

## Remain V Democracy

Remain's problem with democracy isn't some isolated incident but a consistent position - they always chose the path of least democracy:

1, EU supporters did everything they could to stop us from having a referendum in the first place, when that failed they complained it was '*destabilising*' and when they lost they marched through the streets calling for the result to be ignored.

2, When their march against democracy failed they proposed a '*second referendum*' that was a sham: "*We the undersigned call upon HM Government to implement a rule that if the remain or leave vote is less than 60% based on a turnout of less than 75% then there should be another referendum*".

Britain's electorate is 40 million so a 75% turnout would be 33.75 million. 60% of 33.75 is 20.25. So according to their formula Leave could amass a staggering 20 million votes but Remain would only require 13.5 million votes to keep their system in place! When is a referendum not a referendum? When the outcome is fixed!

3, As an independent state Britain can pass whatever laws EU supporters want. The only precondition is that now we have to actually *vote* for them first. Why do EU supporters object? Because they want laws we wouldn't vote for!

4, Leave did well in the referendum where everyone could participate and every vote counted equally, we also rarely lose in the Commons. So Remain always tries to shift the process to smaller, less representative bodies stacked with appointees like the Lords or High Court in order to achieve through legalistic technicality what they can't achieve democratically.

5, The EU removed democratically elected heads of state from office in Greece and Italy.

6, Within the EU the elected parliament is subservient to the appointed commission so it's like the Lords and Commons but inverted - the appointed chamber generates the law, whilst the elected chamber can only make amendments.

7, The EU favours moving decision making as far from the electorate as possible, whereby two dozen people decide the fate of millions of others and then emerge from negotiations to tell us what they have agreed. It shouldn't be *them* telling *us* the policy - it should be *us* telling *them* the policy! Their dream is for a Soviet / Islamic / Chinese style pseudo-democracy in which voting only exists to confirm decisions already made by the ruling elite.