

Corruption in public office

At a conference in the European Parliament (1st October) on corruption, a figure of €2.2 bn. (£1.9 bn.) was reported by the EU anti-fraud agency (Olaf), it identified bid rigging, kickbacks, conflict of interest, and deliberate mismanagement of EU funds in eight member states.

The figure for 2010 announced by Olaf came from a study it had commissioned that had been carried out by accountancy firm PwC EU Services and Ecorys with the support of the University of Utrecht, and was based on a methodology that allows for the probability of corruption to be estimated for the product groups. They had randomly selected France, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania and Spain for the study which looked at both national budgets and the EU budget.

The figure of £1.9 billion represents the estimated overall direct costs of corruption in public procurement in five major sectors like construction and water treatment.

According to the EU anti-fraud commissioner Algirdas Semeta, speaking at the conference, "The study puts concrete figures to what we have long recognised as a threat to public finances and it confirms that once a procurement project is affected by corruption, the public losses increase substantially".

The study said the cost of corruption is equivalent to 3 to 4% of the total procurement budget.

"This seems at first sight a higher estimate than the commission first published two years ago", said Semeta.

The commission had put the

estimate at 1%.

Semeta explained the difference because the study looked at eight member states in five specific sectors most exposed to risk of corruption.

"For the commission, its findings are a useful counterpart and we are committed into looking further into why so few cases are reported by member states", he noted. Furthermore, he added that the commission is finalising its first anti-corruption report due sometime in November. The report will look specifically at corruption into public procurement.

The Olaf-sponsored study was critical of the fragmented nature of public procurement procedures and lack of transparency. It noted that no organisation or body is tasked to fight corruption during the process and that also missing was a national or EU-level authority to integrate all data public procurement for people to scrutinise.

Among the most common ways to steal money is to artificially inflate the price of a contract beyond the actual market value.

One case involved a procurement to reconstruct a historic city centre. The tender had a budget ceiling of €4.32 million. The only bidder submitted an offer for €5.4 million, which was rejected.

The procurement was then relaunched with the same bidder winning the €4.32 million contract. However, later on costs increased by €1.08 million, making the price of the project the same as the company's original offer.

Another case involves 10 civil

servants from different municipalities who handed over confidential information to a construction company concerning several invitations to a tender on road projects.

In return for the confidential information, the civil servants were rewarded with cash and VIP seats at football matches and Formula One races and flight tickets to exotic destinations.

To combat conflict of interests, the EU developed a definition, which they included in a revised version of the public procurement directive. Tabled in 2011, the directive is under legislative scrutiny at the European Parliament.

A high-ranking commission official at the conference said the definition, which covers actual, potential or perceived conflict of interests affecting staff members of the contracting authority or of procurement service providers, would create a legal upheaval in some member states.

The reformed directive includes setting up national oversight bodies to ensure contracts worth at least €1 million are properly implemented but Joaquim De Almedia, director of the public procurement department in the commission's directorate-general on the internal market noted that corruption is largely of culture and of social acceptance of corrupt practices.

"To change this we need more than new laws and new databases", he said.

Member states reported nine cases of suspected or established corruption of EU funds in 2012.

Source: euobserver.com

EU public prosecutor

Many of the national governments of EU member states failed to meet the 28th October deadline to submit any complaints or concerns relating to the setting up of an EU-wide national prosecutor.

Both the UK and Ireland, along with Denmark, already said they would not participate when they opted out of the idea during talks on the EU's Lisbon Treaty. Of the members states, eleven opposed.

This has resulted in a claim that the majority of members are said to back a proposal for a European public prosecutor whose task is said to tackle fraud committed against the EU budget.

"A clear majority of member states

have not issued reasoned opinions and can thus be counted among the probable participants to the European public prosecutor's office" Mina Andreeva, European commission justice spokesperson, has said. Furthermore, she said with the member state positions clarified, EU lawmakers would now push forward with the proposal, first announced in July, with an aim to have it launched in 2015.

When launched the prosecutor would have the power to conduct, prosecute, and bring to justice its own EU-wide investigations in co-ordination with member state authorities against people suspected of defrauding the EU.

Its initial role to tackle EU fraud

could later be expanded to other areas.

The commission has claimed that the office is needed to tackle widespread fraud on the EU budget which they estimate hovers around €500 million (£420 million) in annual losses.

A top EU official in September told the European Parliament that the real figure is in the billions, however.

A majority of deputies at the Strasbourg plenary last week voted in favour of a report by Italian centre-right MEP Salvatore Iacolino.

Iacolino's report covered a wide number of crime fighting issues, including setting up the office, although the Greens voiced reservations of its law-enforcement centric focus.

The Lords try to get answers about the EU

Lord Vinson: Asked Her Majesty's Government what action they are taking to raise public awareness of the United Kingdom's net contribution to the European Union's budget over the last six years exceeding £53 billion, as set out in the HM Treasury Pink Book 2013, and the effect that has on the United Kingdom's public sector borrowing requirement.

Lord Newby (LD): My Lords, to ensure transparency and increase public awareness, HM Treasury publishes details of UK contributions to the EU in its European Union finances and public expenditure statistical analyses publication. The previous Government gave up a significant portion of our abatement, and consequently our net contributions were always likely to increase.

Following the real-terms cut to the 2014 to 2020 payment ceilings negotiated by the Prime Minister in February, they will now be going up by less.

Lord Vinson (Con): My Lords, I thank the Minister for his considered reply. Perhaps I may illustrate my point. Recently, the Chancellor returned from China, pleased that he had raised £13 billion to build the new

nuclear power station so desperately needed for our energy security. Is it not paradoxical that over the past six years our net contribution to the EU, which is substantially used for infrastructure, has been over £50 billion? That is enough to build at least three nuclear power stations. How is it that we can find the money to build other people's infrastructure but not our own?

Lord Newby: My Lords, by looking at the net contribution to the EU, the noble Lord is concentrating on only one dimension of our relationship with the Union. He is ignoring the very substantial economic benefits that we enjoy through increased internal trade via the single market, increased external trade via, for example, the recently concluded EU-Canada trade agreement, and increased investment in the UK by companies such as Nissan. He is also ignoring the non-economic benefits of membership in the fields of the environment, justice and external affairs.....

Lord Hannay of Chiswick (CB): Could the Minister say how many nuclear power stations the Government could have built with the rebates that we have received since 1975 under

Mrs Thatcher's arrangements?

Lord Newby: No, I could not.

Lord Pearson of Rannoch (UKIP): Does the Minister agree with two things about the net payment to Brussels of £12.2 billion for the past year alone? First, that it equates to the £30,000 per annum salaries of 1,100 nurses, policemen or any other public servant per day. Secondly, that there is no such thing as EU aid to us, because for every £1 they now send us back we have sent them £2.56.

Lord Newby: My Lords, I am not going to get into a statistical analysis with the noble Lord, but I revert to my earlier point. Our membership of the EU brings with it a whole raft of benefits which do not simply relate to the EU budget. One area of expenditure that we incurred some time ago was dealing with a war in the Balkans, which cost this country more than £1 billion.

Since the Balkan wars finished, Croatia has joined the EU and other Balkan states will join. We will not fight other Balkan wars. That does not fit into the noble Lord's narrow formula.

Source: House of Lords Hansard 30th October 2013

Brexit prize shortlist

The Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) has announced the shortlist for the IEA Brexit Prize. In total 149 entries were received. 100 of these were from submitters based in the UK and 49 of them from other countries, including: the USA, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, The Netherlands, Ukraine, Nigeria, Hungary, Zambia, Latvia, Austria, India, Norway, Zimbabwe, Denmark, Belgium, Russia and The Philippines.

The first prize of €100,000 will be awarded to the best blueprint for UK withdrawal from the EU.

There will be a special prize of €5,000 for the best entry from an individual aged 30 or under. In this category 35 entries were received from under-31s. The youngest applicant was 15-year-old Kieran Bailey.

The 17 shortlisted applications are from:

1) William John Bailey, Kathleen

Garner, and Laura Stringer

2) Kieran Bailey

3) David Campbell Bannerman

4) James Bennett

5) Rory Broomfield and Iain Murray

6) Ralph Buckle and Tim Hewish

7) Dr. Ciarán Burke and Dr Olafur Hannesson

8) Prof Stephen Bush

9) Dr Alan Butt Philip

10) Ben Clements

11) Iain Mansfield

12) Dr Richard North

13) Robert Oulds

14) Daniel Pycock

15) Philip Rush

16) Miles Saltiel and Charles Proctor

17) Lionel Zetter

Commenting on the release of the shortlist, Mark Littlewood, Director General at the Institute of Economic Affairs, said:

"This is a crucial time for Britain as we decide what our relationship with

the rest of the world should be. Much of the debate about our relationship with the European Union has focused on the pros and cons of membership. But what is urgently needed is a blueprint for how the UK should arrange its affairs if the British people decide to leave. The Brexit prize is a first, crucial step in providing this vital intellectual groundwork."

The IEA believes that we need to give serious consideration to how the UK could have a free and prosperous economy outside the EU, given that exit is a serious possibility after the next election.

The competition's initial judging panel is now inviting the authors of the 17 shortlisted entries to make full submissions of between 10,000 and 20,000 words within a further four months. The deadline for the shortlisted entries is Monday 10th February 2014.

French energy takeover continues

A deal has been signed by the French utility firm GDF Suez with UK based Dart Energy to explore Cheshire and the East Midlands for shale gas.

The firm GDF Suez will buy a 25

per cent share in Dart's 13 onshore licences for £7.4 million, and will pay a further £16.4 million for ongoing costs.

It is estimated that the area concerned known as the Bowland

Shale contain 1,300 trillion cubic feet of shale gas.

The company has said it will drill several wells in the 532 square miles area, assuming it gets permission from the government.

More EU regulation

New European Commission regulations mean that the motors in domestic vacuum cleaners will be limited to 1,600W from September 2014 and 900W from 2017. Reacting to this latest piece of red tape from the European Commission, the UKIP MEP for the East of England Stuart Agnew, said:

"First they came for our light bulbs, then Milk of Magnesia and toilet flushes, now EU officials are coming

after our vacuum cleaners. This petty interference won't save any power because it means that vacuum cleaners will have to be run for longer, to do the same job. These regulations take no account of the efficiency of vacuum cleaners, merely the amount of power used. An efficient and more powerful machine may need to be switched on for much less time than the under-powered machines being proposed by the Commission. These new rules will

end up providing consumers with considerably less efficient vacuum cleaners and I am concerned about the long term effects this needless EU interference could have on the health of asthma sufferers in the UK.

"With 26 million people unemployed in the EU, hasn't the European Commission got anything better to do? The Commission is clearly going to suck a great deal more than will our vacuum cleaners!"

Referendum question needs to change

The electoral Commission wants the proposed EU referendum question (Do you think the UK should be a member of the EU) for 2017 changed

as they suggest that a number of people are unaware that we are already members of the EU. It has suggested the terms "remain a member" or

"leave" should be used instead of the phrase "a member of".

Many will think this will favour the stay-in lobby.

UK exports moving outside the EU

If trends continue, 20 years from now, four-fifths of all British exports will go **outside** the EU.

The ten-year period 2002 to 2012 consisted, broadly speaking, of a mixture of “boom and bust”. An economically benign period from 2002 to 2007 was followed by a five-year depression – not yet over – between 2008 & 2012.

Between 2002 & 2012, British exports to the EU grew in value at an average annual compounded rate of 2.4%. Assuming that UK inflation over that period was, say, 2.5% p.a.(1), it follows that in “real” inflation-adjusted terms, British exports to the EU experienced **zero growth** between 2002 & 2012 – indeed, may have declined. (Table 1)

If, over the ten-year period 2013 to 2022, British exports grow at the same average annual compounded rates as in the period from 2002 to 2012 to, respectively, the EU, and the World-outside-the-EU, the split of British global exports in 2022 will be approximately 70/30: **70% outside the EU, 30% to the EU.** (Table 1)

Projecting ten years further: if, over the twenty-year period 2013 to 2032, British exports grow at the same average annual compounded rates as in 2002 to 2012 to, respectively, the EU and the World-outside-the-EU, the split of British global exports in 2032 will be approximately 80/20: **80% outside the EU, 20% to the EU.** (See opposite page Table 2)

Using the same assumed rate of UK inflation over 2002 -2012 of 2.5% p.a., British exports to all regions of the world outside the EU experienced “real” (inflation-adjusted) growth in that period. See opposite page Table 3

Over the ten years 2002-2012, British exports to EFTA countries – Switzerland, Norway & Iceland – grew **two-and-a-half times faster** than British exports to the EU. (See opposite page Table 3)

British exports to some EU countries over the ten years 2002 – 2012 *did* show “real” (inflation-adjusted) growth – for example, to Poland (9.9% before inflation) and Sweden (5.0% before inflation). (See opposite page Table 4)

However, assuming average UK inflation at 2.5% p.a. in 2002-2012, UK exports to the “Big Four” EU countries: Germany, France, Italy and Spain, as well as to the Netherlands and Japan, shrank in “real” (inflation-adjusted) terms. Table 4 opposite

It should be noted that the foregoing analysis takes no account of the two

statistical distortions, the *Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect* & the *Netherlands Distortion*, which exaggerate the importance of the EU as a destination for UK exports. Had it been possible to “correct” the official trade data for these distortions, the value of UK exports going to the EU (for example in Table 1) would have been a few percentage points lower, and the value going to the World-outside-the-EU a few percentage points higher.

Notes & Data Sources

1: The CPI simple average for that period was 2.55%.

The Pink Book 2013, 31st July 2013, www.statistics.gov.uk>Economy>Balance of Payments>The Pink Book 2013 is the source of the export data. The statistics summarised in this Briefing Note are from Part 3, Chapter 9: Geographical Breakdown of Current Account.

Payments to & from supra- & international organisations, & remittances by expatriates, which are included in “Transfers”, are not strictly-speaking “Trade”, but a large proportion of them are trade-related. HM Government itself justifies UK net payments to the EU on the grounds (unsupported by any evidence) that “the UK needs to be in the EU for trade”.

The data above is not adjusted for the Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect or the separate Netherlands Distortion. The effect of these two statistical distortions is to significantly overstate (in the *Pink Book*) the value of UK exports to EU-26, & to significantly understate the value of UK exports **outside** the EU.

In the tables, “EU-26” means the 26 member-states of the European Union as at 2012 (the UK being the twenty-seventh). Croatia joined the EU on 1st July 2013.

Destination	Value of UK Exports in 2012	Rate of Growth 2002-2012 ²
EU-26	£278 bn	2.4 %
Rest of World	£394 bn	7.2 %
World	£672 bn	4.9 %
1: Exports of Goods, Services, Incomes & Transfers		
2: Annual average compound rate of growth 2002-2012		

UK welfare claw-back?

The UK is examining ways to claw back welfare payments made to migrants from other EU countries from their home governments.

A levy is being considered so that for the first two years a migrant was in the UK, the government would be able

to reclaim any benefits paid out from their country of origin.

This arrangement was used until the 1990s, when the EU had fewer members.

A Foreign Office source has said that officials were checking to see if it

“was possible to return to the system”.

Considering the way the European Union deals with any requests from the UK to reduce our costs of EU membership we suggest that the officials don’t have a chance.

UK exports moving outside the EU

Table 2
Projected Split of UK Exports¹ in 2022 & 2032

Destination	Value in 2012	Rate of Growth ²	Projected Value in 2022 ³	Projected Value in 2032 ³
EU-26	£278 bn	2.4 %	£352 bn - 31 %	£447 bn - 22 %
Non-EU	£394 bn	7.2 %	£790 bn - 69 %	£1,583 bn - 78 %
World	£672 bn	4.9 %	£1,142 bn - 100 %	£2,030 bn - 100 %
1: Exports of Goods, Services, Income, Transfers				
2: Annual average compound rate of growth 2002-2012				
3: Assuming same annual average compound growth rates as in previous ten years: EU-26: 2.4% Non-EU: 7.2%				

Table 3
Rate of Growth of UK Export¹ 2002-2012 by Main Destination

Destination	Value of UK Exports in 2012	Rate of Growth 2002-2012 ²
Other Europe ³	£29 bn	10.6 %
Africa	£30 bn	9.9%
Asia	£123 bn	9.3%
Australia/NZ	£18 bn	7.8%
EFTA ⁴	£29 bn	6.1%
Americas	£166 bn	5.2%
EU-26	£278 bn	2.4%
World	£672 bn	4.9%
1: Exports of Goods, Services, Income, Transfers		
2: Annual average compound rate of growth 2002-2012		
3: Russia, Turkey, non-EU eastern European countries, international organisations		
4: Switzerland, Norway, Iceland		

Table 4 - Fastest-Growing UK Export¹ Markets 2002-2012

Rank	Country	Growth Rate ²
1	Russia	19.8 %
2	China/HK	15.0 %
3	Brazil	13.3 %
4	Thailand	12.0 %
5	South Korea	11.9 %
6	India	11.7%
7	Turkey	10.1%
8	Singapore	9.9 %
9	Poland ³	9.9 %
10	Australia	8.3 %
11	Saudi Arabia	7.7 %
12	Switzerland	6.3 %
13	Norway	5.8 %
14	South Africa	5.5 %
15	Sweden	5.0 %
16	USA	4.9 %
17	Canada	4.3 %
18	Denmark ³	3.5 %
19	Ireland	3.1 %
20	Belgium/Luxemb. ³	2.9 %
21	Germany ³	2.2 %
22	Netherlands ³	2.1 %
23	Japan	1.9 %
24	France ³	1.6 %
25	Spain ³	1.6 %
26	Italy ³	0.1 %
1: Exports of Goods, Services, Income, Transfers		
2: Annual average compound rate of growth 2002-2012		
3: EU member		

Source: Global Britain Briefing Note No 88 dated 13th September 2013

Merkel flexes her muscles

The German Chancellor Angela Merkel has poured cold water on hopes the European Commission President candidate of the most popular political party after next year's EU election will automatically get the post.

On the 25th October in Brussels she said: "I don't see any automaticity between top candidates and the filling of posts.

"The treaty says that it should be taken into account. Otherwise the commission president will be voted by the parliament based on a proposal by the [EU leaders]," she noted.

She added that this means there will

be "many considerations" and "many discussions" after the 22-25th May European Parliament vote on how to divide the vacant posts.

Merkel's comments indicate that the old habits of the past will continue.

This sees EU leaders negotiate behind closed doors to divide up the posts of the commission president, foreign affairs chief and EU council president.

Weight is given to the person's political affiliation, nationality and gender. Their talent or suitability for the job is often an optional extra.

Merkel said there are important posts to be distributed by EU leaders

and that should be "distinguished from" political parties putting forward top candidates.

The chancellor added that the parties' candidates cannot necessarily expect to become president and said "false promises" should not be made.

The continuation of the secretive nomination process stands in stark contrast to the large increase in powers given to the EU as a result of the economic crisis.

New rules now allow the European Commission to see the budgets of euro states before national parliaments do.

LETTERS

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

Whistle blowers

Dear Sir,

Your front page lead of October 2013 revealing “the unintended consequence ofblind monetarism” during the period from 1979, highlights how a vital part of a great power’s economy - manufacturing - can be destroyed by the error of a senior politician and the acquiescence of others who apparently deemed it inappropriate to ‘blow the whistle’.

Therefore, how appreciative we should be of later whistle blowers and demonstrators - for example, the Occupy Movement - who may cause inconvenience while bringing to public notice matters of serious concern.

A curiosity is why Mrs Thatcher and Sir Keith Joseph “felt powerless”. Did not the former have adequate power to set matters right?

RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

Leaving the EU

Dear Sir,

Mrs Stancey, in the October issue of *eurofacts* seems to believe all we need is a backbone to leave the EU.

The reality is the EU is but a part player in a Global world and while those not in the EU represent themselves on the numerous world bodies affecting us, as a member of the EU our interests are left to an EU representative.

Article 50, now even acknowledged by Nigel Farage as the legal route to leave the EU, is the only way to ensure our exit from the EU is controlled and measured and meets our international obligations.

Furthermore, leaving the EU does not mean leaving the Single Market as like Norway we can rejoin EEA and have all the same trading advantages with only about a quarter of the costs of full membership. Norway is also able to veto what they don’t agree with.

Article 50 is practical, grown up and

the approved route out of the EU for the first time, if we are seeking an amicable divorce, this Article clearly sets out the procedure to leave the EU and, importantly, requires the other member states to co-operate. All other options and particularly the repeal of the ECA 1972 is just dangerous macho muscle flexing that will lose us the referendum due to the uncertainty it would create.

NIALL WARRY
Somerset

CBI report

Dear Sir,

The report that every household in the UK is £3,000 better off through being in the EU is an outrageous claim. This means that the CBI is claiming that after the costs of being in the EU are deducted the UK is in profit by £75 billion. The fact is that being in the EU costs the UK economy £170 billion per annum, (see Prof Tim Congdon’s report on “How much does the European Union cost Britain?”).

Hence the CBI is claiming that the UK makes £245 billion per annum out of the EU which results in a profit of £75 billion after deducting Tim Congdon’s cost figure.

This is an extraordinary claim considering that since we joined the EEC/EU in 1973 our accumulated balance of trade with the EU is a deficit (loss) worth the equivalent of £1 trillion at today’s values. Similarly, our accumulated balance of trade with the rest of the world until 2008 was a surplus (profit) worth £245 billion at today’s values. Furthermore, if one makes an estimate of the total accumulated cost of being in the EEC/EU from 1973 up until now it appears that it could be well in excess of £7 trillion.

It is worth pointing out here that the UK has always been the 2nd or 3rd net highest contributor to UK funds and apart from 1 year has always had a deficit in our trade with the EU. In

addition, membership of the EU costs the average family of four an extra £1,000 on its grocery bills to pay for the CAP. Furthermore, being in the EU means we have to support the 600,000 EU migrants who live in the UK off our benefits system. We also have to support 50,000 children whose EU parents live in the UK but who themselves are still living in the EU.

There are further costs associated with being in the EU which are astronomical, including the EU pensions shortfall of £30 trillion.

I have written to the CBI asking them for a copy of their report to establish how they arrived at their figures.

J. WRAITH
Surrey

Toilets examined

Dear Sir,

Why is it that after the “European Commission President Manuel Barroso, recently said the EU executive should be “big on big things and small on smaller things” that they spend time and taxpayers’ money on ‘user behaviour’ at toilets and urinals. Yet again flushing our money down the pan.

The resulting proposal of the 60 page technical report started in October 2011 is that full flush volume of flushing urinal equipment shall be lower than one litre per flush, and for toilets 5 litres per full volume flush.

Next no doubt they will produce a report on the type of toilet seats!

The problem with all of this apart from the costs of producing these reports, is that once they make these so-called recommendations, they very quickly become law throughout the EU resulting in more unnecessary costs to the taxpayers’.

Thanks to people like Stuart Agnew MEP for UKIP at least we get to hear about about this waste of money.

RICHARD FIELDING
Coventry

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **19th November**, 6.00 pm

"Should the UK adopt money GDP targets?"

Douglas McWilliams, *Mercers' School Memorial Professor of Commerce at Gresham College*

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

UK Independence Party
(Arundel & South Downs Branch)
01403 701047 (even)

Monday **25th November**, 7.30 pm

Gerard Batten MEP, *UKIP founder member & MEP for London*

PUBLIC MEETING
Pulborough Village Hall, Pulborough,
West Sussex RH20 2BF
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **10th December**, 1.00 pm

"The English Corn Law Returns, the Corn Laws and the birth of political economy"

D'Marias Coffman, *Newnham College, Cambridge*

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **11th December**, 6.00 pm

"Was Karl Marx always Wrong?"

Douglas McWilliams, *Mercers' School Memorial Professor of Commerce at Gresham College*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London Wall
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(Bournemouth Branch)
01202 430097

Saturday **14th December**, 12.00 am

Guest Speaker: Lord Christopher Monckton of Brenchley

LUNCHEON & PUBLIC MEETING
Liston Hotel, Boscombe Spa,
Wollstonecraft Road, Bournemouth
BH5 1JQ
Admission £12
(Contact: phil_bunce@hotmail.com)

FREE Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

Contact Details

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175

or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Parliament **12th-18th November**
Autumn Recess

UK Parliament **19th Dec. - 6th Jan.**
Christmas Recess

2014

Greece takes over **1st January**
EU Council Presidency

European Union **22nd-25th May**
MEP elections

Italy takes over **1st July**
EU Council Presidency

Scottish Referendum **18th Sept.**
on Independence from the UK

2015

Latvia takes over **1st January**
EU Council Presidency

Final Date for **1st May**
UK General Election

USEFUL WEB SITES

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.ccc.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

Labour for a Referendum
www.labourforareferendum.com

New Alliance
www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe
www.openeurope.org.uk

Sovereignty
www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch
www.statewatch.org

Team
www.teameurope.info

EU Referendum
www.eureferendum.com

The People's Pledge
www.peoplespledge.org

The Taxpayers' Alliance
www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org

**The Future's Bright
The Future's Global**

by *Rory Broomfield*. **£4.99**

Why time is running out if Britain is to take control of its economic future.

'Europe' doesn't Work

by *Tim Congdon*. **£3.00**

A discussion of the three-million-jobs at-risk lie and related misconceptions.

How much does the EU cost Britain?

by *Tim Congdon*. **£6.00**

With a foreword by Gerard Batten MEP this 2013 edition finds the costs of EU membership to be £165 billion or 11% of GDP.

Bloodless Revolution

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£4.99**

Why political parties are the cause of our problems - how to remove them in a day.

Cracking The Whip

by *Christopher Gill*. **£9.99**

Why the Conservative party is weak on the EU and therefore, puts at risk the future of the UK.

**A Doomed Marriage:
Britain and Europe**

by *Daniel Hannan*. **£12.00**

Why the European dream that was meant to unite us, bring peace, prosperity, freedom and democracy, has failed.

**Time for the UK to
Face the Facts**

by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£7.99**

An analysis of how and why the UK has lost its way by a lack of concern for the people whilst trying to appease the EU.

**Saying 'No' to
the Single Market**

Foreword by *Barry Legg*. **£4.00**

A collection of speeches on the Single Market by Professor David Myddelton, Professor Jean-Jaques Rosa, Dr Andrew Lilico, Ian Milne and Dr Ruth Lea.

Time To Say No:

Alternatives to EU Membership

by *Ian Milne*. **£8.00**

Ian examines the cost and implications of EU Membership and considers positive alternatives.

Sail On, O Ship of State

Edited by *Johanna Möhring & Gwythian Prins*. **£12.00**

A collection of writers including: Roger Scruton, Daniel Hannan, Frank Field and Tom Kremer, set out why the nation state should be preserved and cherished.

The Harrogate Agenda

by *Dr Richard A.E. North*. **£5.00**

A well thought out agenda that; Demands for governance by the people for the people.

Montgomery

and the First War on terror

by *Robert Oulds*. **£8.99**

Detailing a little known period of Monty's career and how he fought his wars on terror. Lessons for today's war.

EU In A Nutshell

by *Dr Lee Rotherham*. **Hdbk. £12.99**

As the strap line says; Everything you wanted to know about the EU but didn't know who to ask.

From Ur to Us

Everything you need

to know about History

by *Hugh Williams*. **£20.00**

A wonderful reference book for all those dates and facts you can never remember.

Send payment to

THE JUNE PRESS LTD

PO BOX 119

TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@junepress.com

WEB SALES www.junepress.com

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)

20% for Europe 30% Rest of World

FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE

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

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006