eurofacts

17TH MAY 2013 THE REALITY BEHIND EUROPE MONTHLY £3.50

UKIP set to cause huge damage to the Tories

Conservatives are likely shocked by the growing realisation that the potential vote of the United Kingdom Independence Party is greater than their own

Gerald Frost

In the summer of 2011 Anthony Scholefield and I set out to analyse the origins and likely consequences of the Tory modernisers' attempts to 'detoxify' the Tory image. The result was *Too 'nice' to be Tories: How the Modernisers have damaged the Conservative Party* which was published by the Social Affairs Unit in November of that year.

It was clear to us at the time that even judged by its own criteria, the Tory modernisation programme had failed dismally, and still more seriously that it had crippled the Party's ability to respond to the most urgent political problems of the day: the economy, the issue of EU membership and energy scarcity. It was also clear that the formation of the Coalition, with its leftwards drag on policy, was bound to influence voting behaviour as the Conservative party leadership sought desperately to occupy an over-populated political middle ground, opening up space for new parties on the right.

The political writing was on the wall, but it was not heeded, either then or since. For the first two years of the Coalition natural conservatives gave their support to the administration, although there were unambiguous signs that this was given with growing reluctance. In the wake of the United Kingdom Independence Party's (UKIP) spectacular – though wholly predictable – performance in the Eastleigh by-election, following impressive performances at Corby and Rotherham, it is hard to overstate UKIP's threat to the Conservative Party. Since the early days of the modernising programme, the Conservative Party has not succeeded in winning more than 36 per cent of the vote. It has also failed in its purpose of eating into Lib-Dem support and has similarly failed to win over key target voters, notably women and members of ethnic communities. By way of contrast, in taking votes not only from Conservatives but from the two other main parties, UKIP has demonstrated something which should shock Tories to the core: namely that in present circumstances UKIP's *potential* vote is larger than their own.

The auguries now strongly suggest that UKIP will win the European Parliamentary election in 2014 and is set to cause massive damage to the Tory Party in the General Election of the following year. In a sense, that damage has been self-inflicted. Three developments, which have emerged more strongly since our monograph appeared, underline how serious are the problems facing the Tory leadership. The first of these is the growing public awareness of the linkages between EU membership and the prospect of a flood of Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants of unknown proportions. Rising concern about this issue has increased understanding of the economic cost of the arrival of unskilled labour during a period of sharply falling real wages. There is also a greater public understanding of the capital costs of immigration on schools, housing, and roads.

The ongoing crisis in the eurozone has been devastating to the EU's image of inevitable success, while at the same time, there has been a growing awareness of damage being caused by EU authority over the affairs of the City of London through the creation of supervisory bodies and EU activism over bankers' bonuses. The City has long provided substantial contributions to the Party's coffers and has assisted it in other significant ways. To turn it into an enemy is not smart politics any more than it is smart economics. How long before City bankers line up to join Rupert Murdoch in extending 'secret' dinner invitations to Nigel Farage?

The third factor is the projected increase in the over-65 vote – which will grow by 1.35 million between 2010 and 2015 as compared to a rise of

Continued on page 2

INSIDE: *How many migrants? p 2* – ***France to go into recession p 2*** – *Shale Gas p3* – ***EU diplomats wage increases p 3*** – *Goodbye to the Euro p 4* – ***More calls for EU reform p 5*** – *Latvia wants to enter eurozone p 5* – ***Political advertising p 5*** – *Letters p 6*

UKIP set to cause huge damage to the Tories

Continued from page 1

638,000 between 2001 and 2005. UKIP policy is highly congenial to this group which records a high turn-out at elections and, which is likely to have been unimpressed by the idea of gay marriage and is profoundly unhappy with low savings and annuity rates. This group includes a steady stream of Conservative councillors and activists in their fifties, sixties and seventies who are now defecting to a party which in their view better reflects their core beliefs in patriotism, free enterprise, low taxes, strong national defences and social order than the present-day Conservative Party.

Über-modernisers believe that this does not matter because of the greater number of votes that might be taken from the Lib-Dems, but this has not occurred and is most unlikely to do so. Despite a loss of support, the Eastleigh vote demonstrates how well the Lib-Dems are dug in at a local level, especially in constituencies represented by a Lib-Dem MP. The Lib-Dems are quite rationally positioning themselves as a swing party which may peel off to form a Lib-Labour Coalition when circumstances are propitious.

The Coalition's reputation for economic competence might just have staunched the flow of support from the Tories, but this is visibly crumbling: with other factors the modernisation agenda has discouraged the harsh measures necessary to re-balance the economy by reducing the size of the state. The Tories have consequently got the worst of all possible worlds: they have talked tough in warning of the need for austerity, partly to impress the markets, but have failed to deliver what they promised as public debt has reached frightening levels and consequently not achieved the economic gains which would have followed from more incisive action. The proportion of GDP consumed by the State has actually risen during the life of the Coalition.

The irony is that while conservatism would seem to have a distinctly mediocre future in the Conservative Party under its current leadership, the market for conservative ideas is growing stronger in Britain, as in most western countries. Conservative politicians may still be a long way from bringing a distinctive approach to bear on the analysis of such issues as public debt, the future of the welfare state, immigration, EU membership and the problems arising from the embrace of ill-thought out measures to protect the environment. But events have now forcefully pushed these issues off the taboo list and into the public arena; they can longer be ignored. There is now a great opportunity to bring a distinctive Conservative perspective in formulating policies about such matters. The only question is whether this will take place within the Conservative party, or outside it.

*This article is based on the preface to the second edition of **Too 'nice' to be Tories: How the Modernisers have damaged the Conservative Party** by Anthony Scholefield and Gerald Frost published by the Social Affairs Unit.*

(Available from the June Press £11.00 including P&P - See back cover)

[This article was written before the 2nd May local election results which produced the following figures for: Labour 29%, Conservatives 25%, UKIP 23%, Lib-Dems 14% and others 9% of the vote. These figures confirm the threat posed by UKIP - Ed.]

How many migrants?

According to the Bulgarian Ambassador, Konstantin Dimitrov, the numbers of Bulgarian migrants likely to come to the UK in 2014 is between 8,000 and 10,000. He added that a massive influx of migrants was "not out of the question".

The Romanian Ambassador, Ion Jinga, said he expected 15,000 to 25,000 Romanians to come to the UK in 2014.

The exact numbers of nationals from these countries will not be known until after the event in 2015. However, with a combined population of 30 million from these poor countries the numbers can only be expected to rise year on year.

France to go into recession

A gloomy European Commission report has forecast that France will slide into recession this year.

The report says the eurozone economy will shrink even more than previously expected this year. They forecast that the euro-area growth will shrink by 0.4% this year, down from the 0.3% figure that they predicted in February.

They also say that France will go into recession this year with negative growth of 0.1% and unemployment rising to 10.9% in 2014 up from 10.6% this year.

On Thursday (2nd May) the European Central Bank (ECB) cut interest rates for the eurozone from 0.75%, by a further 0.25% to a level of 0.50%.

Shale Gas

Recognising the enemies within

J. Brian Heywood

In mid 1970 whilst working as an external management consultant/ investigator for a major British company, I discovered that our Government had signed a deal with our continental neighbours that penalised a large section of British agriculture. I was assured by 'important people' that it was a mistake and would not happen again. This was despite the fact that at the time we were trying to join the Common Market, I believed what I was told. After all, no British Government would risk damaging British industry and the future prosperity of its citizens, would it? Over the years I discovered, sometimes at first hand - as can been seen on my website* - that the give away continued. Now, of course, there is general acceptance, even in Westminster, that politicians were wrong to cast aside our industry and the jobs it provided.

When oil was first discovered in the North Sea, the German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, made a major speech in which he asked the British to 'play fair' and not reduce the cost of fuel oil to British industry. Britain, of course, played very fair by increasing the cost to our industry. About four years ago I was horrified to learn that North Sea oil and gas was running out much quicker than originally expected. However, when I looked on the Norwegian Governments website and that of its major company Statoil, I saw that they both claimed that the future for both conventional oil and gas was in new developments in the British section of the North Sea. This claim is now generally accepted but progress is strangely slow.

When doing the same research I came across some early American articles on the development and importance of shale gas and shale oil. I knew that this could be important for Britain because I was aware that you risked getting shale oil on your feet when walking on some beaches in Lancashire. However, it was the articles on how new jobs had been created (many not related to shale) in each drilling area that fascinated me most. Since then of course the shale bonanza has transformed the US economy. Major American newspapers like The *Wall Street Journal* and magazines like *Forbes* have produced headlines using phrases such as 'The British should be all having street parties because they are walking on gold (shale gas)'. The British Geological survey confirmed that there are vast resources of shale oil and gas on land in Britain and that getting it out poses few risks. It also claims that fourteen times as much lies around our shores. This is important because the Americans have now developed a simple drilling process for extracting shale gas around their own shores.

It is natural that people should fear the extraction of shale gas when they read the negative publicity that is being circulated by certain groups. If, however, you look at these groups you find that they are basically the same organisations that want more EU and were responsible for giving away our industry and jobs.

I long for our removal from the EU and the creation of a new severe law on treason.

*www.amiacrank.co.uk

EU diplomats wage increases

EU diplomats to spend more on salaries, less on security

The European Union diplomatic service is to pay €15 million extra in wages next year, but to make deep cuts on security.

Its draft 2014 budget - circulated internally on 3rd April, says it is "fully aware of the severe economic and financial constraints" in Europe and speaks of "value for money for the European taxpayer".

It calls for overall spending of €530 million - €21 million, or 4.1 percent more than this year.

On one hand, it aims to make €5.7 million of cuts to salaries: by axing 17 junior posts; by downgrading 14 senior posts; by ending wage top-ups in foreign embassies; and by reducing leave for embassy staff.

On the other hand, it is setting aside an extra €15.2 million for what it calls "mandatory increases in the remunerations of statutory staff".

It also plans to create several new mid-level officials.

On security, it aims to pay €4.5 million extra for bodyguards in at-risk embassies "due to the security situation in an increasing number of countries and inflation in the price of private security services".

However, there are deep cuts in other areas.

It is to trim €2.5 million - 23 per cent - from secure IT networks in its Brussels HQ. It is to cut another €1.5 million from HQ building security, surveillance and "fitting-out and security works".

Source: euobserver.com article by Andrew Rettman

Goodbye to the Euro

Countries changed currencies scores of times in the twentieth century

Ian Milne

Upwards of thirty currency unions have broken up since 1945. Earlier, at least two others, the Latin Monetary Union and the Scandinavian Monetary Union, broke up. (*Wikepedia: Currency Unions* has a list of them). Countries have dumped one currency for another scores of times in the twentieth century alone.

A recent example of a currency breaking up is the former Czechoslovakia: the country agreed to divorce and the Czechs and the Slovaks immediately created their own currencies, which freely floated against each other. That break-up seems to have gone smoothly. (Slovakia, a glutton for punishment, went through the same process again in 2009 when it dumped the Slovak Crown for the euro.) The Czech and Slovak economies are similar in size to the Greek and have done rather well with their own currencies, attracting a lot of inward investment over the years from Germany and France.

Other post-war examples of countries swapping their currencies include the former Yugoslavia, whose component nations, when that particular artificially-put-together federation (another one!) collapsed, set up their own currencies. On reunification in 1990, East Germany abandoned the Ostmark and adopted the Deutschemark. A few months later, when the Soviet Union broke up, many of its former republics left the rouble and adopted their own currencies.

As recently as fourteen years ago, eleven of the current members of the eurozone - Germany, the Netherlands, Finland, Belgium, Austria, Luxembourg, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Ireland - dumped their national currencies and adopted the euro. In addition, Greece joined in 2001, Slovenia in 2007, Malta and Cyprus in 2008, Slovakia in 2009, Estonia in 2011.

Changing one currency for another is thus commonplace: not at all a rarity. Scores of governments and central banks have real-life experience of doing so in the last couple of decades alone. The break-up of currency unions is no doubt presently being taught and studied in central banks and in faculties of economics in universities all over the world.

Dozens of national changeover plans are freely available on the internet. Google *"National Changeover Plan"* and up pops, in English, the UK's *"Third Outline National Changeover Plan*", all 178 pages of it, published in 2003 by HM Treasury; and the Estonian *National Changeover Plan* (they joined the euro – their timing slightly unfortunate - on 1st January 2011). The Swedish, Latvian and Czech changeover plans are also there in English, though they haven't taken the plunge yet. The Irish had one too, as did (perhaps not in English) the Germans, the French and all the other countries which are now in the euro. The ECB itself, whose working language is English, is presumably overflowing with technical manuals on how to throw out an old currency and adopt a new one.

In a euro break-up and reversion to national currencies the technical/mechanical issues would be, if not the exact mirror-image, very similar. If, say, Italy wanted to escape the euro, the 1999 Italian *National Changeover Plan* could be selected and the word "lira" substituted for the word euro: case solved. When the euro began, the changeover went pretty seamlessly: not just the physical things like notes and coins but the scriptural and contractual things as well. A modicum of planning would ensure that "winding-back the spool" and re-introducing a national currency went just as smoothly.

Some Practical Issues

Changing one's currency is not cost-free. The one-off changeover costs have been variously estimated at three to four per cent of GDP, borne principally by the private sector. (On the other hand, the Bank of England estimated an ongoing heavy cost on joining the "Single" Currency due to loss of control of your interest rate and your exchange rate. On leaving the euro, a country would presumably enjoy an ongoing benefit from regaining control of its interest rate and exchange rate.)

A factor that tends to mitigate the potential disruption in swapping currencies is that throughout the eurozone and the rest of the world great chunks of domestic and international commerce (oil and gas, most other commodities, aircraft*, aero engines, defence equipment, pharmaceutical intermediates, big IT equipment etc etc) continue to be quoted, priced, invoiced and settled in dollars, and would continue to be so through a change of domestic currency. In the case of countries like Italy, many transactions are probably done in Swiss Francs as well.

Another factor is that managements in the private-sector don't spend their working day obsessing about exchange rates: they haven't got time. For most managements, exchange rates are simply one variable to be managed amongst literally dozens of others on both the input and the output side. In any case, in bigger companies particularly exposed to exchange rate risk, managements can "fix" forward exchange rates through their friendly bankers, a procedure which is costly, but not more so than, say, buying copper forward, if copper happens to be a significant component of the manufacturing process.

In a typical manufacturing business, senior management is juggling hour by

Continued on page 5

Goodbye to the Euro

Continued from page 4

hour, if not minute by minute, the costs of dozens of inputs into, and outputs from, the manufacturing process. Inputs include, for example: labour (wages); rent of premises; insurance premiums; interest on borrowings; fees on letters of credit; diesel costs for trucks; fuel costs for heating, electricity and gas used in manufacturing processes; raw materials like steel, copper, plastics, rubber and wood; municipal taxes; fees to accountants and lawyers and property advisors; IT costs; office consumables; and of course fluctuating exchange rates affecting both inputs and outputs.

Eurozone companies with significant export business will most likely also be selling to EU countries outside the eurozone (like the UK, Sweden, Denmark) with currencies that float against the euro. Eurozone companies are also increasingly selling to many countries outside Europe altogether with currencies that float against the euro. If one or more eurozone countries revert to national currencies, their own exporting companies – and their bankers and insurers - will not therefore be faced with an unprecedented management problem.

Conclusion

Eurozone members – including the anchor-country, Germany - are now facing up to the painful permanent on-going economic cost of staying in the euro.

Leaving the euro and floating a currency would also be painful: a one-off economic cost of perhaps three or four per cent of GDP. Nevertheless, changing their currencies is what scores of countries have done in the last twenty years.

Recent events demonstrate that the fundamental choice for a country is not about economics, but about democracy: its permanent suppression or its hopefully-permanent restoration. The history of Europe from 1900 onwards suggests what that choice should be.

** Airbus, which sells aircraft in dollars but whose costs are mainly in euros, and its influential shareholder the French state, have never made up their minds whether they want the euro to be "strong" or "weak" against the dollar.*

More calls for EU reform

Now it is a former chancellor of the exchequer, Lord Lawson, who has called for the UK to leave the EU.

He said in *The Times* last week that the British economic gains from an exit "would substantially outweigh the costs".

Making matters worse, he predicted that David Cameron's attempts to renegotiate the terms of the UK's relationship with the EU would be "inconsequential".

As might be expected, Downing Street has said the prime minister remains "confident" that his strategy "will deliver results".

Furthermore, the pressure has now increased after Michael Portillo has also called for an exit to the EU.

Meanwhile, a new lobby group 'Business for Britain' has been formed by hundreds of business leaders the aim of which is to press the government to renegotiate the UK's deal with the EU.

The group which includes Lord Wolfson and Sir Stuart Rose back Cameron's plan to try for a reform of UK's membership.

However, other business leaders have said it is not possible to pick and choose.

Latvia wants to enter eurozone

In a move that has been expected for some time the small Baltic state of Latvia has applied for membership to the eurozone area in 2014.

Latvia suffered a deep recession in the wake of the financial crisis and as a result received an international bailout has now reached the required financial criteria for eurozone membership. This could make it the 18th member of the eurozone club.

The recovery was aided by its Prime Minister, Valdis Dombrovskis imposing large public spending cuts. this has resulted in Latvia becoming one of the fastest-growing economies in the European Union.

Political advertising

Yet again the UK is in a clash with the European Court of Justice (ECHR). This time it is over allowing US-style political advertising on British television.

European judges are to rule on a legal challenge claiming a blanket ban on the advertising breaches the right to free speech.

The UK government has said it will resist this action ahead of the court ruling. Furthermore, it said that any change to the rules governing political advertising should be a matter for the UK rather than the European Court of Justice.

Justice Secretary, Chris Grayling said it was outside the court's remit.

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Marriage EU style

Dear Sir,
If ever you wondered why Mr Cameron suddenly pulled same sex marriage out of the hat, with little demand for it and irritating a lot of his natural supporters, there could be a simple explanation.

As so often the case with odd laws no one asked for which appear from nowhere, it's the old elephant in the room, the EU.

In November, the EU "Parliament" will vote through the Berlinguer report where all civil contracts such as marriage conducted in one EU country apply in the rest of the EU and become legally binding.

It follows that a couple who could not marry in their home country could just go to another EU state.

It will inevitably become law in November, as the EU "Parliament" always do what they are told and should they rebel the measure goes through a process called "concilliation" and the vote is overturned.

Could it be Mr Cameron jumped the gun to avoid it being too patently obvious where the real power lies and how little our elected parliament counts?
DAVID BROWN
Essex

European elections

Dear Sir,
Following the remarkable progress of UKIP at the recent local elections in the UK, what next?

Could it be that UKIP will not just keep its number of MEPs at the European elections but actually increase the numbers. Furthermore, what if they become the party with the greatest number of MEPs?

Should this happen how can Conservative, Labour or Lib-Dem politicians pretend that they represent the voice of the UK in the EU?

The answer is simple, as always they will ignore the will of the voters and continue on their blind obedience to the EU. This kind of behaviour will result in the UK becoming ever closer in bondage to the powers of the EU or as the EU puts it ever closer union.

Cameron's naive belief that any significant powers will return from the EU is totally misguided and shows a clear lack of understanding about the aims and objects of the EU. Membership of the EU is all about surrendering all real power to the EU juggernaut.

Democracy has been given away by our politicians along with the right of the electorate to be able to use their vote to control their future.
SUSAN MCKENZIE
Yorkshire

Polling Figures

Dear Sir,
Results from a poll last week on EU membership showed how the UK public really feel.

Those against 45%
Those in favour 35%
Those undecided 20%

This result was achieved without the full understanding of how the EU controls the debate and how it influences public opinion.

Take lobby groups, these organisations that are said to represent the public views, most of them receive their major finance from the EU. Hence, they lobby to increase EU influence over aspects of life, using the pretence that it is the public that has asked for these changes.

A simple remedy for the lobby group game would be to make sure that their funding comes only from private donations. No EU or Government grants/donations should be permitted, this would immediately reduce many lobby groups and make it easier to see what the electorate really wants. Then the decisions could be taken by the elected government not by a pan-European ruling, allowing the electorate a chance to change its mind at the ballot box if it does not like the result of such changes.

Political parties would then have to produce real manifestos that really appealed to the voter. Such actions would encourage voter turn-out as their vote would actually matter.
MICHAEL SUMMERS
London

Economic reality

Dear Sir,
The time has come for the UK to return to its real friends in the Commonwealth.

While the eurozone remains stagnant the Commonwealth is expected to grow by 7.2 per cent per year over the next five years, according to the International Monetary Fund.

The EU's Common External Tariff, by which Britain is bound, is on average, between 5 and 9 per cent. For Britain, this is a higher rate than prevailed a century ago.

The UK, therefore, has a special interest in replacing her current terms of EU membership with a classical free trade area. Especially as Britain does a high percentage of her trade outside the EU area and in future this level will only increase as the EU is a shrinking market place.

World trade has already increased to a level of over 50 per cent of our exports if one includes the Rotterdam/Antwerp effect. (The Rotterdam/Antwerp effect increases the so-called export levels to the EU as these are only goods on transit through these ports to other world markets.)

Let us hope that our government understands that the only way to balance our economic books is by increasing world exports. These exports will create real jobs which will also reduce the welfare budget.
VICTOR RICHARDSON
Gloucestershire

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **21st May**, 6.00 pm

"Sir Keith Joseph and the Market Economy"

Vernon Bogdanor CBE FBA, *Emeritus Gresham Professor of Law*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **30th May**, 6.00 pm

"Killing us softly: How demographics drive global economies"

Prof James Sproule, *Accenture*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **6th June**, 6.00 pm

"The New Face of Europe"

Sir Richard Lambert, *Former Director-General, the Confederation of British Industry; Chancellor, The University of Warwick*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Guildhall, London
Admission Free (Reservations required)

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **12th June,** 3.00 pm

Professor Bernd Lucke, *Founder and leader of the Alternative for Germany (Alternative fur Deutschland) political party which opposes the euro*

PUBLIC MEETING
House of Commons, London SW1A
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **13th June**, 6.00 pm

"Taking Modern Money Apart"

Professor Edward J. Nell, *New School for Social Research, New York*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(Southport Branch)
01704 531012

Thursday **13th June,** 7.30 pm

Louise Bours
Paul Nuttall
Steven Woolfe

PUBLIC MEETING
Windsor Suite 11, Royal Clifton Hotel, Promenade, Southport PR8 1RB
Admission Free

The London Swinton Group

Tuesday **18th June,** 7.00 pm

"Policies to promote the social and cultural value of the UK Union"

Alistair McConnachie

PUBLIC MEETING
Downstairs, Orange Street Congregational Church, London WC2H 7HR
Admission Free
(www.swintoncircle.org.uk)

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Parliamentary Recess	**24th May**
UK Parliament Restarts	**11th June**
Lithuania takes over EU Council Presidency	**1st July**
2014	
Greece takes over EU Council Presidency	**1st January**

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Declaration of Independence
www.bdicampaign.org
British Gazette
www.britishgazette.co.uk
British Weights & Measures Assoc.
www.bwmaOnline.com
Bruges Group
www.brugesgroup.com
Campaign Against Euro-Federalism
www.caef.org.uk
Campaign for an Independent Britain
www.freebritain.org.uk
Democracy Movement
www.democracymovement.org.uk
English Constitution Group
www.englishconstitutiongroup.org
EU Observer
www.euobserver.com
EU Truth
www.eutruth.org.uk
European Commission (London)
www.cec.org.uk
European Foundation
www.europeanfoundation.org
European No Campaign
www.europeannocampaign.com
EU Referendum Campaign
www.eureferendumcampaign.com
Freedom Association
www.tfa.net
Global Britain
www.globalbritain.org
Global Vision
www.global-vision.net
June Press (Publications)
www.junepress.com
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
www.lesc.org.uk
New Alliance
www.newalliance.org.uk
Open Europe
www.openeurope.org.uk
Regional Assemblies
www.regionalassemblies.co.uk
Sovereignty
www.sovereignty.org.uk
Statewatch
www.statewatch.org
Team
www.teameurope.info
EU Referendum
www.eureferendum.com
The EU Referendum Pledge
www.eupledge.com
The People's Pledge
www.peoplespledge.org
The Taxpayers' Alliance
www.taxpayersalliance.com
United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org

THE JUNE PRESS - BOOKS

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	**£30**
Europe (Airmail)	**£42/€50**
Rest of World	**£55/$95**
Reduced rate (UK only)	**£20**

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.
Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

Please send me the monthly ***eurofacts*** and the occasional briefing papers.
I enclose my annual payment of £.........
to ***eurofacts*:** **PO Box 119**
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Name . . . .

Address . . . .

. . . .

. . . .

Postcode . . . .

Date . . . .

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

European Commission	**020 7973 1992**
European Movement	020 7940 5252
Federal Trust	**020 7735 4000**

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	**01403 741736**
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
CIB	**0116 2874 622**
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	**0845 833 9626**
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
New Alliance	**020 7385 9757**
Fishing Association	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy	**01372 453678**

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	**020 7287 4414**
Global Britain	Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org
Global Vision	**www.global-vision.net**
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative Rt Hon David Camaron MP	**020 7222 9000**
English Democrats Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	**01277 896000**
Green Party Natalie Bennett	**020 7272 4474**
Labour Ed Miliband MP	**020 7783 1000**
Liberal Mr Rob Wheway	**01562 68361**
Liberal Democrats Rt Hon Nick Clegg MP	**020 7222 7999**
New Britain Mr Dennis Delderfield	**020 7247 2524**
UK Independence Party Nigel Farage MEP	**01626 831290**

ISSN 1361-4134

09

9 771361 413006