

## Winning the EU referendum

Ken Worthy

The great fear of Eurosceptics is that we would lose an In/Out referendum, because of voters' fear of the unknown, plus dire warnings from big business, politicians and the media of the risks of loss of trade and jobs. However we could win a referendum on whether to be a member of the EU or of EFTA. EFTA is inside the single market (the EEA), so there would be no threat to trade or jobs. Those against leaving would be deprived of their most powerful arguments.

Joining EFTA would give us most of the benefits of leaving completely:

- \* Keep our access to the single market, but not the common external tariff.
- \* Let us negotiate our own trade deals, with EFTA or independently.
- \* Allow us to restrict immigration, by using Safeguard Measures provided for in the EEA Agreement.
- \* Enable us to reject future steps towards ever-closer union to protect the Euro.
- \* Provide a powerful negotiating block for future relations with the EU.
- \* Provide other countries with an alternative to "ever-closer union" and the Euro.
- \* Be a stepping stone to full independence at a later stage.

The fear of most Eurosceptics is that even if we succeeded in getting an In/Out referendum, we would lose. People don't know what leaving the EU involves. Fear of the unknown would be reinforced by propaganda from big business, politicians and the media that leaving would lead to a disastrous loss of trade and jobs. The

"three million jobs at risk" scare, however puerile, would be paraded again and again. In opinion polls, the main reason given for staying in the EU is to protect our trade. It is this fear that would lose us a referendum. To win, we need to eliminate the fear.

### A Different Question EU or EFTA?

The Conservatives need to clarify what they would do if the deal offered by the EU is not acceptable. Their solution should be to leave the EU and join EFTA. EFTA is what we thought we were joining - a free trade agreement without all the supra-national ambitions, costs and controls. The In/Out question would effectively be replaced by "would you prefer to be in the EU or EFTA?". In/Out is a scary choice for voters. The choice between membership of the EU or EFTA is much less scary:

\* The key point is that EFTA has access to the single market, and therefore involves no risk of loss of trade and jobs. The opposition of big business would be much reduced, and their claims much less credible. The claim of 3 million jobs at risk would collapse. The case against change would be deprived of its strongest argument.

\* EFTA is a known and established institution. We were founder members. The debate could be based on facts about EFTA and how it actually works, not fears of the unknown. EFTA states are richer than EU states and currently average 4% unemployment. Polls show 70% would support our being

members of EFTA.

### Advantages of EFTA/EEA

EFTA countries are members of the EEA (European Economic Area) - ie the single market. They:

\* Have access to the single market, but don't apply the common external tariff - we could reduce tariffs (eg on raw materials, components & food) to suit our economy.

\* Can negotiate their own trade treaties - EFTA has agreements with over 20 countries, including Canada, Singapore, Mexico, Chile, Turkey, South Africa and South Korea. They are negotiating an agreement with India, which the EU has given up on. EFTA tends to negotiate as one, but members have the right to negotiate their own treaties.

\* Accept most EU regulations (three-quarters in practice so far), but are not bound to accept all of them. Crucially, EFTA polices its own rules, not the European Court.

\* Are outside the CAP and control their own fisheries, oil and gas industries, and justice systems.

The EEA is based on EU rules as they were in 1992, plus changes accepted by EFTA since then. Members can reject new EU rules, including any future moves towards economic union to save the Euro. Technically, EFTA members even can reject the free movement of people and capital. For example:

\* Iceland imposed capital controls and resisted EU pressure to bail out EU

Continued on page 2

# Winning the EU referendum

Continued from page 1

citizens.

\* Norway does not intend to implement EU regulations on its oil and gas industry, proposed in 2011, whereas Britain might have to, under QMV.

\* The EFTA Secretariat has identified over 1200 EU acts designated by the EU as "EEA relevant" but not adopted by EFTA.

\* The EEA Agreement includes "Safeguard Measures" which allow the parties to take unilateral action if serious difficulties arise. UK could use this to avoid the consequences of unrestricted immigration unacceptable to its people. A reciprocal agreement could allow those already in place to stay.

\* Switzerland said in Feb 14 that it will restrict immigration in 3 years time. Not being a member of the EEA, it relies on bilateral treaties for access to the single market. In retaliation, the EU has ended Swiss access to some projects and agreements, but have not yet clarified whether they will try to restrict Swiss access to the single market, which would also involve restricting EU access to the Swiss market.

The UK joining would strengthen EFTA in negotiations with the EU. They could make much greater use of their exemptions from EU law, the potential of Safeguard Measures, and

their negotiating power on future regulations. Iceland and Norway are not fully satisfied with the EEA agreement, but are not powerful enough to force the EU to renegotiate. The UK could also support Switzerland in resisting any EU "punishment" for restricting immigration.

Joining EFTA would also overcome the major practical problem of timescale and workload - how to bring into effect hundreds of replacement trade agreements when we leave, so that trade is not affected.

An enlarged EFTA would be a demonstrably more successful block than the EU. Denmark and others would be likely to follow us into EFTA, to escape the stagnation of the Eurozone. By providing an alternative, it could destroy the EU.

## Arguments Against

The opposition would claim that:

\* EFTA has to obey all the rules without a say in what they are. But they don't have to adopt them all - eg Norway adopted 3,000 Euro-laws in 2002-5, compared with 18,000 adopted by Britain in the same period.

\* The EU would somehow punish us for leaving. But we are their biggest customer, buying more from them than the US and Japan together. EU businesses would not want to lose this market.

\* We would have no influence outside the EU. On the contrary, EFTA countries have their own foreign policies and represent themselves on international bodies. They don't have to adopt a compromise EU position. They have more influence than they would as small members of the EU.

\* We would have no influence in the EU. We would have less, certainly, but they would have much less influence over us, which is the whole point. We don't want to tell them what to do.

## A Staging Post to Full Independence?

The Single Market has its disadvantages. It can be seen as an equal handicapping of all EEA countries with a common burden of excessive regulation. If in the longer term we came to see the disadvantages as outweighing the advantages, we could leave EFTA. We would take the time needed to prepare for our exit and would have the power to set up the required trade treaties in advance. We would find EFTA easier to leave than the EU, and would be more confident about doing so.

Given the choice of being in EFTA or the EU, there is little doubt that voters would choose EFTA. It is the free trade agreement we thought that we were joining - one without all the supra-national burdens and ambitions. We could win that referendum.

## EP election results ignored by Westminster

Despite the results of the European Parliamentary Elections showing that the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) had gained MEPs and increased their share of the vote, the Westminster MPs all carried on with their promotion of the EU.

The Westminster MPs of all parties pretended that this was a protest vote against politicians generally and that the UKIP share of the vote was just about some minor problem regarding immigration.

Unfortunately, the media and many UKIP representatives responded by just talking about immigration and not discussing the costs involved and the loss of sovereignty imposed by the UK's continued membership of the EU.

The public did not vote UKIP just about immigration, it was just as much about the huge financial contribution the UK makes to the EU, and the increasing costs created by the rules and regulation imposed by the EU on the businesses and citizens.

Meanwhile, Angela Merkel and the German led EU machine will continue with the push for more EU powers and regulation to take control of the UK's successful service sector, until it is lost to Frankfurt or Paris all in the name of EU harmonisation.

Democracy and independence have already been given up, the citizens can see this but the leaders of the Conservatives and Labour cannot or do not want to admit it. While the Lib-Dems want more EU, not less.

## BOOK REVIEW

# Trouble with a capital “T”

Derek Stirling

If the reader is in any doubt about the content of this book, they only have to read the strap line: “Why the EU isn’t working. How it can be reformed. What could take its place”.

The introduction lays out the basic problems that the EU is now facing:

“The European Union is at a decision point ..... the EU is a malfunctioning construct for today’s world - and even more so for tomorrow’s. It needs either to undergo fundamental reform or to break up. It was conceived in a world of blocs, dominated by the Cold War rivalry between the US and the USSR and before globalisation and the rise of emerging markets.”

He explains the reasons behind the formation of the EU and why it created political institutions in order for it to become a State.

Moreover, he goes into great detail

---

### The Trouble With Europe

by Roger Bootle

Nicholas Brealey Hdbk 216pp 2014

Available from

*The June Press*

Price £18.99 + 10% p&p

(see back cover)

ISBN 978-1-85788-615-3

---

about the economics of the EU and the problems associated with the euro. Continuing on this theme, a fully detailed analysis of the costs and benefits of leaving the EU are also dealt with.

The so-called Single Market is not forgotten and when looked at more closely is seen to be as easily accessible from outside the EU and not

therefore a reason to be a member of the EU bloc.

A useful reminder that the world including the commonwealth is getting richer and set to rise even more so over the next decades, while the EU economies will shrink should also be considered.

Finally the argument that the Con/Lab/Lib parties portray that life outside the EU would be bad for jobs, the economy, world influence and many more ghastly aspects are quickly laid to rest. He explains how and why the UK, and for that matter other members of the EU can have a real and positive future outside the EU and the euro.

If after reading this book you cannot but wonder at the restrictive narrow-minded views of the current main political parties in Westminster, then I suggest you read it again.

## EU gains more influence

The EU has just hosted the G7 Brussels Summit, that may appear uninteresting to many, but as the EU is not an official member then it is of interest.

How did this come about? Firstly, the G8 meeting due to take place in Sochi under the Russian chairmanship was boycotted by the G7 members. This was caused by the Ukraine situation where Russia took control over Crimea.

The EU has pretended for many many years that it is a member of the G7/G8. However, the president of the EU was originally only invited to attend sessions that fell under its area of competences such as international

trade. Since then it has been allowed to take part in other sessions.

Here again we can see how the EU has managed to creep into taking powers it has not been granted. The G7 has not invited the EU to become a member, yet it managed to host the summit. The host is normally allowed to set the focus of the summit, although many issues are carried forward from previous meetings, the host can add further topics.

This creep of EU influence will probably mean that the EU will now be included in the rotation system to hold the presidency. If so, this will increase the powers of the presidency of the EU and will probably lead to the EU

gaining access to other important international organisations.

Normally only members of the G7/G8 are allowed to host the summit, the EU has now attained that status by the back door route.

The really worrying factor is that the EU presidency will be speaking on and committing the members of the EU to agreements and decisions it sees fit without the need to consult the 28 members. One can see a time when the UK under the goals of the ever closer integration principle of the EU will surrender its seat on the G7/8 to the EU as an act of good faith.

Next years presidency is held by Germany.

## Propaganda begins

While in Brussels the US president Mr Obama, kindly spoke out and expressed his disquiet at the prospect

of the UK leaving the EU.

Clearly he is as well informed about the cost/benefits of the EU, as Bush

and Blair were on the weapons of mass destruction held in Iraq before they invaded that country.

# Lessons from the Scottish referendum campaign

Anthony Scholefield

The course of the referendum campaign on Scottish independence is highly instructive for EU withdrawalists. We are indeed fortunate to have this current example of a possible constitutional change from which we can draw many lessons.

**The Unionists** - Let us start with the opposition to Scottish independence. This has gone through three overlapping phases. In the first phase, unionists did not take the Scottish independence campaign very seriously. After all, it had been rumbling on for many years. For most of the following period the unionists veered between ignoring the issue and appeasement. This latter took the form of conceding devolution and distribution of financial benefits to Scotland. Appeasement still continues and, as the unionists have now woken up to the imminent possibility of an independence vote on 18th September, we can expect more, in the form of promises on tax, fiscal autonomy and other items.

However, we are now in the third phase which both precedes and follows the actual referendum. In this phase, unionists have to take account of the terms of separation and the effect on the rest of the UK. If the Scots vote for independence, the UK government will cease to take account of Scottish interests and solely take account of the interests of the rest of the UK, one of which, of course, will be relations with an independent Scotland. But this change of stance cannot be left entirely until the referendum date without undermining its credibility. The unionists have now had to outline their position and this has impacted on the campaign.

Of course, there are many issues which have been barely discussed, such as the absurd idea Scotland could

have a different migration policy and still have unrestricted movement to the rest of the UK. There are also questions about Faslane, EU membership, pension schemes, etc. – but the currency issue has now been put on the table.

**The SNP** - It is well known that nearly all referendums have a conservative outcome as the undecided voters decide for the status quo and reject change. The Scottish nationalist campaign, quite correctly, focussed on continuity and reassurance.

Alex Salmond stressed that not much would change. The Queen would remain Queen of Scotland. Scotland would keep the pound and would stay in the EU and NATO. There would be no border or migration controls between Scotland and the rest of the UK.

All this was entirely sensible campaigning.

**Salmond's mistake** - The problem is that Alex Salmond did not nail down the key decisions which were not his alone to make. He was fighting for an 'enabling' referendum and promising to attend to the details of independence after the vote. So Salmond did not nail down EU membership, Schengen, etc.

The unionists are now fighting a different type of referendum - a "consent-to-specifics" referendum - which is based on the exact terms of independence.

This is where Salmond has gone wrong. He made assumptions about the specifics - in fact, barely discussed them or even thought about them. He seems to have counted on Westminster's continuing appeasement of Scottish interests after a YES vote.

However, there is likely to be considerable rancour in the rest of the

UK if the Scots decide they no longer wish to be in the same country. The position of the UK government will then focus entirely on the interests of the rest of the UK. Salmond's maximum leverage was just before and at the very beginning of the referendum campaign. The focus of the Westminster government on the interests of the rest of the UK is now manifest.

**The Currency issue** - Once the Westminster government, the main opposition parties, HM Treasury and the Bank of England refused a Scotland-UK monetary union, Salmond seemed non-plussed. It is difficult to see why, considering the five-year long eurozone problems of monetary union dominating financial news. Some of his allies have come up with the idea of 'sterlingization', of Scotland using the pound without any agreement, in the same way as Panama and Zimbabwe use the US dollar. But this is fantasy as regards the financial sector. US banks and investment funds are not headquartered in Panama or Zimbabwe.

The currency issue is critical. If Scotland were a self-contained semi-rural country, as Ireland used to be, it could have detached itself from the UK, albeit with some disadvantages.

However, the Scottish financial sector is enormous and is largely dependent on English bank depositors, English investors and English pension funds – which, for example, account for 90% of Edinburgh-based Standard Life's business.

The idea that English businesses and individuals would keep their principal bank deposits in a bank in a foreign country is far-fetched, even in a monetary union. Think of, say, the Paris municipality or Electricite de

Continued on page 5

# Lessons from the Scottish referendum campaign

Continued from page 4

France keeping their bank accounts, pension funds, etc. in institutions in Portugal, even though both use the same currency. So is the idea that county councils, universities and companies and individuals would keep their pension schemes in a different jurisdiction, let alone a different currency, from where their liabilities arose.

Depositors will recall the example of Iceland, where a popular referendum refused to repay foreign governments who underwrote foreign depositors. Then there is Cyprus where foreign depositors received a 'haircut' at the insistence of the EU. So, either Scottish institutions and banks will migrate to England or their depositors and investors will withdraw their money to England. Neither can afford a mismatch of liabilities in one country and assets in another, with not just currency risk but political (expropriation) risk as well.

**No Scottish independence** - All this, therefore, means that regardless of which way Scots vote, there will be no real Scottish independence following this referendum. However Scots express their wish, the details of a separation agreement will lead to a mass exodus of English money before or after the agreement and leave the Scottish financial sector either in exile in England or in ruins. Salmond would have to face the fact that independence at present was a non-starter.

**Lessons For "Brexit"** - Where does this leave EU withdrawalists?

Essentially, withdrawalists have to avoid Salmond's mistake of assuming that a referendum on the EU will be of the 'enabling' type, where a vague general proposition is put to the electorate with the details to be filled in by the executive at a later date.

Europhiles will make every effort to

turn the referendum into one of "consent-to-specifics" where at least the key details and facts are in the public domain and thus in the hands of the electorate. This could be devastating for EU withdrawalists if the withdrawal case does not rest on clear proposals with all the principal details stress-tested in advance.

If the UK left the EU, some of the problems an independent Scotland would face would not be relevant. There are no currency issues and no EU defence issues.

However, there are a great number of issues that do need to be addressed. For example, it is by no means agreed among EU withdrawalists that withdrawal should be by giving notice under Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty. Also, it is suggested that the UK should return to EFTA and remain part of the EEA, thus reassuring business that it will still be in the Single Market. Some argue that Britain legally remains in the EEA even if it left the EU but it would be advisable to get the leaders of the EFTA countries to go on record beforehand that they would welcome British membership. This whole area needs to be nailed down, not just agreement on what is to be done, but clear demonstration that it *can* be done.

Then there is the question of 'free movement' within the EEA and this is generally supported by business, albeit without taking account of the wider costs to society. Concern about immigration is one of the drivers behind dislike of EU membership. This will have to be addressed, possibly under Article 112 of the EEA agreements, so as to heavily restrict EU immigration.

Another issue is existing EU migrants in the UK. Are they to be allowed to stay indefinitely - with all the costs - or will there be a phased withdrawal of residence rights? How will this impact British residents in the rest of the EU, both existing and

prospective? There is little evidence that this has been thought about.

**EU institutions** - At present the attitude of the EU institutions to the prospect of a British withdrawal is still in the first phase - they do not take it seriously. If the possibility of British withdrawal becomes likely, they may move to some appeasement or not. It depends on their cost/benefit analysis. However, in the event of a British decision to leave, it must be clear that the EU institutions would then be focussed entirely on the interests of the rest of the EU. They will also be in some form of psychological distress.

**Assumptions** - Certain assumptions among withdrawalists rest on quite shaky foundations. For example, it is said it would be easy to conclude a free trade treaty with the EU and that, in any case, Britain imports more than it exports to the EU so it would have leverage. But, some 40% of British trade is with the EU, while the proportion of EU trade with the UK is less than 20%. Europhiles could argue that Brussels would have more leverage than British withdrawalists currently assume.

Then there is the question of existing EU law, the hundreds of treaties with third parties concluded by the EU, and many other items. EU withdrawalists cannot afford to be in a position where there is a cacophony of alternatives offered to the electorate on major issues.

But the blunders of Alex Salmond are helpful. EU withdrawalists must not only win the 'enabling' question. They must also get their exact offer to the electorate agreed over a wide range of issues, and demonstrate that it has been thoroughly stress-tested and can be carried out.

Anthony Scholefield, *Director, Futurus*

# LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## Is it Free Trade?

Dear Sir,

UKIP reflects public opinion over the EU. That is split between distrust of belonging and fear of leaving. In other words, the British public have no clear idea after forty years of membership and is dithering as sceptics without exhibiting an understanding the realities. Those in favour of the EU assess Britain's national interest while ignoring features of its underlying nature and absurdities. During the Referendum of 1975 a similar attitude born of ignorance swept aside consideration of the *socialiste, dirigiste* and protectionist nature of the founding Treaty of Rome.

That was created by founders like Jean Monnet who loved getting round a table to cobble together union in post-war Europe without clear vision. Britain joined in 1973 hoping to enjoy trading advantages within the Common Market. At that time about three-quarters of its expenditure was taken by the Corrupt Agricultural Policy [CAP] and yet its nature has never been debated in Britain, apart from wine lakes, mountains of butter and the like. State support of agriculture was exposed as benefiting rural landowners rather than productive farmers by both David Ricardo in 1815 and Richard Cobden in 1844.

The British appetite was aroused by the assembling of the Single Market during the 1980s. The idea was that it would open a market of free trade in Europe. It is built of thousands of directives covering such important matters as the size of potatoes and tomatoes. So engulfed in the Single Market has Britain become that its admirers claim that the EU is Britain's largest market. They spread fear, that is the cement of the EU, that exporters in Britain would lose a large market, if Britain left the EU.

Those first advocates of free trade in France and a century later in Britain

would be horrified by the protectionist nature of the EU. The French merchants began to challenge mercantilism from about 1666, overthrew it by *laissez-faire* and first formulated the full concept of free trade - meaning trade free of State regulation - before Adam Smith was born in 1722.

However, Britain became the only developed nation to introduce free trade across the board following the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1845. The Conservatives were driven to repeal not by conviction but by a potatoe famine. They challenged free trade and were heavily defeated in the 1906 election. Keynes dismissed it as an outdated philosophy by disingenuous argument in 1925. It was ended in 1932 and protectionism has ruled to this day.

In his recent speech to the University of Berlin José Barroso, retiring after a decade as President of the EU Commission, intended to hand on his passion and leadership. Instead, his speech showed the visionless pointlessness of what is in reality medieval thinking.

UKIP has become the voice of public opinion swept to power by responding to dislike of mass immigration, while not concerning themselves with the deeper realities of the *socialite, dirigiste*, protectionist foundation

MALCOLM HILL  
London

## Time to tear up the Treaties

Dear Sir,

Much has been discussed and written about Brexit; all of it, it seems to me, misses the point.

Getting out is both simpler and harder, but harder only if we lack courage and resolve.

When the UK decides to come out (a simple act of Parliament declaring we are leaving will do - no need for a referendum, just a majority in

Parliament) then we simply do just that: we reinstate our borders, we stop all payments to Brussels and pay no more attention to the EU directives or regulations (except where they apply to our continuing exports to the EU) and clear foreign fishing boats from our waters etc etc.

What about the treaties? We tear them up.

They were imposed in humiliating circumstances and agreed to by a traitorous and obsequious Heath and a succession of equally dismal Tories. We surrendered our Commonwealth, fishing, sovereignty and much else besides.

There are parallels with the Treaty of Versailles imposed on Germany after the First War. Germany was to be squeezed until the pips came out' - as Clemenceau so felicitously put it. Germany had every right to tear it up. Now it's our turn.

There will be screams of anguish and indignation from Brussels. But when the dust has settled (which it will) we may find a lot of other European countries will also be ex-EU, having followed our example.

The UK is in a prison. But it's an open prison, so let's follow the current trend and walk out.

REV. PHILIP FOSTER  
Cambridgeshire

## UKIP victorious

Dear Sir,

I wish to offer my congratulations to UKIP on their impressive performance at the European Parliamentary elections.

The British people have spoken out on EU membership and the result is that they don't like it. While the Lib-Dems committed suicide by stating that they want more EU not less, the voters punished them by reducing them to one MEP.

David Regan  
London)

# MEETINGS

**Conservative Way Forward**  
020 7403 3990

Friday **4th July** 7.00 pm

Celebration of "Freedom under the Law"

SUMMER DRINKS RECEPTION

House of Commons Terrace,  
Westminster, London SW1A

**Admission by ticket Members £40.00  
(Non-members £50)**

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **8th July**, 6.00 pm

*"The Queen's Commonwealth:  
Monarchy and the End of Empire"*

As Glasgow prepares to host the Commonwealth Games, Murphy explores the history and importance of the Commonwealth and asks, 'What Next?'

**Professor Philip Murphy**, *Director of the Institute of Commonwealth Studies*

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

**Admission Free**

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **15th October**, 6.00 pm

*"Human Rights: Philosophy and History"*

The philosophical and historical developments of what may be regarded as essential human rights will be traced. It is essential to understand this development before criticising - or complaining about - modern human rights

**Professor Sir Geoffrey Nice QC**

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

**Admission Free**

*(This is part of the 2014 City of London Festival)*

**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**

**Bruges Group**  
020 7287 4414

**November,**

**Further details to be announced**

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE  
Princess Alexandra Hall, Royal Overseas League, Royal Overseas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London SW1A 1LR

**Admission Charge**  
(Includes lunch and refreshments)

## DIARY OF EVENTS

### 2014

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

Scottish Referendum **18th Sept.**  
on Independence  
from the United Kingdom

### 2015

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

UK General Election **7th May**

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

### 2016

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

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

## USEFUL WEB SITES

**British Weights & Measures Assoc.**

[www.bwmaonline.com](http://www.bwmaonline.com)

**Bruges Group**

[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

**Campaign Against Euro-Federalism**

[www.caef.org.uk](http://www.caef.org.uk)

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**

[www.freebritain.org.uk](http://www.freebritain.org.uk)

**Democracy Movement**

[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)

**English Constitution Group**

[www.englishconstitutiongroup.org](http://www.englishconstitutiongroup.org)

**EU Observer**

[www.euobserver.com](http://www.euobserver.com)

**EU Truth**

[www.eutruth.org.uk](http://www.eutruth.org.uk)

**European Commission (London)**

[www.ccc.org.uk](http://www.ccc.org.uk)

**European Foundation**

[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)

**European No Campaign**

[www.europeannocampaign.com](http://www.europeannocampaign.com)

**EU Referendum Campaign**

[www.eureferendumcampaign.com](http://www.eureferendumcampaign.com)

**Freedom Association**

[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)

**Global Britain**

[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

**Global Vision**

[www.global-vision.net](http://www.global-vision.net)

**June Press (Publications)**

[www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)

**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**

[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)

**Labour for a Referendum**

[www.labourforareferendum.com](http://www.labourforareferendum.com)

**New Alliance**

[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)

**Open Europe**

[www.openeurope.org.uk](http://www.openeurope.org.uk)

**Sovereignty**

[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)

**Statewatch**

[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)

**Team**

[www.teameurope.info](http://www.teameurope.info)

**EU Referendum**

[www.eureferendum.com](http://www.eureferendum.com)

**The People's Pledge**

[www.peoplespledge.org](http://www.peoplespledge.org)

**The Taxpayers' Alliance**

[www.taxpayersalliance.com](http://www.taxpayersalliance.com)

**United Kingdom Independence Party**

[www.ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org)

**'Europe' doesn't Work**

by *Tim Congdon*. **£3.00**

The 3 million jobs trick and more.

**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.

**A Pocket Book Of Freedom**

by *Christopher Gill*. **£5.00**

The stupidity of abandoning fundamental aspects of our common law to the EU.

**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.

**The Norway Option**

Re-joining the EEA as an alternative to membership of the EU  
by *Dr Richard North*. **£5.00**

**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.

**Everything You Wanted To Know About the EU**

**But Were Afraid To Ask**

by *Robert Oulds*. **£9.99**

Ould outlines all the problems associated with EU membership.

**Too 'nice' to be Tories?**

How the Modernisers have damaged the Conservative Party  
by *Anthony Scholefield & Gerald Frost*. **£10.00**

New edition- Why they forgot their true beliefs and drove away their core voters.

**Spyhunter**

by *Michael Shrimpton*. **£25.00**

A fascinating alternative view of history, including the EU, exposes the secret world of German intelligence.

**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.

**DVDs**

**The Norway Option**

by *Bruges Group*. **£12.99**

Full analysis, run time 34 mins.

**Voices for True Democracy**

by *Bruges Group*. **£12.99**

Improving the governance of Britain  
Run time 33 mins.

**Send payment to**

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD  
PO BOX 119**

**TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: [info@junepress.com](mailto:info@junepress.com)

**WEB SALES [www.junepress.com](http://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 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"

<b>European Commission</b>	<b>020 7973 1992</b>
European Movement	020 7940 5252
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020 7735 4000</b>

AGAINST "EU"

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403 741736</b>
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	01738 783936
<b>CIB</b>	<b>0116 2874 622</b>
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>0845 833 9626</b>
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
<b>New Alliance</b>	<b>020 7385 9757</b>
Fishing Association	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

**Congress for Democracy** **01372 453678**

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

<b>Bruges Group</b>	<b>020 7287 4414</b>
Global Britain	
Email: <a href="mailto:globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org">globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org</a>	
<b>Global Vision</b>	<b>www.global-vision.net</b>
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

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

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006