

Letter sent to the Telegraph [from Robert Henderson]
Thanks to them all and copyright is acknowledged as theirs
With thanks concordanceout.eu ltd

Sir,

Mary Lanch (Letters 31 August) engages with the question If Parliament won't implement Brexit, what are voters meant to do?

The answer is precious little for if both the Commons and the Lords put into law whatever Theresa May presents to them then legally that is that.

May's strategy since the Brexit vote has been clearly to sabotage Brexit from within. If she sells out to the EU and presents an *it's not Brexit* to a remainder Parliament which accepts it there is no legal way forward because even if a general election was called it is very unlikely that a majority leaver Parliament would be created. Moreover, even if a majority leaver Parliament was created a new arrangement would have to be concluded with the EU which would give

ample opportunity for delay and remainder obfuscation.

May and her fellow remainers are in danger of creating a revolutionary extra-parliamentary situation.

Yours sincerely,
Robert Henderson

Telegraph

Letters: If Parliament won't implement Brexit, what are voters meant to do?

31 AUGUST 2018 • 12:01AM

Follow

SIR – I read Ambrose Evans-Pritchard's article with despair. He paints an appalling picture of Britain's future as a colony of the failing EU empire, with no control over our laws, our borders or our fiscal policy – not simply Brexit In Name Only, but the antithesis of Brexit.

How can the 17.4 million of us who voted to regain our sovereignty stop this betrayal of our democracy? We can support Leave Means Leave, the campaign that has recently been reactivated by Richard Tice and John Longworth.

We can join the Conservative Party and hope to vote for an

honest Brexiteer as leader: Boris Johnson and David Davis stand out as possible candidates.

The root of the problem is that, on the most important question of our time, the House of Commons does not reflect opinion in the country. The majority of MPs still support Remain, regardless of their constituents' views.

Because Brexit cuts across party lines it is difficult to resolve through a general election. Both main parties' manifestos last year promised to implement Brexit – promises they are now renegeing on.

Mary Lanch

Harrow, Middlesex

SIR – Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, talking about the Government's approach to the Brexit negotiations, says: "It should never have allowed Brexit to be defined in economic terms. The referendum was to settle the elemental question of whether we govern ourselves... it had nothing whatsoever to do with GDP."

This is the absolute core of what the majority of those who voted for Brexit believed in June 2016 and still do today. Sadly it is hardly ever discussed or assessed due to the blinding snowstorm of words around the possible impact on our economy.

Kevin Sheard

Knarborough, North Yorkshire

SIR – Nick Timothy typically hits the nail on the head: the threat posed by the EU's desire to restrict trade would damage Britain.

The EU's continued grandstanding shows that it means to punish us, to sacrifice our people's prosperity, jobs and the stability of our democracy on the altar of ever-closer union.

As Boris Johnson has argued, we need to learn the lessons of what they have done to Greece. We also need to reflect on a crucial lesson of the 20th century: appeasement does not pay.

No one would blame the Prime Minister if she revised her strategy in light of the EU's hostility. For as Mr Timothy rightly says, damaging Britain would not be the act of a friend.

Lord Shinkwin

London SW1

SIR – Ambrose Evans-Pritchard is right: the offer by Michel Barnier of a trade deal “such as there never has been with any other third country” is an attempt to prop up Mrs May's pathetic Government.

Simon Warde

Bognor Regis, West Sussex

Telegraph