

10th May 2018

Bare-Faced Skulduggery*

The Lord's completed their attack on the majority English population who voted to leave the European Union (EU) - mostly English and Welsh - since majorities in Scotland and Northern Ireland together with the London "enclave" all seem to be on the side of the EU on June 23rd 2016.

Most reports suggest that the Lords only attempted to add 14 Amendments to the "Withdrawal Bill" - but actually there were 16 attempts - but two were defeated by the government - Amendment 40 (Animal Rights) and Amendment 50 (Hold a Second Referendum on the outcome of the Negotiations)

Obviously Animal Rights are very important - but getting out of the EU is key for the UK to be able to do anything which is not under the control of the EU and can therefore be overruled, so it is not appropriate at this stage; whereas a second Referendum on the outcome of the UK-EU negotiations is little more than an insult to those who voted to leave - when asked to declare what they wanted and the Commons and Lords voted in large majorities to agree to implement their choice.

Following a clear instruction to leave the EU - the Commons, Lords and Judiciary should have worked together to get the UK out of the EU - not get together with the EU to find ways of not leaving and undermine every attempt.

For such devious and treacherous collusion our establishment is beneath contempt - but it has behaved in the same manner since at least 1973 - now though it is clearly exposed following the June 2016 Referendum (because the result went against their vested interests) and they are capable of doing anything to keep the status quo and assist the EU - to ensure that Britain is totally subsumed and eliminated.

And, since the negotiations are being basically "fixed" by our very own elected Representatives and their Peers - to be as bad as the EU can possibly make them - courtesy of the connivance between - EU supporters in the Lords, the Commons, the Government, Judiciary - and the EU itself - any such new Referendum would, by any definition, be pre-rigged.

The remainder of the 16 Amendments resulted in defeats for the government.

- Amendment 1 - Force the government to negotiate a Customs Union 347 -
225 (122) (Stop the UK leaving the EU)
- Amendment 11 - Retain EU Laws which the UK is better at making 314 -
217 (97) (Keep us tied to EU regulations)
- Amendment 15 - Retain the failed EUCHR - to which the EU won't abide 316 -
245 (89) (Designed for ever closer union)
- Amendment 18 - Shackle the UK to selected post-Brexit EU Laws 285 -
235 (50) (Keep the UK under EU control)
- Amendment 19 - Force the UK to comply with ECJ rulings 380 -
223 (57) (Lawyer's "Confection")
- Amendment 31 - Limit Ministers' "Henry VIII" powers 349 -
221 (121) (Only EU to have power in the UK)
- Amendment 49 - Force the government to re-negotiate any "deal" 335 -
244 (91) (Until the Lords get their way)
- Amendment 51 - Only the Lords will decide what is to be negotiated 270 -
233 (37) (Lords want more control)
- Amendment 59 - Nothing to do with the "Withdrawal Bill" 205 -
181 (24) (Increases immigration)

- Amendment 88 - Lords helping the Irish to help the EU 309 -
242 (67) (Lords give Eire "Brexit" Veto)
- Amendment 93 - Continue with "ever closer union" 298 -
227 (71) (Keeping the UK trapped)
- Amendment 95 - Get rid of any idea of leaving the EU 311 -
233 (78) (EU propaganda trick)
- Amendment 110A - Give-up Sovereignty to suit the "Fat Cats" 245 -
218 (27) (Stay trapped like Norway)
- Amendment 70 - Allow the Lords to change laws after the fact 225 -
195 (31) ("Fiddle" what was agreed)

Common Characteristics of the Amendments

- The defining characteristic of the Amendments was that they were, almost, all designed to stop "Brexit" dead or to "maim" it and defy the British people in favour of the EU - to remove any chance of Britain escaping from the EU in any form that did not suit the objectives of the EU.
- The main proponents of the majority of the Amendments were either ennobled by Blair (Plan "A") or Cameron (Plan "B")
- The largest vote shares against the government (and the British people) were from the Labour Party, "Cross-Benchers" and LibDems (Red Left Alliance) and most of them were ennobled by Blair or Cameron.
- Theresa May made no attempt to prevent the defeats - which was entirely her choice - which she could have achieved by increasing the House of Lords proportion of Eurosceptic Peers to sufficient numbers to prevent the divisive attack on the British government and hence the majority EU Referendum voters - she has practically encouraged further defeats in the Commons.

Parliamentary Rôle Reversal

The EU - advised by Blair and other anti-English collaborators - must have decided that its supporters in the Commons probably couldn't do their bidding without support and direction of the Lords - who are clearly under EU control courtesy of Blair and Cameron's mass takeover of the Lords with EU supporting place-men and sycophants; together with May's refusal to stop their actions by appointing more peers to support the Referendum result and the Conservative Manifesto pledge.

There has been a shift in the nature of our UK "Parliamentary Democracy" since we joined the EEC(EU) in 1973 - the Lords are in charge and controlled by the EU whenever it is threatened - and on the EU's behalf they have provided Amendments in order to consolidate that power. This state of affairs was facilitated by the fact that the European Communities Act (1972) - Section 2(1) and 2(2) cannot be repealed without a majority in both the House of Commons and in the House of Lords.

"A plague on both houses" for attempting to keep hostage the sovereignty of the people of Britain on behalf of the EU - such acts of betrayal couched in legal jargon and the pretence of acting with integrity brings shame to those scoundrels who are a party to such acts of infamy.

*Dominic Grieve's Intervention (update)

In the Guardian on Friday (11/05/18) the Tory Europhile and former Attorney General called for Boris Johnson to resign over his opposition to Theresa May's "crazy" Customs Union Partnership attempt to keep Britain in the EU - In an interview with the Guardian, the Tory MP branded Mr Johnson "disloyal" over his description of the Prime Minister's preferred 'customs partnership' as "crazy".

Mr Grieve accused Mr Johnson of *“destroying” Cabinet’s collective responsibility and “undermining” democracy and continued “If you don’t like a policy, you leave the government. That’s what you should do. “If there are problems, you either accept them or you have to go. That’s your choice.” Asked, if the Cabinet heavyweight should step down as Foreign Secretary, Mr Grieve replied: “He should resign. Yes.”* <https://politicshome.com/news/uk/foreign-affairs/brexit/news/95113/>

This all seems to be a bit rich coming from a Tory MP who has caused a government defeat in order to attempt to block the result of the EU Referendum - and who is content to go against not only the EU Referendum Vote, but also the Tory Manifesto pledge - he should take his own advice and resign instead of creating problems for the government and the British people.

That aside the main reason for this update to the earlier article is Grieve's dismissal of the idea of British sovereignty - he seems to consider our sovereignty to be of lesser importance than the EU's own sovereignty which was established in the Lisbon Treaty (2007) - dutifully enacted into UK Domestic Law and ratified by our own Commons, Lords and the Queen - they had no choice because of the EU's "Henry VIII" powers over the UK - and all done by Brown and David Miliband without the promised Referendum.

He stated in the Guardian last Friday that *“The idea that by shedding the EU we recover this untrammelled national sovereignty is nonsense. The world doesn’t work that way. It never worked that way, even before we were members of the EU.”*

“Their objection to the European court of justice (ECJ) – “this hated supernational tribunal” – is, he adds, equally irrational. “I mean, the world is full of international tribunals arbitrating the interpretation of international agreements. I think we’re subject to about 800 of them, apart from the ECJ. But we don’t get het up about them – so why is it that we get het up about the ECJ?”

The worst parts of the above comments though are their disingenuous nature - for a Barrister and former Attorney General - his claim that since the UK is subject to 800 international agreements - excluding the ECJ - our desire to regain our sovereignty from the ECJ is "irrational" - is as insulting as it is pure EU propaganda.

The EU and the ECJ

The ECJ is not benign, nor is it an independent, above reproach organisation - it is controlled by the EU Commission and tasked with the enforcement of EU Treaties - which it always "Interprets" with a view to "Ever Closer Union". it is the primary weapon in the EU's arsenal (until it gets its own armed forces) in the enforcement of the whims of the Commission - currently being used against Hungary for refusing to follow EU orders to allow migrants to cross its borders.

But there is another disingenuous part to the above statements by Mr Grieve - the European Communities Act 1972 (ECA) gives the EEC(EU) "Henry VIII" powers which enable the EU to force its laws into the UK domestic law; even if every MP voted against their inclusion. As far as we know - NONE of the other 800 or so international agreements have this power over the UK, including the World Trade Organisation (WTO) - if any do then we really have been well and truly sold out by our establishment.

For those who would argue - "But we are part of making those laws - so we have an equal say" - let's look at how the laws are made:

- The EU Commission with its 28 Commissioners (one from each Member State) are appointed (not elected)
- They swear an Oath of Allegiance to the EU and its "Ever Closer Union" and must always act in the best interests of the EU
- They cannot look after the interests of their own country
- They meet in secret - make Directives and Regulations in the interests of the EU and the interests of its lobbying supporters
- Their Commissioners' loyalty to the EU ensures their pension
- They have immunity from prosecution for life and the EU Commission buildings cannot be searched
- They can only be replaced on mass - but then new ones are simply substituted
- The laws the Commission enacts are enforced by the European Court of Justice (ECJ)
- Those Directives and Regulations pass into UK Law without opposition because our Parliament is powerless to prevent it
- Former EU Commissioners walk the corridors of our House of Lords and propose Amendments to our UK laws

Further

- The British "Supreme" Court is not Supreme at all - it defers to the ECJ
- The "Supreme" court was a Blair invention to fool the public into believing that Britain was still a sovereign nation
- The Miller Case was a Sham - the ECJ would have never allowed any other ruling
- Our Parliamentary Democracy is also fake because the system has been infiltrated by EU supporters over the past 45 years
- It is the same throughout every level of the Administration, Devolved Parliaments, Civil and Public Services, Armed Forces
- Europhile Politicians in the Commons and Peers in the Lords act in the interests of the EU not those of the British people
- Westminster is little more than a Town Council debating chamber directed from Brussels (Berlin)
- All carried out by our treasonous establishment behind the backs of the electorate – [FCO:30/1048 - They can't be Trusted](#), in the Articles/Archive
- No other organisation has such power and control over the UK - but it should have none.
- We are literally under "EU Occupation" - but without the troops
- Then again, they don't need troops with so many collaborators in positions of power within the Parliaments of the Member States.
- The EU needs total control of its Member States in order to build an EU superstate - it has no other reason to exist.

The above facts must be known to Mr Grieve but still he wants the UK kept under EU control - so why does he bother keeping a Union Jack on his desk?

For more about the ECJ and its influence please read a recent account from Lawyers for Britain