

# Overturning Referendums – it's the European way

Sometimes I don't know how they do it, these politicians. They stand there with straight faces and say things that are not true. They know they are not true, we know that they are not true. And yet still they expect us to believe what they are saying.

Just recently we have seen a great deal of this. One after another pro-EU politicians have queued up to tell us that they are now reformed characters and that they have no intention at all of trying to keep the UK inside the EU. Oh no, of course not.

"There is no serious chance that the House of Lords will block Article 50" Yvette Cooper tells us. Nicola Sturgeon says she is interested only in protecting the rights of the Scottish government. Gina Miller, who launched the Article 50 court case, assures any one who will listen that she is concerned only to establish the proper process for the move.

You can believe them if you wish. Personally, I do not.

Let's look at how the EU élite have reacted when previous referendums have gone against them.

In 1992 the Danish voted NO to the Maastricht Treaty on European Union. Everyone agreed that democracy was paramount and that the result would stand. Then the EU promised to give Denmark some opt-outs. The slavishly pro-EU Danish government then held a second referendum, which it won.

In 2004 the EU panjandruns agreed the grandly named "Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe". This sought to sweep away all previous treaties and replace them with a single, unified constitution. That would be a constitution like any

other unified state has.

Ratification got under way with Parliaments in several countries pushing it through with big majorities. Spain held a referendum that approved the treaty. Then France held a referendum, which ended with a vote of 55% NO, followed by the Netherlands which gave a resounding 61% NO. Referendums were promptly cancelled in Poland, Portugal, Ireland the UK and Denmark. EU leaders promised to “respect” the referendum results and called for a “period of reflection”.

That period of reflection ended with the Lisbon Treaty, which was virtually identical to the failed Constitution. This time it was pushed through the French and Dutch parliaments without a referendum. So much for respecting the results.

Then the Lisbon Treaty ran into trouble when referendum in Ireland saw a 53% NO vote. In June 2008 the EU Parliament held a debate on the Irish result. Speaker after speaker declared that they would “respect the result”. But of course, they did not. Just a year later the slavishly pro-EU Irish government held a second vote. This time the EU leaders issued a series of high sounding promises about legal guarantees. This time the Irish voted YES.

So we can see the pattern. If a referendum produces a result the EU does not like, the élites issue high sounding – but utterly worthless – statements about respecting democracy. They then announce a few cosmetic changes and hold a second vote.

I have no doubt at all that this is what is being planned by the Europhiles who were so aghast at losing the British referendum in June. The key difference is that in Denmark, Ireland and elsewhere the national government was obsequiously pro-EU and could be relied upon both to hold a second vote and to assure their populace that the vague changes were truly wonderful.

Britain in 2016 is different. We have a Prime Minister who has declared that "Brexit is Brexit". Like her or not, Mrs May and her pro-Brexit administration is all we've got to stand a chance of ensuring that our referendum result is not only "respected" but also implemented.