

I would be very happy to expand on the debate last night as I think it is important that all voices are heard. In the Council Chamber it can be very difficult to get all the information across as time is so limited. In fact I was only able to speak to Cllr. Stewart's part of the Motion and not on Cllr. Blezzard's and as was pointed out they were quite different.

Firstly can I say that if the Motion had read along the lines of "We the Isle of Wight Council oppose all discrimination and urge the Government to do something about it" then I would have raised no objection and supported it. It didn't. What the Motion actually attempted was a thinly disguised attack on the 62% of Islanders who voted Leave by two Remain supporters (Stewart and Blezzard) who wanted to tar all Leavers as racist. They did this because they are bad losers – in line with a significant faction of Remainers

Remain had created a narrative that said voting Leave was racist. It wasn't, but after the result much effort has gone in to trying to prove that it was. This is being done through social media and other campaigns by various Remain/Leftist/Social Justice groups bent on proving they were right all along.

It is not that difficult to generate a rise in any form of incident reporting if you go out and repeatedly ask large numbers of your own supporters for evidence of it. I am sure that some of the extra reports are from re-labeling of other offences, so for instance an argument over a seat on a bus suddenly becomes a hate crime because one of the two is from a minority and a Remainer witnesses it and reports in on Facebook. Previously the incident would likely have gone unmentioned, because it was just two people arguing over a bus seat, but in the atmosphere of hatred created by Remain it becomes a major affair.

The Motion last night was so imbued in this narrative that it was beyond redemption. Our Standing Orders state that Amendments can only alter various words of a Motion not its main thrust. As this Motion was aimed at Brexit no Amendment could be made that would have changed that as it would be changing the context and so therefore not allowed. Some have said that I could have voted 'For' in "the spirit" of the Motion. I am afraid that it is this woolly thinking that has got the Island things such as the Roads PFI, the Waste contract and Cowes Enterprise College. There has been too much well-meaning ignorance of what Motions and Papers actually say and some bad decisions as a result. I always vote on what is written – not what is meant. After all the Lawyers will not be making cases based on 'what was meant'.

One thing noticeably missing from the Motion was any sense of balance. While racism may or may not have increased there has certainly been an out pouring of hatred towards the older population with banners saying such things as 'Old people please die' being not uncommon at Remain marches. I find it odd that this issue was not tackled in the Motion given that the Islands older population is very large and its ethnic minority population relatively small, or are the elderly not worthy of protection? I am sure all those residents ignored by Cllr's Stewart and Blezzard's Motion will remember this at the appropriate

moment next May, as will all the rest of the 62% of Islanders who voted Leave and who will likewise feel let down by the racist innuendo thrown their way.

Ramping up fears of a surge in racism is misguided and ultimately self-fulfilling as constantly saying racism is on the rise gives credence and succor to the low lives who commit it.

With regard to residency and future immigration I say this: The majority of the uncertainty regarding the future status of EU Nationals already living in the UK is being driven by constant stirring from the Remain side who keep shouting about how people will be thrown out. This again was part of the Project Fear campaign and the Remainers just can't cope with the reality, which is that there are no plans to change the status of anybody.

Those living here can stay and it is future arrivals who will face a different system. There are in fact already protections under the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which guarantees 'acquired rights' and to which the House of Commons Library has added the comment "Generally speaking, withdrawing from a treaty releases the parties from any future obligations to each other, but does not affect any rights or obligations acquired under it before withdrawal." This of course works both ways and helps to protect those British people living and working in other EU Countries prior to the UK finally leaving.

As for the often mentioned scenario of crops rotting in the field due to lack of EU migration I would say this: There is manpower available in the UK already, getting people to do the job may sometimes prove problematic, although I hope the Government cracks down on this. Of course you do have to pay them properly which can be a drag as unlike those nice Eastern Europeans who are happy to live nine to a caravan British people seem to prefer to live in houses with their families, so the Living Wage is a bit of a must. Should there still be a shortfall in labour then temporary work permits will no doubt be issued as needed under the points system which is generally accepted as the way forward to manage future migration.

In short this Motion was a badly worded, virtue signaling, mashed up attack on the 62% of Islanders who voted Leave, so I could not support it.