eurofacts

16TH JUNE 2017 THE REALITY BEHIND EUROPE MONTHLY £3.50

# UK/EU tariff possibilities

*Extract of an article by* **William Norton** *for civitas*

Post-Brexit, in the event of there being no trade treaty, UK exports to the EU-27 could expect to suffer tariff costs in the region of £5.2 billion, but the corresponding exports from the EU-27 to the UK would face costs in the region of £12.9 billion. These figures were advanced in previous Civitas research as a strong argument that it is in the best interests of the EU-27 to agree a trade treaty to permit tariff-free access to their markets to the UK.

This paper considers the policy responses open to the UK in the event that a trade treaty is not reached, in terms of mitigating the cost of these tariffs for UK businesses. (see notes).

After Brexit, the UK will be bound by the rules of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). It will be prevented from offering 'prohibited subsidies', linked directly to export performance, and will be at risk from retaliation by foreign governments if it offers 'actionable subsidies', those which cause injury to a foreign business by providing specific benefits for UK industries.

Provided the UK establishes mitigation schemes which are non-specific, economy-wide measures, foreign governments will not be able to retaliate.

Freed from the EU rules on state aid, the UK will be able to implement greater tax incentives for research and development expenditure for all businesses. This policy is justifiable in its own right. The cost would be in the region of £2.9 billion, of which £2.1 billion (73%) would go to industries suffering EU-27 tariffs.

Freed from the EU rules on state aid, the UK will be able to operate a more extensive regional aid programme. Using simple rules acceptable to the WTO, areas covering 65% of the population could receive assistance worth £3.8 billion, of which £3.1 billion (82%) would go to exporting industries. At present EU rules limit the UK to assisting areas covering only 27% of the population.

Freed from the EU rules on state aid, the UK can redesign its energy policy. Whatever it decides to do about emissions trading, and wider climate change policy, abolition of the damaging carbon price floor mechanism makes sense in its own right. It would release £1.2 billion in costs, including £392 million for domestic users of electricity.

These measures would be supplemented by a Transitional Assistance Programme (TAP), a discretionary economy-wide scheme making payments to aid adjustment costs arising from Brexit, capped in practice at 1% of the value of a business' exports. Set at that level, the scheme would not infringe WTO rules on actionable subsidies.

The exports that would be affected by EU-27 tariffs are best considered in four main categories: (i) agricultural products, including food and beverages, which have their own WTO rules; (ii) 'seriously-affected' non-agricultural products, which face tariff costs in excess of 5% of the value of exports; (iii) 'middle products', where the tariff burden would be between 1%-5%; and (iv) 'de minimis products', where the tariff burden would be below 1% of the value of exports.

Outside the EU, the UK would have to negotiate the assessment of its own 'Total Aggregate Measure of Support (AMS) Commitment', the WTO ceiling on permitted subsidies for agriculture. This threshold is likely to be the equivalent of €5 billion. Given WTO rules on the categorisation of agriculture support (the so-called Green Box, Amber Box and Blue Box), this will be more than sufficient to both implement a UK replacement for the EU Common Agriculture Policy and to mitigate the £1.7 billion tariff costs this sector would face.

The 'seriously-affected non-agricultural products' (motor vehicles, most textiles, some chemicals, plastics, fishing, ceramics and aluminium) face total tariff costs of £2.3 billion. Because of the locations in which these businesses are based, and because of their R&D expenditure and electricity usage, it would be possible for the UK government to completely mitigate the impact of EU tariffs through R&D tax incentives, the abolition of the carbon floor price, the TAP and through regional aid.

The 'middle products' and 'de minimis products' groups face EU tariff costs of £1.2 billion in aggregate. The same policies would not only mitigate the cost of tariffs, but would actually leave these industries with slight net gains.

These mitigation measures are better considered not as a stop-gap response to an immediate problem, but as part of a co-ordinated long-term

**Continued on page 2**

# UK/EU tariff possibilities

**Continued from page 1**

industrial strategy to improve British competitiveness for a global market. That is also the best means of matching up 'winners' and 'losers' from the tariffs and the mitigation measures.

Such a strategy would have to be based on a horizontal, economy-wide approach. It would not represent a return to 1970s-style 'picking winners', if only because such an overt targeting of benefits would be heavily constrained by the WTO rules.

Hitherto, discussion of the UK's departure from the EU has focussed upon the risks of 'Hard Brexit' and the need to soften this by avoiding costs for business such as tariffs being levied upon exports to the EU-27.

The real question is not 'how soft a Brexit can we achieve?' but rather 'how hard a negotiation do we wish to drive with the EU?' The balance of negotiating strengths is far more favourable to the UK. If the EU-27 decide to levy tariffs on British exports, Britain has little to fear.

The UK should stop obsessing about the EU and worrying about how they will react. We should get on with the task of managing our own affairs in our own interests, and leave the EU to worry about their own problems.

What does 'Brexit' mean? It means having nobody else to blame.

Note: This Europe Debate paper is based on an extended 142-page analysis, 'Mitigating the impact of tariffs on UK-EU trade'.

Further details at www.civitas.org

# The EU and defence

The US Secretary of Defence James Mattis has warned the Europeans that the US might "moderate" its commitment to NATO unless the European members of NATO actually spend 2% of their GDP on defence, that was the agreed membership fee for the NATO alliance.

The majority of European countries have always relied on the Americans and the UK to provide the bulk of the financial costs and supply the military hardware.

In the EU only the UK, Poland, Greece and Estonia have provided this financial support, even though Greece has been plunged into economic melt down by its membership of the EU.

Would the members of the EU be happy if the rich and controlling member Germany spend 2% of its GDP on defence then it would rise to fourth or fifth place in the world of military power.

The German grip over the future direction of the EU project and the drive for ever-closer union, regardless of the wishes of the citizens of the EU, has for a number of years troubled the UK and others.

What would happen if Germany became a military power again?

Could it be trusted?

These are the questions that those who wish to remain in the EU have to ask themselves.

How does the president of the European Commission president Jean-Claude Juncker respond to Mattis's comments?

He believes that the Europeans are somehow making up for that deficit through their humanitarian and development assistance budgets, an interesting concept.

Europe cannot expect America to keep them safe in perpetuity. With the growing threat from Russia and in light of both US public opinion and the direction taken by Donald Trump's administration, it is simply no longer an option.

Yet if Europeans are to spend more on defense, they need be careful to do it in a way that does not resuscitate the continent's old internal land grab problems.

# Investment aid

The EU is in the process of completing plans called The External Investment Plan, to subsidise private investors with money originally allocated to the aid fund. Will this in fact damage the lives of those most in need only time will tell.

The hope is that this investment will trickle down to the poorest of the country in which the money is spent.

This money will be used for investing in developing countries mixing public and private finance in order to reduce the risks for companies.

However, the assumption that growth creates new good and permanent jobs that help those in most need is questionable, it may also allow companies to undermine other EU priorities, such as human rights and climate change as a price for creating jobs.

The type of businesses that could benefit from this plan are the large companies listed on the stock exchanges in Germany, France and the UK - if it is still a member. Many of whom have been accused of various anti-social practices that are often found in the less regulated companies of the developing countries.

Safeguarding who gets this money and making sure it is used wisely will clearly become the biggest problem for this latest idea.

If this idea works then more money targeted for aid relief could be reallocated this way even in the UK.

Many believe that this type of investment only goes to benefit the richest and does not have the so-called 'trickle-down' effect.

# France's new president

How will Angela Merkel deal with France's new president Emmanuel Macron?

In his campaign to become the new president he promised the French electorate that he would fight for reform of the EU including the creation of pan-European bonds, the establishment of a European finance ministry, and the introduction of EU-wide unemployment insurance policies. He also said that this will require the reinforcement of the Franco-German bond inside the EU.

Meanwhile, although Merkel has praised him for his "courageous pro-European campaign", she has added that "Given the situation that we have in Germany, I don't think we must now give priority to changing our policy".

In respect of his idea on Eurobonds, Angela Merkel's German European policy has always and still is to resist the idea of Eurobonds and to keep the deficit below 3% of GDP.

Her upcoming opponent in the German elections and former President of the European Parliament Martin Schulz, shares her view on the issue, Schulz talking to the *FT* claimed that the idea of Eurobonds had been discarded with the introduction of the European Stability Mechanism, joking, "The only interesting thing about bonds is James". Even, Vice President of the European Parliament and MEP for Germany's Free Democratic Party expressed his own reservations about Macron's plans, saying, "We are all happy that Macron was elected, but even under his Presidency there cannot be a mutualisation of debt".

The idea of any kind of reform of the EU is unlikely to gain favour in Germany especially as they are likely to have to pay out in one form or another.

We can expect that the EU will however, make some minor changes saying that this was as a result of Macron's influence over the EU machine. Allowing him to show the French people how his new type of leadership is getting results.

# Belgian MPs and alcohol

The Belgian parliament has rejected advice from an independent integrity committee to ban the distribution of free beer and wine to MPs, Belgian media reported in January. Free alcohol for MPs was introduced in the late 1990s to prevent deputies from going to bars during debates.

Following a brawl, the parliament's chairman asked for an independent advice on the future of free alcohol distribution, which party leaders rejected.

Unlucky for Belgian tax payers.

# Points of interest

* Despite Brexit fears and the British general election, confidence by the manufacturing companies according to a recent survey is high.

The survey by the EEF employers' organisation British manufacturing growth remains strong, with exports up and companies positive about prospects for the rest of 2017.

The EEF also said companies recruitment plans are healthy, and has raised its manufacturing growth forecasts for 2017 and 2018.

* Greece requires more money from the bail-out fund but there is presently a stand-off over Greek debt.

* The EU commission president Jean-Claude Juncker has rejected a German proposal to link EU cohesion funding to the respect of the rule of law in a member states. Juncker said such a proposal would likely be a "poison for the continent". EU budget commissioner Guenther Oettinger, however, has hinted at imposing funding conditions on member states.

* Defence ministers from Germany and France have broader plans to make "a more coherent security and defence policy" in the EU, according to German broadcaster *Deutsche Welle*. The proposal is part of a so-called permanent structured cooperation (Pesco), which gives a core group of participating EU member states the ability to launch joint security projects.

* Sweden's finance minister, Magdalena Andersson, has said that conditions such as taking in asylum seekers should be imposed on member states to receive EU funding. Andersson says the move is needed because the EU budget will be reduced following the UK's withdrawal from the bloc. "It's unreasonable that countries which have not fulfiled (EU) decisions ... about migration, still receive large contributions from EU's structural funds," said Andersson.

* A recent report by Amnesty International has accused France of abusing its state of emergency by curtailing civil liberties, such as freedom of assembly. France imposed a state of emergency following the 2015 terrorist attacks. The NGO says authorities had issued 155 decrees between November 2015 and 5th May 2017 that banned public assemblies. Hundreds of measures were also introduced, with many linked to protests against proposed labour law reforms.

* Almost unnoticed by many, the Luxembourg based European Investment Bank (EIB) with a capital of €275 billion has quietly grown into the largest multilateral borrower and lender in the world.

# European Economic Area membership

In a recent press information note released by the Campaign for an Independent Britain the case is put for why membership of the European Economic Area (EEA) is not in the UK's interests.

**Immigration** - It is claimed that Britain can control immigration while a member of the EEA by unilaterally enacting the Safeguard Provisions in Article 112 of the EEA Agreement. However, the provisions [1] have to be:

a) proved necessary due to serious economic, social or environmental impact
b) restricted in scope and duration
c) commonly acceptable to other EEA members
d) subject to abolition by the EEA
e) carried out by the European Commission

Clearly, Article 112 does not enable adequate control of borders.

**Fee** - The most common reason for people voting to leave the EU was the perceived high cost and poor value for money of EU membership.[2] The fee for staying in the EEA will still be very high. A House of Commons report estimated it to be only 17% less than the cost of full membership.[3]

**Sovereignty** - If the UK is subject to EEA regulations, it is not in control of its terms of trade and cannot negotiate its own trade agreements.[4]

**Inefficiency** - Freedom from EEA regulation is a key reason for leaving the EU. Producing goods according to EEA, one-size-fits-all regulations is restrictive and inefficient. In some cases, regulations are ignored altogether. However, producing goods to a certain standard under UK law allows freedom to innovate, is much more efficient and generates more opportunities.

**EFTA** - (European Free Trade Area) The 'Swiss option' may seem like an ideal compromise but although the Swiss are not part of the EEA, they cannot control immigration and have to abide by many EU regulations as a result of bi-lateral trade agreements. As a former President Pascal Couchepin says, "countries wishing to enjoy the economic benefits of accessing the EU internal market are expected to adhere to the common rules".[5]

There will be challenges ahead, but we must remember our objective is to free ourselves from burdensome bureaucracy and reclaim our sovereignty.

References
**1**. https://www.migrationwatchuk.org/briefing-paper/389
**2**. https://getbritainout.org/about/polling/
**3**. https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/RP13-42 p 22
**4**. https://reaction.life/cost-eea-membership-not-worth-uk/
**5**.http://www.cityam.com/235765/why-the-swiss-model-would-be-a-poor-choice-for-britain-post-brexit

# The Dieselgate saga continues

While governments decide how to punish owners of diesel vehicles the investigations into the exhaust emissions claimed by the manufacturers of diesel vehicles has now moved on from Volkswagon to other manufacturers.

Recently, French prosecutors have announced that they are looking into Peugeot-Citroen for possible emissions fraud, after it had already started probes into Renault and Fiat-Chrysler.

Following the scandal, which became known as Dieselgate, the European Commission proposed to introduce more checks on the currently allowed national system of approving cars.

Meanwhile a report in the *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* newspaper states that the German government is continuing to reject increased EU oversight of the tests proposed by the Commission in January 2016.

Germany is said to be blocking key parts of the recommendations which resulted from the investigations that diesel cars produced by the German carmaker Volkswagen Group (VW) had been equipped with illegal emissions cheating software.

Currently carmakers can choose in which EU country to run the tests needed for a so-called type approval, and many request them in a country where the car companies also contribute to the economy.

The testing laboratories have also come under scrutiny, with worries that direct payments by the companies whose car emissions they are supposed to test, can cause a conflict of interests.

However, according to the newspaper, Germany is opposed to changing the way testing laboratories are paid. It also reported that the Germans do not want the national authorities in charge of granting approvals to be double-checked by an independent body.

Germany also has not yet reached a position on the proposal that the EU commission should be able to impose high fines on cheating carmakers if the national authority has not done so, the report said.

Twenty months after the VW scandal broke, national authorities in Germany, Luxembourg, Spain, and UK have not yet fined the group's daughter companies, Volkswagen, Audi, Seat, and Skoda, for which the respective authorities had granted approvals.

According to *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* Spain, Italy and the Czech Republic are also slowing down the reforms.

It is believed that at least 12 member states were opposed in February to the Commission's proposal to have more powers to test cars independently.

If Germany, Italy, Spain and the Czech Republic block the plan, it is increasingly unlikely that a deal will be reached anytime soon by the responsible ministers.

# Tax evasion Luxembourg style

*Extract of an article in euobserver by* **Nikolaj Nielsen**

European Commission president Jean-Claude Juncker appeared before an inquiry hearing of MEPs, probing dubious tax schemes in Luxembourg and elsewhere. The euro-deputies on Tuesday 30th May were hoping to extract a confession from Juncker on his alleged role in setting up the schemes, which eventually led to the LuxLeaks scandal.

That scandal, disclosed by numerous media outlets in November 2014, revealed how Luxembourg became a major hub for multinationals wishing to slash their global tax bills through secretive tax rulings.

Juncker had spent decades as the Grand Duchy's prime minister and finance minister, before becoming EU commission president, but he denied any responsibility.

The LuxLeaks was followed almost two years later by a cache of some 11.5 million documents from a Panama-based law firm, Mossack Fonseca.

Known as the Panama Papers, the files further implicate Luxembourg as a major hub in terms of so-called intermediaries, such as law firms and banks that facilitate offshore structures to hide corporate tax money from the public.

When asked who should take the political responsibility for allowing the intermediaries to flourish in his home country, Juncker said it was a non-political issue.

"I don't think we have to be looking for responsibility in the area of politics because the political authorities are not informed of these comings and goings and handlings," he said. He added that he hadn't been responsible for financial and business issues in Luxembourg and that he "never discussed fiscal measures with a company".

"Tax rulings, for example, are negotiated with the tax authorities in Luxembourg and not the ministers," he noted.

Instead, Juncker repeatedly highlighted a dozen policy and legislative proposals, which were tabled by the EU commission under his tenure to crack down on tax evasion and remove the veil of secrecy behind the numerous structures.

He also announced a new directive would be proposed in the coming weeks to weed out intermediaries.

"It is a real problem, it is not only a problem in Luxembourg, but also elsewhere," he said.

German Green MEP Sven Giegold welcomed Juncker's shift as EU commission president towards greater tax justice, but said that big questions remained unanswered about his past roles in Luxembourg.

"You've turned from Saul to Paul on the road to Damascus, so now you are working hard on tax evasion but citizens want to have a clear statement of responsibility about what you did in the past," said Giegold....

Giegold also presented a report to journalists detailing how Luxembourg had, in the past, resisted EU-level tax cooperation under Juncker.

The findings in the report were part of a broader probe initiated by a specialised police investigation unit from the western German state, North Rhine-Westphalia.

According to Giegold's report, the North Rhine-Westphalia probe showed how banks transferred interest received by individuals to companies and life insurance schemes, in order to avoid the so-called the European Savings Tax Directive.

The directive, which required more tax transparency between EU member states, was adopted in 2003 and had entered into force two years after.

But Luxembourg, along with Belgium and Austria, objected and also secured concessions to protect banking secrecy by applying a withholding tax instead.

Once the directive was launched, large sums of money were suddenly transferred from abroad to Luxembourg by wealthy individuals.

Bank deposits of Germans in Luxembourg, for instance, increased by more than 250 percent from $100 billion in 2000 to around $264 billion in 2007. The money was then shifted into offshore companies such as ones in Panama to circumvent the European Savings Tax Directive.

Giegold said it was a conservative estimate because it only looked at findings from the Panama Papers leaks and that the sums did not include schemes that involved life insurance.

"This is only the tip of the iceberg," he said.

Asked to comment on Luxembourg's resistance against the European Savings Tax Directive, Juncker told MEPs he did not have enough time to explain.

"It is very difficult to explain in a few minutes why Luxembourg was for a withholding tax and didn't want to remove tax secrecy," he said.

Instead, he said "that the world was very different then".

The pressure on Juncker on his past roles in Luxembourg has pushed the EU commission to place considerable focus on tax justice.....

The tax enforcement act, proposed by the Green group in the EU parliament, would oblige all EU states to help each other find tax evaders across borders.

Juncker said "Yes," when asked if he would support such a bill.

He also said "Yes" to invoking article 116 in the EU treaty, which would allow EU tax law to be decided by a majority, instead of unanimity, in the Council, where member state representatives sit. Such a move has been described as a "game changer" for tax justice in Europe by campaign groups.

But Juncker also refused to budge in some areas, noting that the EU commission would not include EU states in an upcoming black list of tax havens.

"We don't feel it is our duty to do it unless there are very serious circumstances," he said.

# *LETTERS*

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

## Queen-in-Parliament

Dear Sir,
The significance of what happened on the 23rd June 2016 was that the status quo of constitutional legality was restored to "the Queen-in-Parliament". In former days and centuries the constitutional betrayal of the Queen - the Crown - over our EU membership would have been exposed and dealt with under the Treason Acts.

As a student of the British Constitution for the past half century and someone who was part of a legal team that appeared at the High Court in 2003 against the Government over (the then) European Constitution (*Southall vs Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*), I have been made very aware over the past 44 years that 'powers that be' have caused the queen to be 'deceived in her grant' over the political project. This very unhealthy situation where statute law has been in conflict on the Statute Book will be ended once the ECA 1972 has been repealed.

M. A. CLARK
West Midlands

## The Norway option debate

Dear Sir,
Reading an article on the Bruges Group web site I was interested to see that even the Norwegians do not like the so-called 'Norway Option' of EU membership.

According to a recent poll by Sentio for the Norwegian organisation Nei til EU. More Norwegians want to see a bilateral comprehensive free trade agreement with the EU replacing Norway's membership of the European Economic Area (EEA) than those who want to hold onto the country's EEA membership.

The poll says 35% would prefer a comprehensive free trade agreement, like the British government is aiming for, while less than a quarter, or 23%, would like to hold onto the EEA Agreement often dubbed as the 'Norway option'. The rest is undecided. Measuring only those favouring a free trade agreement and those for the EEA Agreement over 60% would like to switch to a free trade deal while almost 40% would like to keep the EEA arrangement. Meanwhile almost half the Norwegian people support a referendum on whether to ditch the EEA membership.

The vast majority of Norwegians have opposed EU membership in every opinion poll published since early 2005. In the case of Iceland in every poll since July 2009.

Norway like Iceland, Liechtenstein and all the EU member states has to unilaterally adopt EU legislation.

What should not be forgotten is that those seeking EEA membership saw it as a sort of a waiting room for EU membership. So as the article ends it poses the question, 'why on Earth should Britain even consider this option?'.

DAVID SIMMONS
London

## Financial services

Dear Sir,
Since the financial crisis, the EU attitude to the financial sector has changed greatly.

The EU is no longer looking to the UK for inspiration or guidance over how to deal with the economic sector, instead it is now seeking to restrict and control this sector directly. Hence the UK in or out of the EU will become insignificant or have a negligible influence on European financial services.

Unlike the rest of the EU the financial services sector is the most closely watched and best reported sector of the British economy.

DEREK CARTER
Edinburgh

## Direction of travel

Dear Sir,
Many talk of reforming the EU like the new French president, but if history has taught us anything it is that the EU does not wish to change from the direction it is going, namely that of forming one government, one country, and hence one economy with one currency the euro. The aim of 'ever closer union' has always overridden economic considerations.

Tony Blair gave away part of the UK rebate thinking the EU would amend the Common Agricultural Policy, he was ignored once he gave up the rebate.

David Cameron went talk-in-cheek to the EU to make changes he failed.

Brexit negotiations requires real leadership and a determination to leave, if negotiations breakdown otherwise the EU will just make generous promises but not keep them or change its direction once agreement has been made.

ALISON MILLER
Birmingham

## Why the UK joined the EU

Dear Sir,
We should remember why the UK joined the EU in the first place.

When we joined, there was an an increase in exports to the original EU-6 (and an even larger increase in imports from them). This was a consequence of specific circumstances in the 1970s, when world tariffs were much higher than today.

We should not forget the main increases in British exports to the EU as a whole can be explained by the enlargement process, with the EU absorbing countries which were already buying British goods and services. In many cases, these countries have become less significant buyers of UK exports after they have joined the EU.

Hence, UK exports to the EU peaked in 1992 and has since been in terminal decline.

MARTIN OWEN
Devon

# MEETINGS

**Gresham College**
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **21st June**, 6.00 pm

*"Britain and the EU: In or Out - One Year On"*

**Vernon Bogdanor,** *Visting Professor of History*

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

---

**The Economic Research Council**

Thursday **14th September,** 6.30 pm

*"The Inadequacies of Stress Testing Methods on Banks"*

**Professor Kevin Dowd,** *Senior fellow with the Cobden Centre and long-standing free market economist*

Tuesday **3rd October,** 6.30 pm

*"Title - to be announced"*

**Dr Graham Gudgin,** *University of Cambridge. He was seconded as Special Advisor to the Northern Ireland First Minister on econmic policy from November 1992 - 2002.*

PUBLIC MEETING
Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London
**Admission by ticket**
(Non-ERC members £15 - Students £10) via: www.ercouncil.org)

---

**Bruges Group**
020 7287 4414

During **November**

**Further details and speakers to be announced**

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

**Admission charge to be announced**

**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.

***eurofacts* Phone: 08456 120 175**

**or**

**Email: eurofacts@junepress.com**

## DIARY OF EVENTS

**2017**
Estonia takes over **1st July**
EU Council Presidency

UK Government (approx) **28th July**
Recess starts

German Election **September**
(Date to be announced)

UK (approx) **4th September**
Government Recess ends

UK (approx) **11th September**
Government
Conference Recess starts

Lib-Dems **16th-19th September**
Party Autumn Conference
Bournemouth
Bournemouth International Centre

Labour **24th-27th September**
Party Autumn Conference
Brighton
The Brighton Centre

UKIP **29th-30th September**
Party National Conference
Torquay
Riveria Conference Centre

Conservative **1st-4th October**
Party Autumn Conference
Manchester
Manchester Central Conference Centre

UK (approx) **9th October**
Government
Conference Recess ends

*Note: (approx dates) To be confirmed by new government*

## USEFUL WEB SITES

**British Constitution Group**
www.britishconstitutiongroup.com
**British Future**
www.britishfuture.org
**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
**Change Britain**
www.changebritain.org
**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
**Freedom Association**
www.tfa.net
**Futurus**
www.futurus-thinktank.com
**Get Britain Out**
www.getbritainout.org
**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
**Leave.eu**
www.Leave.eu
**New Alliance**
www.newalliance.org.uk
**Open Europe**
www.openeurope.org.uk
**Sovereignty**
www.sovereignty.org.uk
**Statewatch**
www.statewatch.org
**The Taxpayers' Alliance**
www.taxpayersalliance.com
**United Kingdom Independence Party**
www.ukip.org

# THE JUNE PRESS - BOOKS

**Seizing the moment**
*by John Ashworth.* **£4.00**
The opportunities for UK fisheries after Brexit with the restoration of the 200nm/midline resources zone.

**The Road to Freedom**
*by Gerard Batten MEP.* **£8.99**
A 2016 version following the vote leave result. How to exit the EU and regain a proper future for an independent UK.

**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.

**Britain's Referendum Decision and its Effects**
*by Stephen Bush.* **£8.99**
Clear facts that explain the dangers we face inside or outside the EU.

**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.

**Brave New Europe?**
*by Mick Greenhough.* **£10.00**
A comprehensive account of the origins of the EU and what they intend to do in the future with or without the UK.

**A Doomed Marriage**
Why Britain Should Leave the EU
*by Daniel Hannan.* **£8.99**
Without EU membership, the UK can become the most successful nation.

**Britain Votes To Leave, What Happens Next**
*by Ian Milne.* **£2.50**
A fictional letter from the UK Prime Minister to the EU after a referendum decision to leave with detailed ideas.

**Brexit Revolt: How The UK Voted To Leave The EU**
*by Michael Mosbacher & Oliver Wiseman.* **£10.00**
How the idea of leaving the EU took root and the battle of ideas and egos that went on before and during the campaign.

**The Market Solution**
FLEXCIT - Flexible Exit and Continuous Development
*by Dr Richard E, North.* **£5.00**
How the UK can leave the EU, through an orderly, plausible and practical way, that is practically risk-free.

**The Dark Side of European Integration**
*Edited by Anton Shekhovtsov.* **£22.99**
Social foundations and cultural determinants of the rise of radical right movements in contemporary Europe.

**Spyhunter**
*by Michael Shrimpton.* **£25.00**
A fascinating alternative view of history, including the EU, exposes the secret world of German intelligence.

**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.

**British History**
*by Hugh Williams.* **£15.00**
An illustrated guide to a history of Britain from before Roman times to the present day House of Windsor.

**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 |
| **New Alliance** | **020 7385 9757** |
| Fishing Association | 01224 313473 |

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

| | |
|---|---|
| **British Future** | **www.britishfuture.org** |
| Bruges Group | 020 7287 4414 |
| **Global Britain** | **www.globalbritain.org** |
| Global Vision | www.global-vision.net |
| **Open Europe** | **0207 197 2333** |

POLITICAL PARTIES

| | |
|---|---|
| **Conservative** Rt Hon Mrs Theresa May MP | **020 7222 9000** |
| **English Democrats** Robin Tilbrook (Chairman) | **01277 896000** |
| **Green Party** Caroline Lucas MP and Jonathan Bartley | **020 7272 4474** |
| **Labour** Jeremy Corbyn MP | **020 7783 1000** |
| **Liberal** Mr Rob Wheway | **01562 68361** |
| **Liberal Democrats** Tim Farron MP | **020 7222 7999** |
| **UK Independence Party** Paul Nuttall MEP | **01626 831290** |

ISSN 1361-4134

9 771361 413006 10