significant history of international involvement withdraws itself from its customary association with other nations.

As everyone is aware, in 2016 the British people decided in a very close referendum to withdraw from the European Union after a membership of about 40 years since 1973. In an early referendum held in 1975 the result was 67.2% approval compared with 32.8% opposed, approximately 2 to 1 in favour. It was never a whole-hearted decision by Britain to join the EU, but it had become accepted by many, particularly the younger people, and significant benefits had accrued over the years with easy opportunities to travel and work in other countries. But soon there appeared some areas of dissidence, in particular the free movement across borders, which resulted in large numbers of foreign nationals also looking for work in Britain. It is this same condition which has become an irritant in the USA, though many of those immigrants to America have often been either illegal immigrants or refugees from the Middle East and other troubled regions of the world.

Although the decision to leave presaged some of the policies that Trump would push later in USA, specifically *isolationism*, the British, and the American Trumpists too, may well regret this decision in years to come. During the decades as an EU member, Britain had benefited greatly in what had become one of the world's largest free trading groups. (The TPP, if it materialises, would be about twice the size of the EU, representing 40% of 2016 world trade.) The British benefited from their EU membership, where British goods and services had priority over those of non-member nations, and their economy, which had been quite weak once the post-war boom ended, had recovered quite well.

(1) The first loss caused by the British withdrawal from EU is the transferring of the [European Banking Authority](#) which had been in London's Canary Wharf and is being moved to Paris. Loss of the EBA, which regulates important aspects of the administration of EU banks, employed only 150 people, but it is the prestige lost by London, the hub of the financial world until its decline after World War One, that is unfortunate. This result of a vote of EU member nations after Britain chose to leave should be no surprise to anyone, although it would have been unlikely to happen if Britain had not resigned from the EU.

(2) The second loss is the [European Medicines Agency](#), also housed in Canary Wharf. This Agency evaluates new drugs created in the pharmaceutical industry in both human and veterinary medicine and employs about 900 people. Again, as the result of a vote by EU members, the EMA will relocate in Amsterdam, Netherlands. It is not the loss of jobs, however, that is the most unfortunate event for Britain: it is the loss of international prestige.

(3) A third similar event is that for the first time in its 71 years of existence, there is no British judge on the bench of the [International Court of Justice](#). Again, no very significant loss of employment is involved, but again the significance is the loss of involvement in an agency which settles many legal disputes on many subjects between nations and provides much legal advice on international matters. Britain will no longer have much influence over international legal issues. This specific loss has no real connection with Britain's



CANARY WHARF SEEN AT NIGHT FROM THE WEST

withdrawal from the EU, but it is still a significant cause of loss of British influence on the world scene.

Both Britain and America have introduced irrevocable changes in their *status quo*. The changes were in both instances achieved by legitimate constitutional means, but both were also without precedent, and were totally unexpected. This has generated a vacuum which in each case has created difficulties for those who have to make and implement decisions for future direction.

For Britain, the process of extraction from the EU is both uncertain and sensitive, and has a strong possibility of moving in entirely the wrong direction, leaving Britain with no ready backup options. For America, the election of Donald Trump as President meant that a 'loose cannon' has to be controlled, but the man presently in the White House seems to be stubbornly unreceptive to any reasonable form of guidance and rather slow to tackle his serious responsibilities. Meanwhile, those who have no choice but to respond — in the one case, the remaining EU member countries, and in the other, the rest of the world — have to decide on the best line of future action to protect themselves and to fill the vacuum. And in each case, failure to do so could easily turn into disaster. The British do not seem to be admitting any responsibility towards the EU, but many Americans are showing signs of some awareness that whatever they may do within their own country can have very powerful and far-reaching effects on the rest of the world.

---

### WHY IS INTERNATIONAL PARTICIPATION SO EXTREMELY IMPORTANT TODAY?

Participation in worldwide or regional institutions may not seem to be a matter of great importance. But with instant communication available everywhere, it is increasingly difficult to conceal any activity in one nation from the attention of any other. Consequently any human rights violations or 'collateral damage' will quickly become international news: some countries are very astute to pick up on the negative side, but perhaps less so when there is positive intervention. Also, any nation that values the quality and expertise of its own institutions, as Americans clearly do, will wish to see those institutions being involved at an international level. Such exchanges of cultural, political and economic ideas often lead to increased tourism and trade. However the opposite may result when a major

*Concluded on next page, lower half of Column 2*

## A FEW GENEALOGICAL FACTS THAT MAY SURPRISE YOU

### WE ARE ALL INHERITORS OF A MILLION YEARS B.C.

Recently I was listening to a radio program where a lady was talking about her own genealogy. She had discovered that she was related to some well-known people, like the lady in the commercial who learns that George Washington is a distant relative. You never know what surprises may be hidden in your ancestry.

Then I got to thinking. Biologically we all have two parents, although not necessarily still living, but that is beside the point. And those two parents also had two parents — your four grandparents. In the generation before that, you had eight great-grandparents. And on it goes, the numbers doubling with every generation as you trace it back. Even if you can't trace their names, that changes nothing: they were there, or you wouldn't be here now.

Let's consider a few facts. An average generation is usually considered to be about twenty-five years, so for every century there are roughly four generations. Therefore if you are 25 years old now, born in 1992, using the same 25-year average generation length : –

your two parents were born around 1967,

your four grandparents were born around 1942,

your eight great-grandparents were born around 1917.

Therefore in 1892 you had 16 direct line ancestors; in 1867, 32; in 1842, 64; and in 1817, 128.

From then on, as the number of *direct line* ancestors double with each generation, in 1792, you had 256; in 1767, 512; in 1742, 1024; and in 1717, 2048. All are *direct line* ancestors.

If we continue the mathematical process, doubling the number each 25-year period, by 1492, the year Columbus discovered America, your *direct line* ancestors number more than a million — 1,048,576 to be precise. And your DNA contains information from all of them. If we consider an average of only one sibling in each generation, the number still grows exponentially, particularly when many families had more than the usual 2 or 3 children. But given that some families were often much bigger, with a dozen or more children in some cases, the total will be much greater, and as a result you have many more blood relatives than you can count.

If you are doubtful, do the calculation for your own family. You may be surprised. I was an only child, and so was my father, but my mother had two brothers who each had two children, and they are all my blood relatives, a total of seven, not counting my own children and grandchildren, who number seven more, for a total of 14. Mine is a small family, but even so, two of my great-grandparents families each numbered about eight children.

In the Bible, the *Book of Genesis, ch 4, v 9*, we are told that God asked Cain where his brother Abel was. Cain had killed him, and did not want to admit it, so instead he answered, "Am I my brother's keeper?" People have often denied family relationships that may be sensitive or embarrassing, and that can make them hard to trace, but they are the facts of life. You may be a distant blood relative, from way back, of John A MacDonald, Josef Stalin, Queen Elizabeth,, Joey Smallwood, Adolf Hitler... But the facts have been concealed.

There may have been a few mixed-up generations, and the further back you go, the harder it can be to find names, unless you are connected with a well-known family. It can be very confusing when second marriages, adoptions, or illegitimate children (who are often

listed with another family) are part of the narrative. And even official records can be lost or destroyed in fires and wartime events. But we are dealing with biological facts here, and no matter how much you may argue, all of us had TWO parents, four grandparents, and so on, back through the ages. So how many blood relatives must you actually have over thousands of generations and MILLIONS of years?

Those who have studied scientific genealogy tell us that we all have some genes that show our ancestry including a fair number of Neanderthals, CroMagnons, and others from the earliest years of humanoid beings on the planet. And genetics can't lie. So don't be too surprised if some of your present day relatives seem to show a few rather primitive characteristics! It's all in the blood, you know!

— SLH



www.shutterstock.com · 564162847

*Continued from previous page*

power withdraws from a proposal like the [TransPacific Partnership](#), a move which America has made but may very possibly regret in the not-too-distant future.

The American withdrawal from TPP has left a fast-developing region of the world open to the energetic activity of a large and fast-developing nation — the People's Republic of China. Fortunately, Canada has increased our involvement in the Pacific rim, and hopefully our own interests there will be safeguarded and should bring important trading benefits to Canada, replacing some of our trade that may be lost to America under Trump's policies. Trump's isolationism is likely to work against his *Make America Great Again* (MAGA) ideas as Chinese influence grows, notably in South America, and in consequence Americans may find themselves as outsiders with a limited formal role there.

*References for further information. Be aware that some are more current than others, but the older references can provide very useful background for understanding the current situation :-*

From *The Guardian*, 2017 November 21

[London loses EU agencies to Paris & Amsterdam in Brexit relocation](#)  
[No British judge on world court for first time in its 71-year history](#)

The BBC also has a few older articles that provide excellent background and analysis of the benefits and problems of the TPP :-

[TPP: What is it and Why does it matter?](#) 2017 January 23

[TPP trade deal: Who are the winners and losers?](#) 2015 October 06

[TPP: What's at stake with the trade deal?](#) 2014 April 22