eurofacts

15TH SEPTEMBER 2017 THE REALITY BEHIND EUROPE MONTHLY £3.50

Customs arrangements and the dangers of a transition deal

The UK government's post-Brexit aim is to achieve as close as possible a frictionless movement in trade between the UK and EU. In this regard it has produced a government paper on "future partnership on UK-EU customs arrangement post-Brexit", including the idea of a transition period. However, the EU's reply was, "We take note of the UK's request for an implementing period and its preferences as regards the future relationship, but we will only address them once we have made sufficient progress on the terms of the orderly withdrawal [which include the citizens' rights agreement, the financial settlement, and the Northern Irish border]." That sounds like a typical bureaucratic way of saying not unless we get our own way and in the process delaying Brexit as long as possible!

In the paper the UK talks about a transition period after the withdrawal from the EU in March 2019 when the UK will technically leave the EU's Customs Union and the UK Supreme Court will then become the highest court in the UK and not under the rule of the EU courts.

The transitional idea however, could quite likely last 2-3 years, maybe longer – David Davis recommends before 2022 - this may also result in a compromise giving EU courts a degree of influence until a final exit deal has been completed. This also assumes the current government will still be in office at the end of this period – what if the EU obtains a time extension? Many will question the wisdom of such an idea.

What about the UK making trade deals with countries outside the EU? again these could well be prevented until the transition was completed and during this delay the leadership of many countries could change bringing the idea of quick trade deals considerably longer to achieve.

A transitional period, sounds good in theory but may well result in the EU holding it up as long as possible in order to await the possible change of leadership of the current Conservative in the hope that it will change direction or even better the arrival of a favourable UK government that would decide to remain within the EU.

The EU is fully aware that the UK only has until 2022 before the next General Election must take place, so it is not in their interest to complete these negotiations before that time.

The first proposals in the government paper is for a long-term arrangement suggests managing a new customs border with the EU, simplifying requirements on EU goods entering the country as much as possible and providing border "facilitations" to reduce and remove trade barriers.

The second is for a long-term option for a "new customs partnership with the EU" suggests the UK could "mirror the EU's requirements for imports from the rest of the world where their final destination is the EU." This would mean the UK would choose to "apply the same tariffs as the EU, and provide the same treatment for rules of origin" on goods that transit through the UK to the EU. The paper suggests this could remove the need for any customs procedures for goods moving between the UK and the EU, as the UK will enforce EU duties and requirements on this trade. It also suggests this solution would allow the UK to apply its own tariffs on trade from other countries destined for the UK only.

However, as the paper itself acknowledges, this is a complex and untested proposal. It would require a "robust enforcement mechanism" to ensure all goods exported to the EU complied with EU trade policy. It could also mean "a repayment mechanism" where traders are required to pay the higher of either the UK or EU tariff, and

These proposals also require a willingness on the EU's side to firstly accept that the UK is serious about leaving the control of the EU institutions and secondly to understand that any financial separation agreement will only be acceptable to the UK government and citizens if sensible trade agreement is reached.

With regard to the problems over the Irish border problem and the Gibraltar border issue, these cannot be dealt with in isolation. Both are related to what kind of EU trade deal is eventually agreed upon and the kind of trade deals made by the UK with countries outside the EU and how disputes are to be handled.

VOL 23 NO 1

Why EU negotiations could fail

Anthony Scholefield

According to the Futurus think tank, the UK-EU negotiations will fail.

"It is worth restating that the EU negotiating position is contrary to Article 50 of the Treaty. It is also contrary to Mrs. May's wishes as expressed in the Article 50 notification letter.

And it certainly creates problems that there need not have existed.

One must ask what possible motivation there could be for the UK to agree the principles of a financial settlement without even the beginnings of discussion on a future relationship.

In these circumstances it would be impossible for the government to get a financial settlement in principle without any figures through Parliament and to get the approval of the electorate. It would be equally difficult to get a settlement with substantive payments approved. Also, the question arises as to how any financial settlement is to be paid – in euros. You can only get euros by profitable trade but the EU does not want to discuss future trading relationships yet, so it is left in the air how the EU expects the UK to generate extra trade so as to pay a financial settlement.

David Davis should never have accepted the sequencing because, as Barnier has suggested, the matter is *"explosive"*.

After all, Barnier is facing a big hole in EU finances and has to come up with big figures. Otherwise he would not be prioritising the finances.

Some have suggested that almost any proposed financial settlement should be accepted so that negotiations can move forward to the 'framework' for the future relationship. But how would this look if there is no satisfactory 'framework' agreed after this concession?

To look at the principles in negotiating international obligations we must go back to history and the locus classicus is Gladstone's speech about the State's obligations and guarantees of August 10th 1870 (in relation to Belgium in the Franco-Prussian war), also referred to by Sir Edward Grey in his historic speech to parliament before war was declared on August 3rd 1914 and by Asquith the day before war was declared in 1914. Gladstone's essential statement of principle was as follows,

'*I am not able to subscribe to what plainly amounts to an assertion, that the simple fact of the existence of a guarantee is binding on every party to it, irrespectively altogether of the particular position in which it may find itself at the time when the occasion for acting on the guarantee arises.'*

Following the logic of the commonsense principles laid down by Gladstone, in the last few years the German government breached the Stability and Growth Pact and the European Central Bank breached the Maastricht Treaty and bailed out indebted countries. In each case, they considered the interests of the German people and the defence of the euro justified such breaches despite their treaty obligations.

So, in the view of Gladstone, Grey and Asquith, as well as the German government and the ECB, international obligations and guarantees are not binding irrespectively but depend on the position at the time action is required.

One should also note that the UK Supreme Court has also rejected the notion that a legal obligation (in British law) is binding irrespectively, for example, in a case concerning party political funding (Electoral Commission v United Kingdom Independence Party, 2010).

To agree a financial settlement alongside negotiations over a future 'deep' relationship would be difficult enough. For the EU to think that the UK would agree a financial settlement without any guarantee of such a future relationship framework is not only contrary to the EU Treaty but purblind.

David Davis should never have accepted this sequencing.

There will inevitably be a confrontation over the financial settlement and possibly other issues and, therefore, a breakdown in negotiations.....

....It needs to be plainly put to the EU that, if there is no trade agreement, and in good time, the UK will have to take steps to ensure its financial stability. That means reducing EU trade to a fair balance to what can be financed by British trade with the EU in the post-Brexit scenario.

As Mervyn King, former Governor of the Bank of England, has stated, the British government needs to have some clarity about what would happen if negotiations fail.

'If you are going to have any successful negotiation, you have got to have a fallback position which the other side understands and believes is credible. So we need to be able to say if we can't reach an agreement we will nevertheless leave and we can make it work.'...".

Source - Extract of Futurus *Briefing "*The Negotiations Will Fail" *August 2017.*

Fishing quotas farce

Following a report from the Danish national auditors regarding their fisherman, the Danish police have been asked to investigate the public administration of EU fishing rules after the auditors found examples of fishermen who, in reports to the ministry, pretended to own vessels and quotas. This practice may have led to Danish fishing quotas being in reality concentrated on just a few owners. Danish Fisheries minister Esben Lunde Larsen and two leading ministerial officials have already been removed from office.

Germany's upcoming election

As Angela Merkel gears up for her attempt to obtain a fourth term as leader of Germany in the 24th September election. The question for the EU will be what will be the consequences for the EU if she wins.

Merkel using her EU influence has proposed sharing of refugee's throughout the EU by the process of obligatory quotas is one of the many important issues that this election has brought up, especially in the context of the EU budget.

Despite the fact that many EU members like Poland, Hungary, Slovakia and The Czech Republic are determined not to accept the quota system, Angela Merkel though is determined to continue with this proposal. Meanwhile, Greece and Italy are feeling the brunt of the current refugee crisis.

Merkel has also confirmed the she does not want a repeat of the 890,000 refugees that entered Germany in 2016 - A situation of her own making.

Replying to her opponent in the upcoming election, Martin Schulz of the centre-left SDP who has proposed a cutting EU funding to members who failed to accept the quota system! Merkel has refused to accept this idea and said on German radio that this would not work and that the disagreement on the distribution of refugees was regrettable, saying "I will not let it go,".

Merkel has also stated that she does not accept the idea that Germany should set an upper limit on numbers of refugees as suggested by her closest political ally, Horst Seehofer, the leader of the conservative CSU party in Bavaria.

Angela Merkel's power over the EU will be increased substantially should she win the German leadership battle, and the Brexit negotiations will no doubt be influenced mainly by the German government with a little support from the French.

What level playing field

Ryanair has accused Lufthansa and the German government of conspiring to carve up collapsed airline Air Berlin.

Lufthansa is negotiating over buying Air Berlin, which is still flying, following a 150m euro German government loan.

Ryanair has said there was an "obvious conspiracy" between German Lufthansa and Air Berlin to carve up the assets.

The German government has rejected the accusation and said its support for Air Berlin did not breach anti-trust rules.

What if BA received such a UK government loan, we can but guess!

Further EU integration

The future of EU members not in the eurozone is beginning to look very precarious indeed as France and Germany wish to have a single eurozone economy and finance minister.

According to French president Emmanuel Macron in an interview in *Le Point* a French magazine August 31st, "The eurozone should have a sizeable budget of its own and play a more muscular role in the global economy" and that the new euro budget should be worth "several points of the eurozone's GDP" and be funded out of member states' tax incomes.

The eurozone's combined GDP last year was €10.7 trillion.

"The creation of such a budget would first of all mean establishing a minimum level of solidarity to eventually be able to raise money in common, invest, and absorb economic shocks that could hit Europe again." Furthermore, he said "Europe's fiscal policy is too restrictive today compared with those of China, Russia, or the United States, and our jobless are paying the price".

Macron whose popularity has slipped to 40 per cent is also calling for labour law reform in France while at the same time raising the idea of a "European vanguard" to push for more integration.

German chancellor Angela Merkel has nodded to Macron's ideas and said that she "could imagine an economy and finance minister" for the eurozone.

Following the German election in September Macron has promised more concrete proposals.

The Repeal Bill

The Lord Stoddart of Swindon has said: "I welcome the UK Government's Repeal Bill and I sincerely hope that Parliament will now do its duty by the people and pass it through the House of Commons unimpeded.

"It is a great pity that the Bill is a year late as I was advocating that it should happen soon after the referendum result. The intervening year has been costly because it has allowed unpatriotic and anti-democratic Remain politicians to re-group and begin a determined campaign against Brexit. The delay has also given us an unwanted and unnecessary General Election, the result of which has been irresponsibly used by Remainers to further their dangerous campaign against the will of the people.

"The Labour front bench has made clear its opposition to the Bill in its present form but where are the Labour Brexiteers? I am concerned about their continued low profile on this vitally important issue. When are they going to speak up for the will of the people? Now is the time."

The real cost of EU immigration

Extract of an article by Bob Lyddon for the Bruges Group

This is the first part of an article entitled “Unlocking the benefits of leaving the EU”.

“The current Government led by Theresa May has noticeably failed to include any “Brexit dividend” into its policies for the coming 5-year Parliament. This is concerning because it may indicate either that they have not yet figured out the sources and extent of the financial benefits from Brexit, or that they are not going to pursue the negotiations with the EU in order to garner them, or both.

The guideline financial benefit is £50 billion per annum, or £961 million per week: almost three times the “battlebus” figure of £350 million, and approximately the size of the black hole in the Labour Party manifesto pledges for the recent election.

The keys to garnering the difference between the two figures lie in structuring a fair deal on the EU economic migrants already in the UK and on the taxation of corporate profits. “Fair” means fair to the UK population as a whole.

Talk of “a breakthrough” supposedly achieved on the first day of negotiation in the matter of the rights of EU citizens living in the UK must be a concern if this turns out to mean that the *status quo* is preserved for the 3.6 million citizens of other EU countries now living in the UK, since this heading contains the single largest amount of money connected with these negotiations.

It is vital that real “reciprocity” on this matter is achieved: the same amount of money flowing in both directions and for the same amount of time.

This is not the same as striking a deal that has an equivalence in words but not in figures, applying equally to EU citizens here and UK citizens living elsewhere in the EU. There are only 1.2 million UK citizens so affected, and these bald figures do not reflect either the annual cash value of the services delivered in the UK to EU citizens as compared to those delivered to UK citizens in other Member States, nor the age demographic: for what period will these services need to be provided?

Research based on the UK government’s National Labour Survey and issued by Global Britain indicates that the UK subsidises the public services obtained by each of the EU citizens in the UK by just under £10,000 each per annum. This figure is the difference between (i) their direct and indirect tax payments and national insurance contributions on the one hand and (ii) the costs to the UK state deriving from their usage of public services on the other.

In other words, the annual cash cost to the UK state of the 3.6 million EU citizens currently in the UK is £30 billion per annum. If the trade proposed by the UK government involves the exact same cost per head being spent by other EU Member States on UK citizens, then the annual cash cost on that side would be £10 billion, resulting in a net detriment to the UK under this heading of £20 billion per annum.

There is also the question of demographics: if the average UK citizen involved is a pensioner living in Spain and the average EU citizen in the UK is aged 25, then the cost to the UK will be of far longer duration than the cost to the other EU Member States. Mr Davis’ travelling direct to Spain from the first day of negotiations in Brussels could be taken to indicate that it is exactly this type of UK citizen that constitutes the average, and that the main country with whom a deal needs to be done is Spain.

Whatever has actually transpired so far, the UK government needs to now justify whatever position it has taken in the negotiations by qualifying the computations around which it is proposing a “trade” on this issue, based on:

Confirmation of numbers of people involved.

Age demographic – to indicate for how long the people will be contributing funds and drawing benefits.

Analysis of usage of public services:

* in the UK, this would indicate whether the consumption per annum per head is more or less than the £10,500 average
* in other Member States the figures would need to account for the actual cash value of the public services usage and not assume that the level of the service or the cost are the same as the provision in the UK

Analysis of contribution of direct and indirect taxes and national insurance contributions

That analysis will then deliver two figures:

Confirmation, or not, of the estimate above that there is a cost to the UK of £30 billion per annum, and for how long that cost will persist;

The equivalent figure for the 1.2 million UK citizens living in other EU Member States and for how long that will persist. The assumption made in this article that there is a parity of cost-per-head on both sides is no more than that, although the costs on the UK side are based on research undertaken for Global Britain.

These figures can then be expressed as a Net Present Value, and we can then see what money should flow from other EU Member States to the UK as a lump sum, or in the other direction, for the *status quo* to be maintained.

There are, of course, other ways of doing it, to ensure reciprocity, but also to cap the liabilities of the rest of the citizenry of the UK. For example, the rights of EU citizens to continue to live here could simply be curtailed as of March 2019, along with their rights to UK benefits and pensions, beyond a single pension transfer payment that buys as many years of entitlement in the state scheme of their home member state as they have paid NI contributions for into the UK scheme:

The real cost of EU immigration

* They do not retain an entitlement to the UK state pension;
* They get as many years' entitlement in the state system of their home member state as they paid for into the UK scheme.

If this approach were to be adopted, the transfer value of UK citizens' contributions into the state schemes of other member states must be offset against it and those UK citizens awarded as many years of the entitlement in the UK scheme as they accrued in their host member states while abroad.

Another alternative would be for the 1.2 million UK citizens living elsewhere in the EU to apply for nationality in the member state where they are now living, and to continue to accrue rights in the state system there; when they get foreign nationality, they would surrender their UK passport and the UK would pay over a transfer value to buy them as many years of state pension in their new home country as they had accrued while working here.

Were this to be the arrangement, then the 3.6 million EU citizens would be free to apply for UK nationality, and the UK would have to have a scheme to adjudicate whether those applications are accepted. If they are not, the person would be obliged to return to their home member state, and the transfer value of pension rights would be paid over.

The first key point here is that no-one will have dual nationality. The second key point is that there is always a third-party to the tests of fairness of the arrangements, beyond just the UK government and the individual involved. The third-party is the UK taxpayer, who should not be called upon to subsidise any economic migrant. This has been one of the major failings of the EU from a UK perspective and a main cause of the failure to eliminate the public spending deficit.

After the Eurozone debt crisis of 2011 the UK rose in attraction as a place of employment, and the previous Conservative/LibDem government made great play on the increase in numbers of people employed and the increase in GDP that resulted. Unfortunately, and as the National Labour Survey has shown, these were mainly low-skill/low-wage jobs taken by EU economic migrants, and each such job has cost the country money.

In order to block every breach in the financial dam, the UK's negotiators need to make sure there is a comprehensive exit on several other issues including:

Release from all the contingent liabilities associated with (i) the 2013-2022 Multiannual Financial Framework for the EU Budget and for all preceding budget periods; (ii) the European Central Bank; and (iii) the European Investment Bank – EUR1.3 trillion in all;

Buying out the European Investment Bank's loans into the UK and then offsetting - against the reimbursement to the EIB - the UK's book of Student Loans to citizens of other EU Member States who have studied in the UK, taken a UK student loan, and returned to their home countries or elsewhere without repaying it;

No further payments into the EU Budget after March 2019.

If the EU does not agree to all of the above and to one of the approaches outlined regarding citizens living outside their home EU Member State, the UK's fallback would be to open the issue of the past – as well as the future - costs of the 3.6 million migrants and their benefits and pensions. If they are to stay in the UK, their home member state should pay that cost in cash every year, with a mechanism to adjust it annually, and make an upfront payment of the retrospective costs that the UK has already shouldered.

For the future we have to have it in our own hands to define our migrant worker regime for workers from anywhere in the world, and the start point can be a fairly easy one:

1. A maximum six-month visa for seasonal and contract workers, with no access to UK public services: the employer would need to show an insurance policy for healthcare during the worker's stay in the UK and pay – and show they had paid – the premium upfront;
2. A work permit for a permanent, salaried position, as long as the salary is on a PAYE basis and is a minimum £50,000 per annum. The person would have full access to UK public services and the direct and indirect taxation and national insurance would certainly be above the £10,500 average consumption of public services.

As for the other elements of the UK's financial relationship with the EU going forward, these come down to the terms-of-trade.

The two essential elements here are:

What replaces our current membership of the customs union and Single Market;

How we protect ourselves from predatory tax practices of other EU Member States.

The guiding principle is that it is impossible to remain part of the customs union and Single Market and also preclude predatory tax practices.

To solve the latter issue, the UK needs to rewrite its domestic corporate tax code by drawing up industry templates for cost/income ratios through which HMRC could run the group-wide figures of the likes of Google and Amazon, and the many other companies who benefit from the Freedom of Establishment and the sweeteners embedded in the domestic corporate tax codes of Ireland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands in particular."

[It is clear from this article that the UK officials charged with the Brexit negotiations should take a long hard look at the true cost of EU immigration before agreeing to a post-Brexit plan- Ed]

Bob Lyddon is the author of "The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanisms of the European Union".

LETTERS

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

System of government

Dear Sir,
The *eurofacts* article by Hugh Williams - Suggested way forward for UKIP - (21st July 2017) raises significant matter about Britain's political parties and parliamentary system of government.

Are the main political parties approaching a turning point? And why?

Mainly because they are parties of ***class***; and now Britain is in process of becoming an independent multinational state such as the UK has never quite known itself.

What Mr Williams suggests requires a political party that will represent the interests of UK multinational society as a whole. Not any particular class or section. Not business; not labour; not the institutions. Just multinational UK in all its complexities.

This does require a new political party that can offer clear leadership in the period the UK will enter in the coming years.
RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

Harrogate Agenda

Dear Sir,
Hugh Williams 'Suggested way forward for UKIP' of getting more independents into Westminster is not a new idea as it was advocated by Vernon Coleman in his 2009 book 'Bloodless Revolution'. Prompted by this I stood as an independent candidate in 2010 having formed my own party now since dissolved.

The trouble with this proposal is that even if, and it is a big if, enough independent MPs got elected to Westminster they would still be operating in the same corrupted system of governance with no mechanisms in place, apart from General Elections, of keeping independent candidates independent.

This is why I'm now involved with 'The Harrogate Agenda' which has six demands to reform our system of governance. Our proposals for more 'Direct Democracy' has at its heart that it is the people, and not parliament, that must be recognised as sovereign. In this way governments, of any colour or mix, can be made, when required to reflect the will of the majority.

Those that are interested can read more at www.harrogateagenda.org.uk and finally I am absolutely convinced that unless we addresses the fundamental issue of who holds ultimate power in this country any new ideas will simply join the ever increasing list of initiatives that have and will fail.
NIALL WARRY
Somerset

Leadership

Dear Sir,
It's time our politicians got to grips with this. This is how after all the wrangling and in-fighting with a weak Prime minister, who seems not to either care for or know of our history, or as the world sees us.

WEAK, with rubber, not steel in our spines. Get Owen Paterson to stand for PM; the country needs courage, honesty, the integrity of someone with care for this country and people in his heart and a good dollop of commercial nous. There are few enough people who have that, combined with a knowledge of the ancient Constitution and Common Law, that with Magna Carta, has served us well and would continue to do so.

For the love of God and the good of our people, determine to act for all of Great Britain.

(Jorge Valero summed it up - As eurocrats, diplomats, journalists and other inhabitants of the EU bubble pack their swimwear for sunnier destinations, a sense of relief hangs in the air.

The *annus horribilis* Europe faced in 2016 became a near-end scenario in 2017, thanks to the challenge posed by anti-European populist parties in the elections held in the Netherlands and France.

But Geert Wilders' anti-Muslim speech did not convince enough Dutch voters to allow him into government, and France picked Emmanuel Macron, the most pro-European president in decades, over Marine Le Pen.

Macron's victory against that particular bogeyman reinvigorated the Old Continent. Europe's comeback was the new ditty to sing.

And Europe's future finally does look brighter. The economy is regaining so much of its former robustness that, for some, there is no longer any need to speak of a recovery.

The European Commission clearly proved that it has the upper hand in the Brexit talks with a disorganised, weakened British government.)
JOHN B. SEARS
Essex

What a shambles

Dear Sir,
The EU does not understand the word 'negotiation', it instead believes it just dictates terms and the other party has to accept them.

Like every British leader since we joined the European machine 40 years ago in all its various names, David Davis is learning that the EU is just a political dictatorship.

David Cameron tried talking and failed, while Tony Blair gave up part of the UK financial rebate but received nothing in return, except that he is currently kissed and cuddled like an obedient child.

The reason the UK has to leave is because unless you 100% believe in the goal of EU dictatorship then are in the wrong club. The EU treats negotiations just as it treats Referendum results either they agree with the EU or they are told to come back when they do.
ROLAND SIMONS
Buckinghamshire

MEETINGS

FRINGE MEETING
LABOUR CONFERENCE
BRIGHTON

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
020 7388 2259

Monday **25th September,** 5.45 pm

"Keeping Brexit On Track"

Brendan Chilton
Paul Embery, *FBU (Speaking in a Personal Capacity)*
Kate Hoey MP
Kelvin Hopkins MP
Austin Mitchell, *ex MP*
Graham Stringer MP
Chairman, **John Mills**

FRINGE MEETING
Brighton Hotel, 143-145 Kings Road, Brighton BN1 2PQ
(Close to the Conference Centre)
Admission Free
All Welcome

FRINGE MEETING
CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE
MANCHESTER

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Monday **2nd October,** 1.00 pm

"Brexit"

Dr Gerard Lyons, *Advisor to Boris Johnson*
Professor Patrick Minford, CBE, *Economist*
Jacob Rees-Mogg MP
Shanker Singham, *Trade expert*

FRINGE MEETING
The Great Hall, Albert Square, Manchester M60 2LA
Admission Free

FREE - Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations.

eurofacts **Phone: 08456 120 175**
or
Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

The Economic Research Council

Tuesday **3rd October,** 6.30 pm

Dr Graham Gudgin, *Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge*

Thursday **5th October,** 6.30 pm

"Central Bank Engagement with Society" Under Chatham House Rules

Andrew Haldane, *Chief Economist, Bank of England and a member of the Bank's Monetary Policy Committee*

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

Saturday **4th 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.

DIARY OF EVENTS

2017

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

German Election **24th September**

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

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

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

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.

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.

The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanisms of the European Union
by Bob Lyddon. **£8.00**
How the UK's exposure to the EU is over £80 billion and maybe more.

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.

What it Will Look Like
How leaving the EU and the Single Market can be made to work for Britain
by the Bruges Group. **£5.00**
Addressing the main concerns this report shows a clear route out of the EU.

The Dark Side of European Integration
Edited by Anton Shekhovtsov. **£22.99**
How social and cultural issues form radical right movements in the EU.

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.

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

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 Sir Vince Cable	**020 7222 7999**
UK Independence Party Leader - To be announced	**01626 831290**

ISSN 1361-4134

9 771361 413006 01