

## The EU referendum, what next

**Anthony Scholefield**

**T**he EU referendum is just the beginning, what happens next after day 1 and day 100 is what matters.

### **Scotland – Winning a referendum does not mean ‘leaving’**

Winning a ‘leave’ majority in a EU referendum does not mean that the UK automatically ‘leaves’ the EU, nor does it define the post-exit relationship the UK would have with the EU.

This distinction has always been the hidden obstacle in the way of Scottish independence. In Scotland, winning a referendum on the basis of a list of wishes does not mean that independence for Scotland would be achieved on the basis of those wishes. Others, such as the UK government and Parliament and, indeed, the EU institutions, would have a say on what the terms of independence would actually be. Additionally, those terms would be informed by the reaction of English investors in the Scottish financial sector who, after independence, would find their assets in one jurisdiction and their liabilities in another and would, in some cases under a fiduciary duty, have to take steps before independence to rectify that position.

### **The opinion of the government and Parliament**

The overwhelming fact about the EU referendum is that, on R-Day plus 1, a ‘leave’ vote in a referendum would be announced to Parliament where it is unlikely that more than 5 per cent of

the membership would have voted to leave. Unlike the case in Scotland, the executive decision and the legislative endorsement to ‘leave’ does not lie in any way with outsiders. It is solely a case for the British government and the UK Parliament.

There is no devolved government representing the ‘leave’ side although any government would be well advised to constitute an advisory body of the main ‘leave’ organisations. Of course, the EU institutions are also involved in the exact shape of UK withdrawal but the knotty questions of continuing EU membership and the currency, which apply in the case of Scottish independence, are not relevant in this scenario. At the end of it all, the EU institutions would not, and could not, prevent UK withdrawal.

What would the reaction of the UK Parliament be, assuming that the bulk of Conservatives, Labour, Liberal Democrats and Scottish and Welsh Nationalists, all endorse a ‘remain’ vote on the basis of what David Cameron offers?

Of course, there has been a shift of opinion, even in the government and the pro-EU parties. They are no longer urging a vote to ‘remain in’ on the basis of the putative advantages of EU membership as it is. Practically all now advocate reform of some sort. Indeed, it is likely that David Cameron’s offer will be a dressed up associate second class relationship, but still in the EU. Both the Eurozone crisis and the immigration crisis have brought into focus exactly what the nature of the EU actually is, a supranational government which in

crucial areas takes no account of the democratic legitimacy of elected national governments.

Thrown into this speculation is the determination of the EU institutions to create even more centralisation in Brussels on the basis of the 5 Presidents Report with a move to Treaty change being considered in 2017 onwards.

The exact interaction of this with the actions of a British government, which is under orders from the electorate to leave, but does not wish to do so, is highly unclear.

### **How they do it in Switzerland**

If one was a believer in the pure expression of the democratic will, or happened to live in Switzerland, it would be comforting to think that the UK government would look at the arguments and propositions put forward by those wishing to leave and would then implement a ‘withdrawal’ strategy following a ‘leave’ vote.

This is the practice of Swiss governments even when they disagree with the popular vote, such as the ban on minarets. They implement the referendum decision. A first consideration is to consider how the federal Swiss government would react and one of the deciding factors is the clarity of argument behind the majority vote in the referendum. A second which applies in Switzerland and will apply in the referendum result in the UK is meshing in with existing agreements. But the minaret vote was straightforward. The referendum was a

**Continued on page 2**

# The EU referendum, what next

Continued from page 1

clear instruction from the people – no more minarets – and the Swiss government did not have to take account of other opinions.

In the case of the referendum of April 2014 which approved limiting the number of migrants by quotas, this also included a provision that Switzerland would have to renegotiate its bilateral accord with the EU on the free movement of people by 2017 or else revoke it. The Foreign Minister, Didier Burkhalter, said: *“The people have decided and the government will implement the decision for the best of the country”*. The EU objected strongly and threatened to end all other bilateral agreements, as it was entitled to do by the bilateral agreements. The current position of the EU is demanding Switzerland call a new referendum by the end of 2016. So, in this referendum case, there has not yet been an outcome and the vote of the electorate has not been implemented. In September, on a visit to Berne, Angela Merkel asked for negotiations to continue.

## Clarity of strategy

The clarity of strategy could be based on notifying withdrawal under Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty and negotiating a pull-out from the political, judicial and monetary structure and the common policies of the EU, while remaining in the Single Market and coming to friendly transitional

During the the Conservative Party conference in October, Theresa May delivered an uncompromising speech and unveiled a planned reform of the UK’s asylum rules.

Mrs May pledged to reduce the numbers claiming asylum in Britain while taking in the “most vulnerable” refugees from conflict zones around the world.

She also said high migration made a

arrangements (These would include incorporating the existing *acquis* into UK law). There are, of course, variations on this, such as a Swiss position, a WTO relationship or an Australian-style mutual recognition relationship. These would mesh the result of the vote in with existing agreements and would probably be acceptable to the EU institutions.

But, of course, all this has to be implemented by an executive and a Parliament which is likely to have voted the other way.

It is not simply a case of replacing the existing government by a government which would be made up of supporters of ‘leaving’. That putative government, and a Parliament to support it, does not exist. This is unlike the situation in 1975 when Harold Wilson made it plain he would implement either an IN or OUT vote and would be able to command the votes in Parliament to do so.

What is being asked is for the executive and the legislative to implement a crucial and massive change which they have overwhelmingly voted against.

One can speculate about what actions might be taken by a government in this position. There might be a promise to ‘negotiate’ harder in fresh negotiations while drawing attention to the fact that 40 per cent plus of the electorate may have voted to stay in. This would, no doubt, be coupled with a promise of another referendum on the outcome of the fresh

## Migration fears

“cohesive society” impossible and that the UK “does not need” net migration at current levels, saying the overall economic effect was “close to zero”.

Her speech was then criticised by some business groups with the Institute of Directors attacking its “irresponsible rhetoric”.

Many others claim we need migrants to replace our ageing population and help to pay for the state

negotiations. Something like the Danish double referendum in the past might follow. Another possibility is for the government to call a general election and fight it on a similar basis, calling for ‘untied hands’ to negotiate the people’s will but possibly coming up eventually with EU-lite and, again, possibly asking for that to be endorsed in a further referendum.

## Decisions to take

Two things are clear.

First, those who wish to leave must put forward a clear aim and a clear plan to leave which would be the yardstick of clarity by which the government is judged and which cannot be ignored. Those who call for referendums in Switzerland are well aware of this and are very careful to couch the referendum question and decision in such a way it cannot be ignored.

Second, to maintain any sort of respect for the popular vote, an Article 50 notice must be served by R-Day + 100. That gives the government ample time to get its negotiating position in order. The negotiations to implement the popular vote will then take place against a long stop; Britain leaving the EU after two years. This is the kind of long stop used in the Swiss referendum where the free movement of EU citizens into Switzerland will be revoked if there is no agreement on migrant quotas.

pension liabilities, but what happens when the new influx gets old is apparently not considered. Maybe the government hopes that they will all have private pensions and therefore no cost to the state.

The Prime Minister David Cameron has stated that the governments policy on immigration “hasn’t worked so far”.

Meanwhile the numbers of asylum seekers continues to rise.

# Your country needs you

J Brian Heywood

Between 1970 and 1973, I worked for a major consultancy agency as an investigative-marketing consultant and carried out a number of investigations for large companies and British Government departments.

Most of these investigations were based on trying to establish what the result would be for our country when we joined what is now the EU. During this time I discovered what appeared to be a 'give-away' of British industry in order to cement our membership. I could not be sure if we were going to receive secret benefits in return and although this was unlikely, it eased my mind and so I did nothing. We never got a reciprocal benefit.

In late 1973, I accepted a job in the US division of a well known British company. Eventually I joined the committee of an American industry body and at various meetings I witnessed the efforts made by the US Government to get companies to buy American products. Visits to New Zealand and Central American countries clearly demonstrated that these governments adopted the same policy.

In late 1977, I returned to the UK and was soon working again as a business consultant. During this time I became increasingly concerned about how membership of the EU was damaging our industry and so creating a devastating loss of worthwhile jobs for future generations of British people. In 1986 I lost a very important 'fight' with the Government because the Cabinet Minister finally responded by only dealing with a problem that was not raised.

In the mid 1990's I started to send out pamphlets to small and medium sized companies with titles such as, 'Does British industry need and deserve more support'? This had limited affect. I then tried websites and found that I was only dealing with the already converted. Between 1995 and 2002, I wrote a number of business

books and then in 2003 published the first of two anti-EU novels.

In 2005, however, I discovered that I had probably been damaging British Industry because a book I had written five years earlier contained a section explaining how to avoid the need to outsource jobs overseas. It was intended for publication only in the UK but it was eventually published worldwide. The relevant US Government website still tells its business leaders to read the book. No similar Government comments were made in the UK and I had to accept, therefore, that, in total, my efforts may have done more harm than good to British industry. As a result, I decided to limit my future EU activity to leafletting for UKIP.

However, just a few months ago I decided to put most of my experiences relating to the EU, together with documentary evidence proving my claims, in a free (but Amazon make a small charge) 32 page e book called 'The Betrayal of British Industry'. I did this because more and more people were exposing (whistle blowing) the damage to our citizens by failing Government departments. So I start and end the book by asking people who know of damage to the UK from membership of the EU to get their experiences known.

I was, nevertheless, aware that a few new exposures would probably not result in converting enough new people to become eurosceptic before the referendum takes place. What is clearly needed if we are to be sure of the Brexit is a sudden explosion of a small number of facts showing the different ways the EU is currently damaging the lives of working people in this country. All these facts would need to be linked together in a newspaper article. They would need to be brief, easy to understand, be truthful and convince the reader that the claims are true. Needless to say I had no idea of how to bring that about.

The answer came to me on the 11th

October 2015. A lady who had read my little book wondered if one of the stories involved could explain why Chinese firms were able to send goods all over the world without paying postage. She then discovered that the people of Britain and other so called developed countries were paying for all these postage costs because of a UN agreement made years ago. She also pointed out that almost all the developed non EU countries were trying to get out of this arrangement.

But the important thing about this is that the story was given to me in a relatively small number of words and the proof was provided by just putting in the web addresses of the relevant government departments of the countries trying to leave.

Therefore, just imagine what would happen if the British public were to see even a small article in their newspaper that listed at least five ways the EU was damaging their lifestyle and they were free to click on to check it out for themselves. As stated above, the claim would have to be true but experience shows that most readers would accept it as true and not bother to click on to the sites. Its possible that something as brief as, 'Membership of the EU is doing all of the following: killing British industry (email) taking quality jobs from the UK year by year (email) increasing food costs each year (email) and so on would do the job.

Asking *eurofacts* members to provide the information is the best and perhaps the only way this can be done. If this produces enough responses, an article could then be put together and emailed to the 800 plus daily and weekly newspapers in the UK. I have recently contacted over 600 of these papers on behalf of Equitable Life pension sufferers and I believe a significant number would be alerted by an article with such exposures. The major newspapers would also get the article, but it would not matter if some of them tried to come up with counter

**Continued on page 4**

# Time to consult parliament

Peer calls on prime minister to consult Parliament on the EU re-negotiation before going 'cap in hand' to Brussels.

The independent Labour Peer, Lord Stoddart of Swindon (20th October) has called on David Cameron to put his proposed EU re-negotiation stance to Parliament for debate before taking it to the European Council.

Lord Stoddart said: "At the moment, Westminster seems to be

playing second fiddle to the European Council. I understand that Mr Cameron is going to write to the President of the Council to set out his proposed negotiations before bringing them to Parliament. I call upon the Prime Minister to lay his proposals before Parliament in the right and proper manner and to do so *before* he presents them to the Council.

"I would remind Mr Cameron that he is the Prime Minister of a

Government and sovereign Parliament at Westminster and he is subject to the traditional obligation of any Prime Minister, namely to consult Parliament first about this or, for that matter, any other major Governmental policy decision.

"Therefore, I have submitted a written question in the House of Lords, asking if the Prime Minister is going to consult Parliament, before going cap in hand to Brussels."

## What is the EU for?

Richard Davis

With all the talk about the upcoming referendum on EU membership some of the most important questions are being ignored. Questions like 'What is the EU for' and 'Who if any benefit'?

Firstly, what is the EU for?

Is it a democratic organisation that wishes to improve the lives of the people it has made its citizens, or a dictatorship that seeks power and domination like the former USSR?

The formation of its own police force, diplomats, flag, anthem and a parliament with the power to restrict the ability of the members own elected national parliaments, added to this its calls for its own military capability and the use of *aquis communautaire* (once power is given up to the EU it cannot be taken back), must lead one to believe that this is the formation of a new country. If any doubt exists the fact that the EU now represents 28 nations

on numerous world bodies and therefore speaks for those nations regardless of the views or cultural differences of the individual members or indeed the electorate of those nations, speaks volumes.

Secondly, who if any benefit?

In terms of nations only Germany appears to really gain financially, followed closely by the large multinational companies who can more easily influence and dictate the direction and scope of the laws and regulations that assist their businesses.

Smaller nations, many who receive financial hand-outs from the EU are in no position to influence the direction of the EU, in case their hand-out is reduced or cancelled.

What benefit is there for the citizens of this fledgling empire?

The only one appears to be the idea that war between member states will not happen again. This is a red-herring

as the nations are and have been for some time mutually dependant on each other for business and investment. It is NATO not the EU that has preserved the peace.

The UK as a former empire gave independence back to nations, while the EU takes away independence as it creates its own empire.

The lose of any democratic control over the future of the lives of the citizens is a price not worth paying. If history has taught us anything then it is the ability to control ones own destiny is paramount to the lives of all.

What is important for the future is a sharing of common values and the understanding that different cultures have very different needs. The EU should be a lose agreement between nations whilst still giving true control to the elected government of the individual nations. In other words the electorate gets the final word.

## Your country needs you

Continued from page 3

claims. They would have a hard job challenging a group of simple basic truisms relating to different subjects which all claimed that worthwhile jobs in Britain will continue to decline.

Just imagine if *eurofacts* or any other organisation was able to send a

preface with the newspaper article that read something like this.

'After some detailed research we are now able to show beyond doubt that the facts given in the attached article are true'.

So, if you believe that you have special knowledge that the EU is

damaging the life style of our people then please send the the information for the attention of Mr Heywod by post or by email to [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

We will then forward to Mr Heywood for further investigation.

The results could prove to be very enlightening!

# The EU is no place for the UK

Following his very successful first edition of this pamphlet, Hugh has now updated this simple list of 101 reasons why the UK should leave the EU.

In his own words, “The essence of the referendum debate revolves around this simple question: Do you want to be governed by: The United Kingdom Parliament or The European Union. In short there is no question (no possible argument at all) but that the UK would be better off out of the corrupt, dictatorial and totally undemocratic EU”.

His book is divided into specific areas namely,

- 1) The Democratic Deficit
- 2) A list of some of the over one

---

**101 Reasons  
Why We Should Leave the EU**  
*by Hugh Williams*

St Edward's Press  
Pamphlet 12 pp 2015

Available from  
*The June Press*  
Price £3.00 + 10% p&p  
(see back cover)

---

ISBN 978-0-955418-84-6

hundred thousand rules that the EU has imposed upon the UK.

- 3) Further effects of the EU's dictatorial regime.
- 4) Costs of membership.

- 5) Regionalisation.
  - 6) The end of the nation state.
  - 7) The threat to the UK's financial independence.
  - 8) Corruption in the EU.
  - 9) The Treaty of Lisbon (the EU's constitution).
  - 10) The Euro.
  - 11) If we left the EU.
  - 12) The EU is now a country in its own right.
  - 13) EU waste and destruction.
  - 14) Nobody is allowed to criticise the EU.
  - 15) How the Labour and Conservative Parties, as well as the Media, do all they can to help the EU.
- Ending in a brief history of how the EU treats whistle-blowers.

## Pollution made legal

In a surprising decision taken on Wednesday 28th October, the EU decided that diesel car manufacturers will be allowed to exceed the exhaust emission of 80 milligrams of nitrogen dioxide per kilometre for 2017.

This decision has been approved through the EU committee procedure, this means that the European Parliament (MEPs from member states) had to reject or accept the ruling but could not make changes.

Commenting on this decision *Client Earth*, a British non-profit law organisation which focuses on air quality is reported as saying, “This is a shockingly cynical move. Car Manufacturers have failed to hit air pollution limits on diesel cars and instead of trying to sort the problem,

they have been told: ‘that’s alright, we’ll just lower the bar’”. While British MEP Catherine Bearder said, “This is a shameful stitch-up which once again puts the interests of carmakers ahead of people’s health.

Interestingly though the only car manufacturer who to date has been proved to be exceeding the current limits is the German Volkswagen company, many may believe this explains the lack lustre response.

The new rules regarding emission levels being brought in on the 1st September 2017, will require these tests to be conducted on the road instead of in the laboratories.

However, the new test will still allow diesel models to exceed pollution nitrogen dioxide levels by a

factor of 2.1, in other words up to 168 milligrams per kilometre. The factor to be reduced in 2020 to 1.5 allowing a level of 120mg/km.

The European Commission considers this to be a good deal, “the allowed divergence...is still a significant reduction compared to the current discrepancy” according to the Commission.

The original laboratory tests are reported to show that vehicles fitted with special equipment used by certain manufacturers gave results four times lower than the real emissions. Instead of the 80mg/km level required, levels of 320mg/km were being emitted.

The EU appears to have one rule for manufacturers and another for the public it is supposed to represent!

## Greek problems may get worse

As if Greece did not have enough to worry about, the European Parliament and the European Commission are set to discuss the parliament's role in the supervision of the Greek bailout programme after

parliament leaders gave the green light to proceed.

Parliament president Martin Schulz received a mandate on the 3rd of September from the leaders of the assembly's political groups to

“explore” with commission president Jean-Claude Juncker “the possibilities” of such an involvement.

Greece is set to require more bailouts in one form or another for the next five years, but at what cost?

# LETTERS

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

## National psyche

Dear Sir,

The psyche of self-sufficient independence can be a fragile thing. Britain's evolved over centuries.

From the 16th to the 19th centuries Britain fought and won wars against Spain and France, one result being colonisation and a global empire.

The Civil War in the 17th century established parliamentary government. And the Industrial Revolution of the 18th century created the workshop of the world.

The First World War was shattering to the national psyche. Its continuation, as WWII, required fighting alone against a Continent under Nazism. Victory could only be achieved in alliance with Russia and the United States.

Then came decolonisation followed by political correctness, resulting in what seemed like a devastating blow to the national psyche. It was believed that no longer could Britain face the world alone. In order to survive the country had to be part of a larger entity.

This attitude may still be the biggest hurdle to be overcome in order to free Britain from the constraints of the EU.

Appreciating a long and successful national story may help repair a damaged national psyche.

RALPH MADDERN

Warwickshire

## Is Turkey a threat to immigration?

Dear Sir,

Now that Turkey is actively being encouraged, particularly by David Cameron and George Osborne, to join the European Union, is it not time that we unilaterally closed our borders, despite the fundamental policy of the EU for open borders and the free movement of people?

Turkey has in excess of 70 million people, mainly poor muslims, who would virtually have the right to come here to live. If only, say 5% were to

arrive, we would be quite unable to cope, particularly bearing in mind that we cannot cope now, with education, housing, and the NHS etc. all under very severe strain. Their very presence could lead to confrontations and protests.

We cannot wait for the EU Referendum, we must tell the EU that enough is enough, and deal with the consequences. Sometimes, the bull must be grasped by the horns!

TOM COLLINS

Essex

## Does pollution matter?

Dear Sir,

The exposure of the German vehicle manufacturer Volkswagens apparently illegal activity with its disregard for public health on a world scale is simply ignored by the EU, why?.

Despite admitting that the company had breached exhaust emissions on their diesel vehicles the EU's reaction was the same as Angela Merkel's. It was illegal but let's not make a fuss.

The large numbers of diesel Volkswagens in the UK and elsewhere, could easily explain why the higher nitrogen dioxide readings are being found at the kirbside than would be expected by the engine results.

Is this an example of why large companies like the EU?

If George Osborne wishes to raise money then he should collect it by imposing a large fine on the Germany company for its level of environmental pollution, or as a member of the EU is that not permitted?

CATHERINE SIMPSON

London

## Thoughts of a former MP

Dear Sir,

Now that Mark Carney has entered the fray I wonder whether he would agree that in one specific area the cost to all UK subjects of remaining within the EU and therefore being ultimately obliged to adopt the EU criminal

justice system (*corpus juris*) far exceeds the benefits of leaving the EU, thereby making us free to ensure the continuance of English 'common law'.

Furthermore, what is constantly overlooked in the great debate about the European Union is that a vote to stay in is most certainly not a vote for the *status quo*.

If the British people vote to stay in that will be all that the EU needs to accelerate its drive towards its much vaunted 'ever closer union'.

So little is understood about where this would ultimately lead that the cry that we must, 'for fear of the unknown', stay in, is the exact opposite of the truth.

In reality the 'unknown' is what, in the event of a vote to stay in, the EU would subsequently impose upon us and against which, incidentally, we would have no power to resist.

CHRISTOPHER GILL

Shropshire

## Non-UK voters?

Dear Sir,

Ted Heath pretended that the EU was only a trading arrangement (Common Market) when he took us into it without our permission. Harold Wilson did nothing to enlighten us during the 1975 referendum. The forthcoming referendum is about how the people of the United Kingdom wish to be governed in future and their political affiliations.

Apparently there are some 2 million non-UK EU citizens working in the UK who, presumably, live here. Accordingly, they are entitled to register to vote but they should *not* be entitled to vote in a referendum to decide our future. It is nothing to do with them. Does any one know if those people are to be excluded from voting? I hope the EU is not telling us that we cannot exclude them? Either way we should be told.

JOHN COOKE

Cumbria

# MEETINGS

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **18th November**, 6.00 pm

*“Envy of Kings: The Guildhall of London and the Power of the Medieval Corporation”*

**Simon Thurley**, *Visiting Professor of the Built Environment*

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

**Bruges Group**  
020 7287 4414

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

*“The Referendum Choice: Who Governs Britain?”*

**Sir Bill Cash MP**, *Chairman, European Scrutiny Committee*

**James Delingpole**, *Journalist, novelist and columnist*

**Kelvin Hopkins**, *Labour*

**Rt Hon Peter Lilley MP**, *Former Secretary of State for Trade and Industry*

**Ewen Stewart**, *Consulting Director of Global Britain*

**Rt Hon Lord Tebbit of Chingford CH, PC**, *President of the Bruges Group*

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

**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 help advertise the event without charge.

**Contact Details**  
**eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175**  
**or Email: eurofacts@juneprss.com**

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Thursday **26th November**, 1.00 pm

*“The Equity Premium and Low Interest Rates”*

**Jugit Chadha**, *Gresham Professor of Commerce*

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

**The Freedom Association**  
**0845 833 9626**

Friday **11th March, 2016**  
until - Sunday **13th March**

**The Freedom Festival**

*“A series of talks about the big political issues including a questions and answers session”*

**Full range of Speakers**

FREEDOM FESTIVAL  
Marsham Court Hotel, 3 Russell-Cotes Road, East Cliff, Bournemouth BH1 3AB  
**Admission Free**

## DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Budget **25th November**  
Autumn Statement

UK Parliament **17th December**  
Commons Recess Starts

UK Parliament **22nd December**  
Lords Recess Starts

**2016**  
Netherlands takes over **1st January**  
EU Council Presidency

UK Parliament **5th January**  
Commons Recess Ends

UK Parliament **11th January**  
Lords Recess Ends

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

## USEFUL WEB SITES

**British Constitution Group**

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

**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.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk](http://www.campaignforanindependentbritain.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.eutruith.org.uk](http://www.eutruith.org.uk)

**European Commission (London)**

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

**European Foundation**

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

**EU Referendum Campaign**

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

**Freedom Association**

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

**Futurus**

[www.futurus-thinktank.com](http://www.futurus-thinktank.com)

**Global Britain**

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

**Global Vision**

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

**June Press (Publications)**

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

**Stewatch**

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

**Team**

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

**The Taxpayers' Alliance**

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

**United Kingdom Independence Party**

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

**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.

**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 leave 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.

**101 Reasons**

**Why We Should Leave the EU**

by Hugh Williams. **£3.00**

An updated version of his successful pamphlet, showing in simple terms a list of 101 reasons for Brexit.

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

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)  
20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

## 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"

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403 741736</b>
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	01738 783936
<b>Business for Britain</b>	<b>0207 3406070</b>
CIB	0116 2874 622
<b>Conservativesforbritain</b>	<b>www.conservativesforbritain.org</b>
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>0845 833 9626</b>
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
<b>Leave-the-EU</b>	<b>www.Leave.eu</b>
New Alliance	020 7385 9757
<b>Fishing Association</b>	<b>01224 313473</b>

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

<b>Bruges Group</b>	<b>020 7287 4414</b>
Global Britain	Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org
<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 Cameron 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>
Jeremy Corbyn MP	
<b>Liberal</b>	<b>01562 68361</b>
Mr Rob Wheway	
<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	<b>020 7222 7999</b>
Tim Farron 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