

Another Whitehall farce?

Brian Mooney

A cross-party EU Committee in the House of Lords has produced an eye-opening report on the government's EU reform and renegotiation agenda. **The referendum on UK membership of the EU: assessing the reform process** (HL Paper 30) slipped out as the summer recess began, so would have been easy to miss.

* The report puts the government on the spot over its several matters; although it uses tactful language, it even questions if **the renegotiation process might not be seen as a genuine one.**

* It starts by sympathising that the Government is right to press for a referendum as soon as possible in order to minimise uncertainty, but warns that the renegotiation process will be contentious, with much potential for delay and disruption.

Not least as the Prime Minister had been clear that he would not "sacrifice substance" for the sake of speed.

* It basically challenges the Government both to explain what it is seeking to achieve and the means by which it is seeking to achieve it.

It perceives that the Government's reform priorities are gradually crystallising, although "precise parameters" remain undefined, hinting clarity is needed so that Parliament can hold Government to account and voters can make an informed decision in the referendum.

* It pulls up David Lidington, the

Minister for Europe, over not being forthcoming about what proposed reforms would require treaty change.

Also on how any agreed reforms have 'secure legal status into the future' and cannot simply be unpicked through later political decision. Lidington had said that it was too early to say what form a "solemn commitment" would take, although a legally binding protocol or draft clauses to be enacted in a treaty in due course were among the possible options.

The report concludes that a legally binding reform deal is **"easier said than done"**.

* When the Committee asked Lidington to confirm that Parliament and the UK's devolved administrations would not be confronted with a *fait accompli* at the end of the process, he was unable to do so, stating that "a lot will depend on how long the negotiations take and the processes and instruments by which reforms are agreed to be delivered".

* It notes that "one of the haziest aspects of the renegotiation is the nature of the internal Whitehall structure for handling the renegotiation. The Minister's account of how the internal Whitehall process for handling the renegotiation will work is unrealistic".

* It sees a large number of institutions, both in the UK and EU, involved in the renegotiation, and that there is insufficient clarity about their roles and how they relate to one

another. It also notes that representatives of the EU institutions and other Member States are anxious to receive more details on the UK Government's precise objectives.

It notes that the Prime Minister had spoken to all other 27 Member States' heads of government since the General Election, most of them one-to-one, avoiding the need for a detailed discussion at the June European Council meeting.

* It notes that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office had undertaken "detailed analysis" of the need for constitutional referendums in other Member States, but that Lidington was not prepared to share it with the Committee.

* It probes the government's line that "the EU democratic process" could be enhanced by national parliaments playing a greater role in EU decision making.

It notes how new mechanisms for cooperation and coordination would need to be devised and resourced, and warns Lidington not underestimate the challenges. The latter speculated that this might need to be addressed "in some sort of parallel process", rather than the renegotiation.

* It warns that the simplified 'Article 48' procedure for treaty revision is unlikely to be available, and that a more drawn out procedure would be required. This would involve drawing up a Convention, at which several institutions, including national

Continued on page 2

INSIDE: President Obama and other foreign leaders should keep out of EU debate p 2 – **EU propaganda aimed at schools?** p 2 – **The EU referendum** p 3 – **German safety** p 3 – **Could Cameron be changing his EU plans?** p 4 – **Immigration worries are not to do with race** p 5 – **The cost of EU membership** p 5 – **Letters** p 6

Another Whitehall farce?

Continued from page 1

parliaments, would be represented, unless both the European Council and European Parliament formally agree one is unnecessary.

The Lords EU Committee is to be congratulated on its attention to detail and asking so many searching questions. Notably only one of its nineteen members is conventionally identifiable as a 'Eurosceptic'.

It intends to bring the Minister for Europe back for regular further

questioning. Would it be too much to ask that it probes how exactly he would repatriate powers given the ruling of European Court of Justice in 1986 – in Case 44/84 the latter observed that even in 'inter-governmental' negotiations, Member States were bound to act in line with existing treaty goals and obligations.

It is my reckoning that attempting to take powers back would conflict with the principles of the '*acquis communautaire*' and 'ever closer union'. The European Commission has

made it clear that

"The main goal of the EU is the progressive integration of Member States' economic and political systems".

Source:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees-a-z/lords-select/eu-select-committee/news-parliament-2015/eu-referendum-report/>

Brian Mooney is Campaign Manager at New Alliance.

President Obama and other foreign leaders should keep out of EU debate

Lord Stoddart of Swindon, the Independent Labour Peer, has called on the Government to honour a commitment made by Baroness Anelay of St Johns, the Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, in a reply (17th June) to a written question from him, in which he was promised that efforts would be made to keep foreign leaders out of the debate

about Britain's future in the EU, ahead of the referendum.

The Baroness said that '*the decision in the referendum will be one for British voters to make*' and that '*The Government will make this clear as necessary in its discussions with foreign leaders and EU officials*'.

Lord Stoddart has written to

Baroness Anelay on the 24th July to remind her of the commitment she made, in light of the latest statement from President Obama in which he has blatantly involved himself in the debate about the EU, ahead of the referendum. He has urged her to ensure that the Government makes representations to the President on the matter.

EU propaganda aimed at schools?

Recent exposure of the huge budget the EU has to spend on promoting itself, some £536 million, a significant proportion of which is spent on propaganda sent to schools, has provoked Lord Stoddart of Swindon, to remind the teaching profession of its legal obligations under sections 406 & 407 of the 1996 Education Act which charges schools to provide balance in the presentation of political issues.

Lord Stoddart said: "The coming referendum is the most important issue of our time and I believe that the Government is failing to ensure that schools obey the law and provide a balanced presentation of the issues on either side of the argument. Even if, as the European Commission states, the material is requested by the schools, head teachers and school governors have a statutory duty to ensure that

political balance is achieved in the classroom".

In a reply to a written question from Lord Stoddart on the 20th July, the Government confirmed that EU propaganda is being sent to schools on request and the legal obligations the schools are under. Lord Nash for the Government said: "The European Commission makes information about the European Union available to schools. European Union institutions have a policy of distributing publications only on demand. They do not send out unsolicited information. There are very few publications produced by EU institutions that are targeted towards schools. Sections 406 and 407 of the Education Act 1996 requires schools to prevent political indoctrination and ensure the balanced treatment of political issues. How this

is done is a matter for individual schools".

Responding to the Government's answer, Lord Stoddart said: "It is evident that there are rather more publications aimed at schools than the Government thinks. Flooding educational establishments, even primary schools, with sinister pro-EU comic books designed to indoctrinate our children and ignore the very strong arguments for leaving the EU, is simply not acceptable. It puts teachers in conflict with the law and highlights the Government's failure to take this issue seriously".

Source:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Lords/2015-07-14/HL1437/>

The EU referendum

Malcolm Hill

After the Second World War there was a desire to form a union in Europe to prevent another war. That threat, however, had been extinguished by the hard lesson learned from two worlds wars that caused extensive damage, ruin and bankruptcy: in a word, both had been futile.

The foundation of the European Economic Community was laid down in the Treaty of Rome 1957. In Britain the fear of being left behind when the train left the station was encouraged without it being observed that it was leaving backwards. Thus the nature and direction of the union was generally misconceived and the EU has remained sunk in time-worn protectionism. That is plain in its three main policies. At first the fraudulent Common Agricultural Policy [CAP], then the delusive Single Market and the absurdity of the euro.

The Corn Laws were exposed by David Ricardo in 1815 to protect, not agriculture, but rural landowners. Throughout 1844 Richard Cobden pursued the idea in the country and Parliament by showing tenant farmers would lose the value of state subsidies at rent reviews and that owner farmers received profits as farmer and the subsidies as landowner. The nature of the CAP has never been publicly even discussed in Britain.

During 2011 Britain paid 4 billion euros into the CAP and received back 3.3 billion. The actual position is that British taxpayers paid 4 billion euros of which 3.3 billion were returned to farmland owners who contribute nothing. The abolition of the CAP would cause a fall in farmland rents and values without loss in food production.

The Single Market is said to be a

free trade area. The French merchants demanded in 1666 of the champion of protectionism, Jean Colbert, to cease his endless ministerial intervention with their cry *Laissez nous faire*. That was developed into the concept of free trade during the early decades of the eighteenth century and agreed that government should quit economic regulation in order that free trade might arise of itself. That message was delivered in the British campaign to repeal the Corn Laws that began in the late 1830's until repeal was achieved in 1845. The creation of the Single Market by thousands upon thousand of directives has been the re-establishment of protectionism.

The euro was created by bringing the EU into managing a currency. It has two existential flaws that will destroy it.

First, outside a dictatorship no state managed currency has survived for more than a few years.

Second, the different climates of the Mediterranean and northern Europe do not provide a stable foundation for a currency parity. Greece will leave, Italy, Spain and Portugal will follow. Jean-Claude Juncker's affirmation that existence of the euro is guaranteed by unutterable agreements between nations is simplistic.

It is difficult to believe the coming referendum will decide that Britain leave this protectionist, *socialiste* union, after a few petty reforms that do not touch its nature. Not given to face the realities of its nature the British people will be governed by fear of being locked out of the Single Market; much as they were afraid of being left behind at the 1975 Referendum. Then over ninety-per cent of community expenditure financed the CAP [today about forty per cent of a much larger

budget].

Cobden warned that protectionism was the breeding ground of bayonets. It is engendering groups of opposition and the agreement on which it depends will be gradually undermined.

Serving the interests of rural landowners, bureaucrats in Brussels and the crooks who thrive on extensive regulation, the EU is not advancing prosperity within or without.

Free trade, dismissed by disingenuous argument by Maynard Keynes in 1925 as eighteenth-century philosophy, is as relevant to modern times as daylight.

It will always be the alternative to protectionism when government seek such ends as to protect Britain's trading position, negotiate trade deals or create free trade areas.

Britain has never traded as much as a hairpin during its existence. Trade is conducted by its people and the only grounds for government action is to prevent trade in unlawful goods or services.

There is one free trade area: the globe and free trade arises of itself when States remove themselves from commerce. It is sad indeed that France and Britain forget their history and march determinedly back to the protectionism exposed during the Enlightenment.

The referendum when the British people to decide to remain in or not is cited as democracy in action. The potential of democracy does not just consist in voting but also importantly in understanding the issues involved. Plainly in relation to the EU that understanding is pitifully low.

The British people lack the courage to leave the EU and revert to free trade of which it was to 1932 the only champion in modern times.

German safety

The Greek debt crisis has saved the German government some €100 bn (£70 bn) in lower borrowing costs

because investors have sought safety in German bonds, a study has found.

Even if Greece defaults on all its

debt, Germany would still benefit, says the German IWH institute.

Germany has funded €90 bn so far.

Could Cameron be changing his EU plans?

Ken Worthy

Eurosceptics have always suspected David Cameron's EU renegotiation. With the EU more and more dominated by the needs of the Eurozone, Britain needs major changes. Eurosceptics think that Cameron will get what concessions he can, claim victory however modest they are, and campaign to stay in. His demands are limited, and he cannot bear even to say that Britain will leave if we don't get the changes we want. Why should EU leaders take him seriously?

However there are two more recent developments that may give some grounds for hope.

The first is his admission that his 2017 deadline (let alone a possible deal in 2016) won't allow time for treaty change, bearing in mind that EU leaders don't want treaty change and that any change has to go through 27 national parliaments, some of them hostile to Britain's requirements. Instead, he says, he would be willing to accept solemn and binding commitments from EU leaders that the agreed changes will take place in due course. Some of us will remember "Solomon Binding". He was a key player in trade union negotiations in the 1960's. As I recall, he wasn't very reliable then, either. Somehow firm union commitments had a way of melting away. Our experience of solemn and binding agreements with the EU is not very encouraging. The first was Tony Blair's agreement to the reduction in our budget rebate, in exchange for a solemn and binding EU undertaking to reform the CAP. Needless to say, the CAP stayed unreformed and our rebate stayed reduced. Another was Jean Claude Juncker's formal undertaking that Britain would not have to contribute towards any bail out of Greece. Under the pressure of a long negotiating

session with Greece, this promise was junked and bailout funding was promised from an EU budget to which Britain has contributed - the EU Currency Stabilisation Fund. We have a guarantee that Britain's money will not be at risk. We shall see how valuable that is. There was also talk that in the event of Grexit, Greece would receive "humanitarian aid" from the EU budget. Yet again Britain would be on the hook for a large contribution. Why else were the leaders of the whole EU, instead of just the Eurozone, invited to the summit that was supposed to eject Greece from the Euro? They were expected to bring their cheque-books.

The second development was Cameron's demand in July for an opt-out from EU employment legislation. This is unique among Cameron's demands, in that it is highly unlikely to be agreed by EU leaders. Freedom of movement is one of the cherished "four freedoms" of the EU. In EU minds this means that equal treatment must be ensured by imposing a very detailed and demanding set of labour laws that ensures all EU countries are equally handicapped in competing against non-EU countries.

In all his other demands, Cameron has carefully covered himself by clever wording, to ensure treaty change is not required, success or failure is difficult to measure, and EU leaders might be able to reconcile themselves to his demands to some degree. So why did he depart from this approach? It could of course be just a negotiating discard. He is already starting to back away under pressure, as he always does.

Or could it be possible that even Cameron is beginning to recognise that his plan won't work? The Mediterranean migrant crisis has brought immigration to the top of the list of voters' concerns. The limits on

immigrant numbers he originally wanted have been watered down into restrictions on immigrant benefit claims, which is not what's worrying Eurosceptics or low-paid workers. Cameron may not succeed even in curbing benefits. A group of Eastern European countries, led by Poland, are indicating serious opposition to any cut in benefits for their migrants to Britain. Cameron might get little or nothing on immigration. He certainly won't get enough.

And how much reliance can be placed on any other commitments he gets? Any claim that EU promises can be relied on, without treaty change, would be demolished during a referendum campaign by Eurosceptics, including those in his own party. The EU's reputation has taken a few knocks recently. It has shown itself to be utterly ruthless in pursuing its own ends, and vindictive too. Voters will have noticed. Has Cameron?

Who might have influenced Cameron in changing his mind? Consider the position of George Osborne. He is a clever and pragmatic politician, and he must know that, as the EU's biggest customer, Britain's access to the EU single market would not be threatened by our leaving. He must recognise that all the alarmist talk of jobs and trade being lost is just so much hot air. He is positioning himself to succeed Cameron, with Cameron's blessing. Would he want Cameron's premiership ended prematurely by a massive party row about whether the renegotiation has been fudged to produce a Yes vote? A row in which he would be on Cameron's side and other potential leadership candidates might be on the other side? Would Cameron himself be up for such a fight?

The alternative for both of them might be a serious try at renegotiation,

Continued on page 5

Could Cameron be changing his EU plans?

Continued from page 4

making demands that would decisively change Britain's relationship with the EU, and the EU's own competitiveness in the world. Osborne will have a key role in the negotiations, and he will not want to bring back from Brussels a damp squib to sell to the British public. He is starting to talk about some kind

of separate status within the EU for non-Euro countries. If these demands succeed, triumph for them both. If EU leaders reject them, then reluctantly the government would see itself as obliged to campaign to leave. The EU had shown itself to be unreformable, despite their best efforts. This would, of course, be made abundantly clear in confidence to EU leaders during

negotiations, to concentrate their minds.

Leaving the EU would be a very big deal, but it would be Cameron's premiership that would be dominated by it. And what a legacy for a man who still needs one! His successor would be free to set a proud and independent course for Britain, free of EU shackles. There are worse fates.

Immigration worries are not to do with race

Geoffrey Clark

Some immiphiles say the numbers of illegal migrants at Calais is small and that therefore we should admit them to the UK. Yes, the number at Calais is small at 5,000, but their admission to the UK must be added to the net 250,000 lawfully entering the country last year from the EU alone. And that figure is the number net of the EU citizens that have left. So the true total number is about 470,000. That means in round figures that number of our indigenous Northern European, Anglo Saxon, Norman, Celtic population are being squeezed into ever smaller areas of the UK; some might say being progressively "Ethnically Cleansed". So the "Net

Figure" camouflages the far greater cultural damage being done. If I said that 20 people were put into Buckingham Palace....no problem. If I then put the same 20 people in a three bedroomed house...BIG PROBLEM.

A small island like Britain is dwarfed by the land mass of Germany and France. At a time when our milk farmers are being driven to the wall, it's worth noting that the UK imports over 40 per cent of its food. We are not making "new land". Green fields eyed up for "Immigrant Housing" are our food banks for the future. If all countries in the world could import the food that they could not produce for themselves then starvation would be

eliminated but Britain has max'd out on her Credit Card. "Impoverished Britain"..... why would Australia and New Zealand feel duty bound to send us subsidised food parcels when an up and coming prosperous China will offer a higher price to them for their butter?

Immigration is not about race....that accusation works if the host culture is a benevolent one like the UK. NUMBERS is the killer blow. For a Nation State, especially an Island State, to sit back and knowingly allow its population to rise to a level way above its ability to employ, house, medicate, pension and feed it is a recipe for civil unrest and violence.

The cost of EU membership

Tim Congdon

An outline of the cost of our EU membership in 2014 were these:

* The *net* direct fiscal cost (i.e., the cost of our payments to EU institutions minus the rebate and EU expenditure in the UK) had risen sharply compared with, say, a decade ago. Roughly speaking, the net cost had been about 0.3% or so of gross domestic product in the early years of the 21st century. But the figure now is 0.7% - 0.8% of GDP, depending on how the relevant statistics are presented.

* Although Blair's December 2005

surrender of part of the rebate was part of the explanation for the extra cost, much of the deterioration had in fact occurred under the Conserv/LibDem coalition government. According to the Treasury, net contributions to the EU Budget were £4.3 billion in 2009, but £10.5 billion in 2013. Shockingly, this huge increase had been almost entirely overlooked in the public debate.

* The poor 2013 outcome arose partly from a failure of expenditure control. In July 2012 White Paper the Treasury expected the net cost in the 2012/13

financial year to be £7.0 billion; in its November 2013 successor the figure had climbed to £9.7 billion. The £2.7 billion overshoot suggested considerable tension between the Westminster and Brussels bureaucracies, as well as some incompetence in UK officialdom.

* The whole subject was a mess, with conflicts between data produced by the Office for National Statistics for the UK's balance-of-payments statistics and the Treasury for purposes of public expenditure management.

LETTERS

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

Failures of the Electoral Commission

Dear Sir,

The main article in the July 26th 2015 edition of *eurofacts* by Lord Vinson on 'Who guards the guardians? - Why does the Electoral Commission routinely fail to protect our electoral system?' This echoes those fears we have here in the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire.

The laws which protect our electoral system need to be upheld rigorously else they become obsolete. I remember in 2001 the agent for one of the candidates in the local elections cut his holiday short to secure her signatory on her election expense form because he did not want an enquiry into why her form was late in arriving at the Borough Council offices after the deadline.

Jump to the present day and a percentage of the Green candidates in the Newcastle Borough Council election in May 2015 have yet - as of 27th July - to hand their completed electoral expense forms into the council when a Staffordshire County Councillor and a Newcastle Borough Council colleague went in by appointment on Monday 6th July to check the election expense forms.

Most UKIP election expense forms are said to be completed incorrectly with no receipts which even the Electoral Commission officer, Simon Grant, admits is illegal as all monies spent over £20 need receipts. Surely the Electoral Commission should do their job properly and investigate complaints or why do we waste money on a toothless commission.

There is either a law or there is not a law.

If the law states that the election forms need to be filled in correctly, handed in before a certain date with receipts then the law must be obeyed, otherwise why have the law?

DAVID NIXON
Staffordshire

[If you wish to speak to Staffs County Councillor about this letter please phone 01782 628740]

EU referendum outcome?

Dear Sir,

Since UKIP as a political force has been instrumental in eliciting the promise of a referendum on our membership of the EU, we can all be satisfied that it is on the agenda.

However, given the constitutional position of the House of Commons, we should be mindful that a British Government is not bound by the outcome of the result. Given the Prime Minister's strong attachment to remaining in the EU, there is no hindrance, constitutionally, to putting the results of a OUT referendum result to a Commons vote which he could, on current calculations, easily defeat.

The only way a referendum may carry force is if the PM promised to abide by the result of the referendum, in advance and undertook that his government will accept the democratic result. Without such an undertaking the outcome may well be hollow!

Dr. GUTFREUND WALMSLEY
Manchester

What immigration problem?

Dear Sir,

Having recently read an article on the numbers of immigrants. I would like to make a few points.

Firstly, why are the EU borders open to all including possible terrorist's?

Secondly the idea that all EU countries should take their fair share of the immigrants over-running should be investigated correctly. While Germany and France would like to link the number of migrants to each country's GDP thus sending huge numbers to Britain, a better system would be to use population density per sq. km.

Using this figure England being the most densely populated country within the EU with a population of 53 million

has a population density of 413 per square kilometre.

In order for Germany to reach this figure of 413/sq km it would need to take in 67 million people. For Italy 63 million, Poland 89 million, France 160 million, Spain 161 million, Ireland 25 million and even Scotland has room for 25 million. This ignores the rest of the EU, but gives an idea of the room actually available for those who need to find a new home.

Why then has the British government failed to point out this simple idea to the EU powers that be?

The answer maybe that the government does not understand basic sums or is so frightened of its EU masters that it does not wish to be seen to speak out of step.

In all, just thirteen European countries could accommodate more than 680 million migrants before reaching the same population density as England.

That seems to solve the problem of deciding how countries should take their "fair share" of the migrants.

The next problem will be how these countries can afford to pay for the services necessary to absorb these numbers. The UK has done this by loaning money and putting the burden of repayments onto its hard pressed tax payers'.

Welcome to the real world.

JOHN SIMPSON
London

EU farming

Dear Sir,

How nice to know that when mainly Belgium, French and German farmers protest against plummeting prices for their produce the EU pays up.

EU agriculture ministers at a recent meeting announced a €500 million (£365 million) aid package after the farmers protested on the streets of Belgium.

DENNIS RUTHERFORD
Bournemouth

MEETINGS

FRINGE MEETING LABOUR CONFERENCE BRIGHTON

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
020 7388 2259

Monday **28th September**, 5.45 pm
(immediately after the last Labour
Conference Session)

*"Why Labour should fight for change
to our EU terms of membership"*

Ian Hodson, *Bakers Union*
Kelvin Hopkins MP
Austin Mitchell
Graham Stringer MP
Chairman, Kate Hoey MP

FRINGE MEETING
The Mercure Hotel, 149 Kings Road,
Brighton BN1 2PP
(Close to the Conference Centre)
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **1st October**, 6.00 pm

"The Costs of Business Cycles"

Jagjit Chadha, *Gresham Professor of
Commerce*

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

FRINGE MEETING CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE MANCHESTER

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Monday **5th October**, 1.00 - 3.00 pm

Daniel Hannan MEP
Jim Mellon, *International billionaire
investor and supporter of the "NO to
the EU campaign"*

FRINGE MEETING
The Banqueting Suite, Town Hall,
Albert Square, Manchester M60 2LA
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01626 831290

Monday **12th October**, 7.30 pm

"Say NO to the EU tour"

Nigel Farage MEP
UKIP Local MEP

PUBLIC MEETING
The Sage, St Mary's Square, Gateshead
Quays, NE8 2JR
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Tuesday **20th October**, 7.00 - 8.30pm

Philip Davies MP
Professor David Myddelton
Rt Hon Owen Paterson MP

PUBLIC MEETING
Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-
Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's
Street, London SW1A 1LR
Admission charge £10

UK Independence Party
01626 831290

Friday **23rd October**, 7.30 pm

"Say NO to the EU tour"

Nigel Farage MEP
UKIP Local MEP

PUBLIC MEETING
Liberty Stadium, Landore, Swansea
SA1 2FA
Admission £1

The Freedom Association
01242 235333

Monday **26th October**, 6.30 pm

The McWhirter Memorial Lecture

Charles Moore
MEMORIAL LECTURE
Captain's Lounge, HMS President,
London moored on Thames by
Blackfriar's Bridge
Admission Details to be announced

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Saturday **21st November**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

*"The Referendum Choice: Who
Governs Britain?"*

Speakers to include:
Sir Bill Cash MP
Kelvin Hopkins MP
Peter Lilley MP
Ewen Stewart, *Global Britain*
Lord Tebbit

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-
Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's
Street, London SW1A 1LR
Admission charge £20
(Includes lunch and refreshments)

FREE
Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting
and/or conference dealing with the sub-
ject 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

Lib-Dems **19th-23rd September**
Party Autumn Conference
Bournemouth
Bournemouth International Centre

UKIP **24th-26th September**
Party Conference
Doncaster Racecourse

Labour **27th- 30th September**
Party Autumn Conference
Brighton

Conservative **4th-7th October**
Party Autumn Conference
Manchester
Central Conference Centre

UK Parliament **12th October**
Conference Recess Ends

The EU: A Corporatist Racket

by David Barnby. **£9.99**

How the EU was created by global corporatism, he includes details about Edward Heath's real involvement.

Germany's Fourth Reich

by Harry Beckhough. **£8.00**

Code-breaker and spy explains the real drive by Germany for control over Europe without war. Re-produced from his original 2008 pamphlet.

A Dinosaur's Guide to Libertarianism

by Godfrey Bloom. **£9.99**

Why we are governed in a hopelessly inefficient corrupt and incompetent way.

Europe: In or Out?

by David Charter. **£8.99**

In short, concise chapters, the *Times* Berlin correspondent, explains the pros and cons of being part of the EU.

How much does the EU cost Britain?

by Tim Congdon. **£6.00**

Congdon finds the annual direct cost of EU membership to be £13 billion or 1% of GDP is just the tip of the iceberg.

The Democratic Imperative

by Robert Corfe. **£12.99**

The reality of power relations in the nation state and why democracy is only possible in a nation state.

Zero Plus: The Principles of EU Renegotiation

by Martin Howe QC. **£8.00**

Why Britain must be in a position to withdraw from the EU if its priorities are not met.

Generations Betrayed

Cutting the Roots of our National Identity.

by Chris McGovern. **£1.50**

A short booklet exposing how school education has been altered to remove parts of history and national identity.

Top 10 Reasons to Leave the EU

by John Petley. **£9.99**

A short explanation about the main issues clearly and succinctly spelled out. Furthermore, it details the benefits of regaining independence.

Everything You Wanted To Know About the EU

But Were Afraid To Ask

by Robert Oulds. **£9.99**

All the questions answered and the problems of EU membership explained.

Too 'nice' to be Tories?

by Anthony Scholefield & Gerald Frost. **£10.00**

How the modernisers damaged the party and why they forgot their true beliefs and drove away many of their voters.

Spyhunter

by Michael Shrimpton. **£25.00**

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

The 'Dispossessed', the 'Never Possessed' and the 'Bastards'

by Luke Stanley. **£5.00**

This book shows the reasons why some MPs rebelled and others did not about the EU and points a way to the future.

Britain's Global Leadership

by Ewen Stewart. **£5.00**

Why membership of the EU is holding back the UK in terms of growth and trade with the wider prosperous world.

DVD - The Norway Option

by Bruges Group. **£12.99**

Full analysis, run time 34 mins.

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 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.	01738 783936
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
Jeremy Corbyn MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Tim Farron MP	
New Britain	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 831290
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006