

Cameron's misleading statement

Michael Shrimpton

The Prime Minister's statement to the Commons on the 22nd February, to the effect that in the event of a vote to withdraw from the EU on 23rd June the UK would be unable to negotiate replacement trade agreements for at least two years is, with respect, wholly misleading and wrong.

In the first place, he seems to be drawing his 2-year figure from Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU). As I have repeatedly pointed out over the last quarter of a century the UK, as a sovereign state, may denounce the TEU, most conveniently on 12 months notice, under the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Vienna Convention routes to withdrawal could have been excluded in the TEU but were not. They therefore remain open to each Member State.

Secondly, Article 50 **does not require an agreement between the EU and the withdrawing state. If no new arrangements are sought or agreed the withdrawal automatically takes effect two years from the date of notification (TEU Article 50(3)).** This period may be extended, but only with the consent of the withdrawing state. The EU could not impose a longer period.

Nothing in Article 50 nor any other provision of international law would prevent the UK from entering into negotiations during the notice period with other states concerning trade arrangements which came into effect upon withdrawal. In the interim the UK would continue to 'enjoy' access to the so-called single

market, although of course the reverse would also apply and EU states would continue to enjoy access to our market, which is of course worth far more to them than their markets are to us.

The PM cited the case of the Dominion of Canada, but the delays there were nothing to do with the UK. There is no reason at all to suppose that the UK and Canada could not resume a preferential trade relationship commencing as soon as either the two-year TEU or one-year Vienna notice periods expired. The UK would not be confined to other member nations of the Commonwealth, who were so badly treated in 1972. I have no doubt that we could negotiate a free-trade deal with the Russian Federation and the CIS community.

Mention of Canada leads me to point out that the claim of pro-EU campaigners that the EU is the world's largest market is factually incorrect. As of 2014, the most recent year for which reliable statistics have been published, the nominal GDP of the three NAFTA states (the Dominion of Canada, the United States of America and the Federated Mexican States) exceeded 20 trillion US dollars in 2014 values. The EU, including the UK, trailed in second place, at 18.5 trillion dollars.

Only in terms of population is the EU the larger market, the figures for the end of 2014 being roughly 480 million for NAFTA and 508 million for the EU including the UK.

However it is somewhat illogical to boost the EU's figures for GDP and population by including the UK in the context of withdrawal.

After withdrawal, again taking the 2014 figures, the EU's GDP would be just over 15.5 trillion dollars, nearly 5 trillion behind NAFTA. We have a very strong relationship with two of the three NAFTA states, Canada and the USA, which are part of the Anglosphere and were allies with us in both the world wars started by Germany, albeit after slight delays on the part of the USA.

The EU's population would be reduced to about 444 million by UK withdrawal on 2014 figures.

Although the economies of the EU member states are more closely integrated than those of NAFTA there is no reason in principle to treat the EU as a single economy and divide NAFTA into three.

The PM was however correct to say with respect that joining WTO and trading with EU member states under WTO rules is an option, arguably one commanding majority support amongst those in favour of regaining national independence.

The PM's reference to Norway and Switzerland was presumably intended as a reference to the European Economic Area, which brings with it open borders with the EU, i.e. one of the very things we are trying to get away from. It seems implicit from his statement to the House that the government would regard a Leave vote as a public rejection of the EEA Treaty as well as the TEU. Given the way the campaign is being run that must be right. It would be a democratic nonsense for the UK not to denounce the EEA at the same time as the TEU.

A reminder of the 2009 Lisbon Treaty

Extract of "Tackling the EU Empire" by Anthony Coughlan

The 2009 Lisbon Treaty, the EU's Constitution: This treaty incorporated most of the provisions of the *Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe* of 2004, which sought to establish the European Union *directly* on the basis of its own Constitution, just as with any State. In 2005 French and Dutch voters rejected this constitutional treaty in referendums, following which its ratification process had to cease. Showing complete contempt for French and Dutch voters, the Member State Governments repackaged the provisions of the EU Constitution virtually unchanged three years later in the Treaty of Lisbon and adopted them *indirectly* in the form of amendments to the existing treaties. Former French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, who chaired the convention which drew up the original Constitution, said of Lisbon: "*All of the earlier proposals will be in the new text but will be hidden or disguised in some way*". The Lisbon Treaty dropped the actual word "Constitution", while the reality of a federal-style Constitution was pushed through. The legal effects of the two treaties were 99% the same, apart from a few minor details. For example the provision giving the EU flag and anthem a formal basis in EU law was dropped. The flag and anthem still have no treaty base, although they continue to be used throughout the EU.

When it came to the EU Constitution as embodied in the Treaty of Lisbon, however, the French and Dutch were denied a second referendum vote. Ireland was the only country to be allowed that. In 2008, on a turnout of over half of the Irish voters, the majority of them voted No to the Lisbon Treaty. The Irish people were then told that they must vote again on exactly the same treaty, as any change would require the whole ratification process to begin anew. They were promised that some of their concerns over Lisbon would be taken

into account in a Protocol to the next EU Treaty, which would be Croatia's Treaty of Accession, although Lisbon itself would not be changed. In Ireland's second referendum on the Lisbon Treaty in 2009 the Brussels Commission and the German and French Governments weighed in, in a big way. YES-side spending outweighed NO-side by a factor of ten to one. Bullying and threats reached unprecedented levels. In this way Irish voters' NO to Lisbon of 2008 was turned into a YES to the same treaty sixteen months later.

The Lisbon Treaty provided for the abolition of the European Community, which had been the legal repository of supranational powers up to then, and its replacement by a constitutionally new European Union with full legal personality separate from and superior to that of its Member States for the first time. This gave the EU and its institutions the constitutional character of a Federation - the political goal that had been mooted in the 1950 Schuman Declaration. It abolished the formal distinction between the supranational and the intergovernmental areas of public policy and established the EU with a unified constitutional structure, just as in any State.

Thus the areas of justice and home affairs and of foreign, security and defence policy, which were previously "intergovernmental", became Union powers for the first time. This meant that following a transition period of five years ending in 2014, the Commission is now able to make proposals for EU laws in relation to justice, policing and crime, and the Court of Justice has the power to rule on these laws. The UK and Ireland got a legal opt-out from EU measures in relation to crime and justice, with the right to exercise a case-by-case opt-in (Protocol No. 21) Denmark already has such an opt-out since Maastricht (Protocol No. 22). The post-Lisbon EU can now negotiate international treaties

on behalf of its Member States in virtually every policy area of government. (Art.216 TFEU). By making these changes the Lisbon Treaty brought about a shift from unanimity to qualified majority voting in some 45 new policy areas.

Lisbon made citizens of the different Member States into real citizens of this new federal-style Union for the first time. One can only be a citizen of a State, and Lisbon gave the citizens of each Member State a real second citizenship at European level. Before Lisbon, citizenship of the then embryonic EU was stated to "*complement*" national citizenship. It was an essentially notional or honorary concept. The Lisbon Treaty (Art.20 TFEU) provided that that EU citizenship should be "*in addition*" to one's national citizenship, just as citizens of regional provincial states such as California, Massachusetts, Bavaria or Brandenburg have two citizenships., for they are citizens also of their respective Federal States in the case of the USA and Germany. EU legislation gives to every citizen of the 28 Member States the right to move and reside in the territory of any of them, just as in any Federation. It confers a wide range of other rights - and corresponding obligations.

EU law has primacy over national law and the claims of EU citizenship have primacy over the claims of national citizenship in any cases of conflict between the two (declaration No17, Art.263 TFEU). The Lisbon Treaty was effectively therefore The Treaty of European Union, the Constitution or foundation treaty of a constitutionally new Union. Using the same name, European Union, before and after Lisbon disguised the reality of this profound constitutional change. Most people were - and are - unaware that Lisbon made them real citizens of this new entity, with all the obligations and rights of citizenship. The EU's media seems equally unaware.

A reminder of the 2009 Lisbon Treaty

EU POWERS and NATIONAL POWERS: The Lisbon Treaty brought virtually all areas of government within the ambit of the new Union. It set out a catalogue of governmental powers or competences for the post-Lisbon Union (Title 1 TFEU).

First there are the EU's "**exclusive competences**" or powers, where only the EU can make laws and decide policy. These are customs union, competition policy for the internal market, monetary policy for the Eurozone, conservation under the common fisheries policy and the common commercial policy governing trade (Art.3 and 207 TFEU).

Then there are the "shared competences" which cover most other public policy areas, where policy-making is divided between the Union and the Member States. To establish clear EU legal primacy in these areas the Treaty lays down that: "*The Member States shall exercise their competence to the extent that the Union has not exercised its competence*" (Art.2 TFEU). Lisbon

also gave the EU a **coordinating competence in relation to the economic and employment policies of Member States**. In addition it has a **supporting, supplementing and coordinating competence in relation to any agreed policy area**. And it has its own **foreign policy, security and defence competence**.

Lisbon made the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights legally binding. It also turned the "European Council" of national Prime Ministers and Presidents into a formal EU institution for the first time. This brought that previously "intergovernmental" grouping within the ambit of the treaties and made it the constitutional driving force for ever further integration, especially for the 19 Member States of the Eurozone, to which the six founding fathers of the original EEC/EU all belong.

New in Lisbon also was the "self-amending clause" (Art.48.6-7 TFEU) whereby the European Council can amend most areas of the Treaty, excluding military matters, and move

policy areas from unanimity to qualified majority voting, as long as they take such a decision unanimously amongst themselves and National Parliaments do not object. The EU Treaty retains the "flexibility clause" (Art. 352 TFEU) whereby the Council of Ministers, acting unanimously, may take action or adopt new policies not already provided for in the Treaties of these are considered necessary to attain one of the Treaties' wide objectives - excluding foreign policy. These Treaty articles are known colloquially as the "rubber stamps", they are so flexible. They enable the EU Commission and Council to expand the EU's powers significantly without the inconvenience of having to call an intergovernmental conference to draw up a new treaty, which would then have to be ratified unanimously by the Parliaments or Peoples of the Member States.

Anthony Coughlan is Director of The National Platform in Dublin, Ireland.

What of the future in the EU?

The EU has decided to assess products not be risk but by hazard; so many pesticides and other agricultural products will cease to be available, not because they actually pose a risk, but because they conceivably could.

Organic farmers beware, as the EU is to overhaul regulation in the sector.

Fewer exemptions and stricter regulations are likely to make it harder for farmers to move to organic, and push some back to conventional methods.

The EU is keen on 'gender balancing' farming and fishing, as well as company boards will be affected. It appears that gender balancing could be a Cross-Compliance criterion.

The EU is considering banning diesel cars from large cities by 2010, but it goes further suggesting that

petrol cars could also be banned from large cities by 2020. How sufficient electricity can be produced for the proposed increase in electric vehicles remains to be seen. However, more unsightly wind turbines can be expected.

The motorist can also expect the EU black box (spy in the cab) to be fitted to all new cars by 2018 under the excuse that it is to help investigate road accidents etc. The information will in the first instance be only used when necessary but we can look forward to it probably ending up in an EU data storage facility, where insurance companies and anyone else who is interested can obtain the data.

With the promise of further enlargement of the EU the UK can look forward to a further reduction in its so-called 'influence' over the EU decision

processes.

In 1973 the UK had 2 out of 13 EU Commissioners (15.4%) by 2013 we had 1 out of 28 (3.6%).

MEPs in 1979 the UK had 81 out of 410 (19.8%) by 2014 we had 73 out of 751 (9.7%).

In 1973 we had 17.0% vote in the Council of Ministers by 2013 we had 8.2%.

Bosnia has already applied to join the EU and the possibility of Turkey with its 75 million people joining cannot be ruled out. The citizens from these low-paid countries will be looking at the UK as a source of employment and welfare. As they become EU citizens we will be unable to prevent that happening.

The future for the UK within the EU is not in the control of the UK government or the UK taxpayer!

EU threatens jobs in chemical industry!

Don Briggs

A YEAR ago Jim Ratcliffe, chairman of INEOS, warned Jose Manuel Barroso, then President of the EU Commission, that green taxes and the reluctance of banks to fund riskier new technologies would kill within a decade “one of the jewels in Europe’s crown” - its chemical industry.

The eurocrats came up with a solution which alarmed boardrooms of energy-intensive companies throughout the EU: “Energy use must be cut by 27 per cent by 2030. It will be good for the environment, for jobs and the economy”, they said.

The EU’s ignorance provoked INEOS to invite the Commission to visit its site at Cologne, to show them just how energy-efficient it was.

Tom Crotty, a director, explained: “We don’t need more regulations, or targets. Energy efficiency is a core business value. Nearly every technology available and affordable has already been installed at our sites.”

INEOS spends more than £1 billion on energy a year. Its annual sales worldwide top US\$54 billion. Cutting its use could only mean cutting production, he said. “That will destroy the chemical industry in Europe, and

kill six million jobs.” Worldwide, the chemical industry generates sales of US\$4.3 trillion - bigger than Germany’s GDP.

The industry provides basic chemicals for almost everything we use daily from washing-up liquid to fuel and oil for cars and planes, smartphones and laptops, to medical implants like hips, and lightweight parts for cars and Airbus jets.

INEOS’s appeal to the EU officials to see sense during their Cologne visit was backed by Germany’s BASF, the world’s biggest chemical company. Brigitta Huckestein, its government relations officer, said the firm was struggling, and had cut its strategic investment in Europe. “We feel driven out” [of Europe], she said. Forcing production cuts “would be dangerous for the German and the European economies”. And she warned: “If conditions are not favourable, we will invest elsewhere”.

Neither company is likely to be bluffing. In 2010, when Tony Blair’s government refused to allow INEOS to delay a £350 million VAT payment because of liquidity problems, Jim Ratcliffe promptly moved its UK HQ staff of 80, and their families, to

Geneva — outside the EU and its VAT net. Its profits in Europe had halved. In the US, its plants had tripled their profits because of cheap shale gas, which has revitalised US industry.

INEOS has now built a fleet of ships, storage facilities and terminals in Scotland and Norway so it can import US shale gas to keep its European plants running, including loss-making Grangemouth. It has won 13 licences to explore a million acres of land in the UK for shale gas, brought in an expert team of three US engineers with 30 years’ experience of the industry, and bought licences of “uneconomic” oil sites in the North Sea. Its wealth of experience of chemicals’ and high safety standards make it a natural diversification into the new industry.

And the EU’s response after its Cologne visit? Paul Hodson, Head of Unit Energy Efficiency and Intelligent Energy (!) sent this email: “Let me once more reassure you that a thriving European industry is at the core of our concerns, and that our policies seek to increase the European industry’s competitiveness”.

We surely have heard that before!

Will we get an honest EU referendum?

In 1975 when the UK had a referendum on continued EEC membership, questions were raised about the validity of the count!

The polling arrangements were very different from any other national election that has ever been held in the UK - and at the cost of considerable transparency and verification of the result. The Chief National Counting Officer for the 1975 referendum, appointed just three months before the vote and responsible for ensuring fair and transparent democracy by the then Home Secretary, Roy Jenkins, was retired Home Office Permanent Secretary, Lord Allen Abbeydal, a man

with precisely NO previous experience in running elections.

Instead of all votes being counted locally immediately, (as in other elections), after the voting was completed, all the ballot boxes (50,000) were transported to Earls Court in London, where they were all counted together and several days after polling had finished. In addition, the ballot papers were all destroyed very shortly after being counted.

Those differences of procedure suffered several democratic deficits: The ballot boxes were not - as is the usual procedure - continuously under observation from the moment polling

closed until they were emptied at the counting station, ensuring that no-one had the opportunity to interfere with their contents.

The results of each individual constituency’s poll were not available separately and announced at the press conference of each count - as usual.

The gathering of all the ballot papers together before being counted potentially provided massive scope for vote-rigging. As Josph Stalin put it, “It’s not the votes that count, it’s who counts the votes”.

Source: “The EU A Corporatist Racket” by David Barnby (Rear page).

Is EU membership necessary?

The think tank Global Britain has produced eight well-researched arguments supporting the idea that EU membership is a price not worth paying.

1) **Only one-tenth of the UK economy is involved in exports to the EU.** The other nine-tenths of the UK economy is involved in domestic UK activity, and in exporting OUTSIDE the EU.

2) **Despite only a tenth of the UK economy being involved in exports to the EU, all 100% of the UK economy is subject to EU regulation, most of which has nothing to do with UK overseas trade.**

3) **UK exports OUTSIDE the EU are already at least 50% greater in value than UK exports TO the EU.**

4) **UK trade is in surplus with the world OUTSIDE the EU. UK trade is in ongoing large structural deficit WITH the EU.** They sell far more to us than we do to them. So the rest of the EU is far more dependent on the UK economy than the UK economy is dependent on the EU.

5) **UK exports to the EU - a shrinking market, mirrored in recession - were LOWER in 2014 than eight years earlier, in 2006. UK exports to the world OUTSIDE the EU were HIGHER than they were in 2006.**

6) **Growth-wise, the EU was the worst-performing UK export market in the world over the ten years 2004-2014.** Over the same period UK exports to Switzerland, Norway and Iceland (none of them EU members)

grew almost three times faster than did UK exports TO the EU.

7) **You don't need a Trade Agreement with the EU to export to the EU.** The USA, China, Japan and dozens of other countries have never had trade agreements with the EU but nevertheless export massively to the EU.

8) **Following a Leave vote the EU is legally-bound (under Article 50 of its own Lisbon Treaty) to negotiate trading arrangements with the UK.** Even in the absence of post-Brexit EU-UK trade arrangements, the rules of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) provide the international legal framework within which free trade would continue between the UK and remaining EU countries - and the rest of the world.

Is a cashless EU coming soon?

Recently Bloomberg implored officials to “bring on a cashless future” implying that notes and coins were, “dirty, dangerous, unwieldy, and expensive”. But, it appears that authorities and the powers that be seem determined to lay the groundwork for the abolition of what Bloomberg calls “antiquated” physical money.

A statement from Norway's largest bank DNB, executive Trond Bentestuen said that although “there is approximately 50 billion kroner in circulation, the Norges Bank can only account for 40 per cent of its use”. Therefore 60 per cent of money usage is outside of any control.

“We believe”, he continues, “that is due to under-the-table money and laundering”. DNB goes on to say that after identifying “many dangers and disadvantages” associated with cash, the bank has “concluded that it should be phased out”.

Evidence that officials across the globe are preparing to institute a cashless “utopia”, came when Handelsblatt reported (in a piece called “The Death of Cash”) that the Social Democrats – the junior partner in

Angela Merkel's coalition government – have proposed a €5,000 limit on cash transactions and the elimination of the €500 note.

Germany is using a familiar scapegoat to justify the plan: the need to fight “terrorists” and “foreign criminals”. According to the Social Democrats. “If sums over €5,000 have to pass through traceable bank transactions, laundering would be severely hampered, it adds.”

Meanwhile, the Deputy Finance Minister Michael Meister, Germany is proposing a euro-area ban on cash transactions over €5,000 to combat terrorism financing and money laundering, cross-border. He went on to say that, “Since money laundering and terrorism financing are cross-border threats”, it makes sense to adopt a bloc-wide “solution”, but “if a European solution isn't possible, Germany will move ahead on its own”, he added.

This comes at a rather convenient time for policy makers in Europe. Rates are already sitting at minus 0.30 per cent and are likely to be cut by an additional 10bps in March. But that's not likely to do anything to curb the

disinflationary impulse. Mario Draghi isn't anywhere close to his inflation target and it says a lot about how ineffective the ECB has been when everyone is relieved to see annual inflation running at the “brisk” pace of 0.4 per cent.

As a reminder, the gradual phasing out of cash strips the public of its economic autonomy. Central bankers can only control interest rates down to a certain “lower bound”. Once negative rates are passed on to depositors, people will simply start pulling their money out of the bank. The more negative rates go, the faster those withdrawals will be.

When you ban cash you eliminate this problem. If the economy isn't doing what a bunch of bureaucrats want it to do, they can simply make interest rates deeply negative, forcing would-be savers to become consumers by making them choose between spending or watching as the bank simply confiscates their money in the name of NIRP.

Source: Extract from article in the February issue of the *Runnymede Gazette*.

LETTERS

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

City woes

Dear Sir,

In *eurofacts* volume 18 no.3 of 23rd November 2012 you reported that an agreement to set up a single Eurozone banking supervisor had been obtained. Nothing has since been reported but no doubt is still in existence. You also reported that a financial transaction tax had been proposed but that the UK was opposed because it would damage the City of London. On 16th May 2014 you reported that 11 countries were to adopt a FTT and that the ECJ said the UK could not block it although the UK government was to take further legal action.

Now that Mr Cameron has displayed his tough negotiating skills to the EU leaders nothing will prevent the EU from introducing measures damaging to the City. City income is essential to our solvency so our huge debt burden will be impossible to service. It will then not be long before we are forced to join the euro and end up like Greece. Clearly, if we are stupid enough to vote "Remain" in the referendum, that is bound to happen.

JOHN COOKE
Cumbria

EU 'bribery'

Dear Sir,

Is this the type of EU we wish to be a member of?

Angela Merkel's EU has offered a large payment €6 billion (£4.7 billion) of EU funding to Turkey in the hope that it will in return the prevention of the flow of migrants to Greece over the next three years.

The proposed scheme will be based on a formula "for every Syrian re-admitted by Turkey from Greek islands, another Syrian will be resettled from Turkey to the EU member states".

The plans will commit the EU to "effectively and expeditiously resettle

Syrians from Turkey... on a monthly basis" with up to 300,000 people being relocated. Under the agreement, Turkey will "re-admit expeditiously all irregular migrants crossing into the Greek islands from Turkey" over the summer.

This proposal will mean a further UK contribution to the fund, up from €327 million (£252 million) to €654 million (£504 million). The UK may also have to pay into an EU-Turkey agreement to cover the cost of the country taking back hundreds of thousands of failed asylum seekers from Greece over the coming months.

France, Cyprus and other countries in the EU's Schengen zone were also angered by Mrs Merkel's failure to consult on key issues such as her offer of early visa liberalisation for 75 million Turks to enter the Schengen zone.

David Davis, a senior Tory MP who is campaigning for a leave vote in the referendum, accused Mr Cameron of surrendering to Turkish blackmail and of allowing Britain to be sucked into a crisis caused by the failings of the EU's borderless Schengen zone.

"Presumably this money is to bail out Schengen, so I find it hard to see on what legal basis we are being told to pay towards it, unless this is a voluntary sum, in which case tougher negotiations need to be had", he said. "I wouldn't be paying them money at the moment on a blackmail basis."

Meanwhile the president of the European Commission has announced his intention to table several options, including an overhaul of the EU's current asylum rules, to which Britain is signed up, known as the Dublin regulation. Mr Cameron has warned European leaders that he would use Britain's opt-out of EU asylum measures if Jean-Claude Juncker tabled proposals for binding migrant quotas is enforced.

Furthermore David Cameron has announced the deployment of Royal Fleet Auxiliary vessels to help a

combined Nato and EU Aegean Sea operation to shut off the flow of migrants from Turkey to Greece. Operations began yesterday. This will cost the UK taxpayer even more money.

So with continued EU membership the UK can look forward to paying even greater sums of money to the EU bribery scheme for Turkey, even though we are not a member of the Schengen zone.

Will the same happen if the euro collapses? Of course it will, by one means or another!

RICHARD GREAVES
London

Fear factor

Dear Sir,

Why do the government use fear tactics of the dangers of leaving the EU without explaining the fear factors involved with remaining in this organization?

Clearly they do not understand the real effects of EU membership on the citizens of this once proud country.

Could it be that they are only interested in the hope, that like Neil Kinnock and Peter Mandelson they will get onto the EU gravy train?

DAVID CARY
Somerset

MPs pay and EU membership

Dear Sir,

Should the UK remain in the EU after the 23rd June referendum, will the MPs then correctly have their numbers and salaries reduced to reflect their influence over the future direction of the UK?

When the new salaries of MPs are being assessed they should be compared with that of a bus driver, even though a bus driver unlike the MPs, does have knowledge of the eventual destination of his journey.

REBECCA DAVIS
Manchester

MEETINGS

Grassroots Out

www.grassrootsout.co.uk

(Or GO for short! The national, cross-party, grassroots campaign to leave the EU.)

"Have a number of taskforce launches in the next few weeks, in their opinion this referendum will be won or lost, vote by vote, door by door."

They are organizing a number of meetings up and down the country at local level in towns and cities.

Further details contact grassroots directly.

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk

They are organizing a number of meetings up and down the country at local level in towns and cities.

Further details contact CIB directly.

Bruges Group

020 7287 4414

Tuesday **22nd March**, 7.00 pm

"The Renegotiation That Never Was - vote to leave the EU"

John Baron MP

Dr Ruth Lea, *Economist*

The Hon. Jacob Rees-Mogg MP

PUBLIC MEETING

Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London SW1A 1LR

Admission £10

(Includes refreshments)

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

euofacts Phone: 08456 120 175

or Email: euofacts@junepress.com

Gresham College

020 7831 0575

Wednesday **6th April**, 6.00 pm

"Human Rights: Whether in Europe or out!"

Vernon Bogdanor CBE FBA,
Visiting Gresham Professor of Political History

PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2

Admission Free

Gresham College

020 7831 0575

Tuesday **19th April**, 6.00 pm

"Leaving the European Monetary System in 1992"

Sir Geoffrey Nice QC, *Gresham Professor of Law*

PUBLIC MEETING

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

Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Parliament **24th March**
Easter Recess Starts

UK Parliament **11th April**
Easter Recess Ends

UK's EU referendum **23rd June**

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

2017

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

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

2018

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Constitution Group

www.britishconstitutiongroup.com

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaonline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk

Conservatives for Britain

www.conservativesforbritain.org

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

English Constitution Group

www.englishconstitutiongroup.org

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

EU Referendum Campaign

www.eureferendumcampaign.com

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Futurus

www.futurus-thinktank.com

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

GrassRootsOut

www.grassrootsout.co.uk

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

Labour for a Referendum

www.labourforareferendum.com

Leave.eu

www.Leave.eu

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Stawatch

www.stawatch.org

Team

www.teameurope.info

The Taxpayers' Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Vote Leave

www.voteleavetakecontrol.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.

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.

A Life Most Ordinary

by Ken Wight. **£7.99**

A UKIP activist reveals how his life in Slough has changed over the last 60 years, especially with the rise of the EU.

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

**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
Business for Britain	0207 3406070
CIB	0116 2874 622
Conservativesforbritain	www.conservativesforbritain.org
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
Leave-the-EU	www.Leave.eu
New Alliance	020 7385 9757
Fishing Association	01224 313473

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