eurofacts

8TH FEBRUARY 2019 THE REALITY BEHIND EUROPE MONTHLY £3.50

For the economy we are better off out

Extract of a report "**Clean Brexit, Bright Future**" by the Freedom Association

In this part of the report written by Ruth Lea, CBE an economic case for leaving the EU is explained in detail even if 'No Deal'.

...."It has been apparent for many years that the European Union accounts for a diminishing part of the world economy. Its markets are relatively slow growing and its population is ageing. According to the IMF, the EU28 accounted for 30% of world output in 1980 (using market exchange rates conversions) but this had fallen to 16.5% by 2017.... Moreover, the EU's share, along with its influence, will almost certainly continue falling.

When we joined the EEC back in 1973 the mood music was so different. The bloc was thriving, apparently leaving the UK, the "sick man of Europe", trailing in its wake. Putting aside the political considerations for joining the EEC, we were told the economic ones were truly advantageous. Join the EEC and, as if by osmosis, the British economy would be transformed by a new "dynamism". Suffice to say, it did not quite work out like that and it took the truly transforming Thatcher government to tackle the economy's deep-seated problems.

This, however, is history. Fast-forwarding 45 years, we face a fundamentally changed global economy. It is all too apparent that the growth markets of the future will continue to be outside the EU. The EU may have been the future once, but it is not the future now. Under these circumstances, it seems to me to be a "no brainer" that it is economically sub-optimal to remain tied to the European Union, with its antiquated and limiting Customs Union and its regulation-heavy social market model. Of course, business lobbying groups do not see the world this way, dominated as they are by the vested interests of their members. Their view is, however, a static one. They are overwhelmingly concerned with the status quo, rather than on where tomorrow's businesses may be in a fluid, dynamic economy. We should focus on the future....

I have long believed that membership of the EU, tied to the EU's Single Market, with its regulatory straightjacket, and tied to the Customs Union, with the inability to unilaterally negotiate free trade deals and modify tariffs, has been a drag on the UK economy, not an enabler. Crucially, Britain needs to be free of the Customs Union and the Single Market in order to have the necessary freedoms to deliver a potential post-Brexit competitiveness boost to the British economy. This is the true post-Brexit dividend. This paper assumes, as a working assumption, that there will be a clean break, out of the Single Market and out of the Customs Union. Anything else would be selling our economic prospects short, as well as being a political betrayal of the referendum result.

My preference until recently has been for a straightforward trade deal broadly based on the continuation of tariff-free trade for goods and a special arrangement for financial services. Both of these policies would be mutually beneficial. Indeed, arguably, tariff-free trade helps EU exporters to the UK more than UK exporters to the EU, given the EU's enormous goods surplus with the UK - £95bn in 2017. Some claim there is a need for "regulatory alignment" and, of course, British exporters to the EU will have to conform to EU product standards after Brexit, as they have to conform to US product standards when they export to the US. But there is no need to conform to labour market regulations, for example. Post-Brexit we must be able to decide our own regulatory regime as befits the needs of the country. Concerning financial services, Bank Governor Mark Carney has been commendably robust in his assessment that the City, as Europe's banker, provides considerable benefits for our EU partners as well as benefiting the UK. Some arrangement on financial services would, therefore, have made commercial sense.

I now take the view that such a vanilla, Canada-style free trade agreement is no longer on the cards. Our negotiators have gone for a BRINO-style Brexit instead, potentially tying the UK to the EU in many ways for years to come. Given these circumstances, a "no trade deal"

Continued on page 2

INSIDE: *A gentle reminder for John Bercow p 2* – ***Does power come from the people p 3*** - *How EU spends tax payers' money p 3* – ***What future for the eurozone p 4*** - *The Noe's have it...May's deal failed p 4* – ***Irish renuification p 4*** - *No deal Brexit not a problem p 5* – ***Letters p 6***

For the economy we are better off out

Continued from page 1

outcome, trading under WTO rules, would be far preferable.

There are many misconceptions about the "WTO option", some doubtless mischievously promoted. It has been variously dubbed as "falling off a cliff" and/or "crashing out". But a sober analysis makes it perfectly clear that the WTO option is not just feasible but would provide this country with the economic freedom it needs to make the best of Brexit.

Some very basic points need emphasising. Firstly, we are already WTO members, have been since its inception and we will continue to be members. No lesser person than Roberto Azevêdo, the Director General of the WTO, made this very clear in October 2016. Secondly, disciplined rules based on the principle of non-discrimination are at the heart of the WTO's trading regime. Specifically, once a "domestic" standard has been imposed, it must be generalised to foreign countries' exporters. The EU cannot therefore discriminate against UK exporters assuming the latter comply with EU standards. Thirdly, the WTO has made huge strides in facilitating trade across customs borders in recent years. Under the landmark Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA), developed countries with adequate resources are expected to install state-of-the-art border systems in order that trade should not be impeded. Streamlined, computerised borders are now the norm.

The WTO's rule-based trading regime is comprehensive, tried and tested, and respected by the world's trading nations. It is not some dreadful leap into the dark. Moreover, the UK already conducts over 55% of its exports trade with non-EU members, primarily under WTO rules. Even if allowance is made for those non-EU countries that have preferential trade deals with the EU, which may not immediately carry over on Brexit, about half of our exports go to the remaining non-EU countries. However, it makes sense for the current FTAs the EU has with Switzerland, Norway and Korea, in particular, to be grandfathered. They would be mutually beneficial.

.....Growth rates in British exports in goods and services between 2007 and 2017 for Britain's key trading partners .....key aggregates, show that total exports grew by over 60% over this period, whilst exports to the EU and the non-EU expanded by around 40% and 80% respectively. ..... It is clear where the growth markets are. Unsurprisingly, the share of Britain's exports going to EU markets is in inexorable secular decline, in spite of the avowed benefits of the Customs Union and the Single Market, reflecting the EU's relatively slow growth.

Trade, therefore, can thrive under WTO rules, given favourable commercial circumstances, and there is little doubt that this would continue to be the case if the UK opted for the WTO option. Trade is overwhelmingly driven by commercial realities, irrespective of membership of the much vaunted single market – which, incidentally, we would still have access to under WTO rules, as a third country...."

A gentle reminder for John Bercow

In 1998 in his pamphlet "*Aiming for the Heart of Europe: A Misguided Venture*" the current House of Commons Speaker, John Bercow MP spelled out clearly the problems with EU integration and his view of Britain outside the EU.

The following extract at least shows he did once understand!

"Allied to a crusading internationalism in trade and diplomacy is the self confidence to preserve our own institutions. Where other countries have suffered dictatorship, civil war or foreign occupation the British experience has fortunately been different. What some see as insularity by Britain, is a justified attachment to the way in which we run our affairs, Napoleon said that a nation's policy is determined by its geography. If that is so we do well to remember that Britain is not at the heart of Europe but on her western edge.

Policy needs to be determined by successful history and present need. In the spirit of liberty, democracy and the pursuit of prosperity, we need for the second time since 1943 to reverse a ratchet, Keith Joseph and Margaret Thatcher identified the socialist ratchet that undermined our prosperity at home, lowered our esteem abroad and sapped our faith in ourselves. They set out to reverse that ratchet and they succeeded. Today the task is to recognise that there is a ratchet for European Integration. As the federalist juggernaut speeds ahead, ever more power is taken from the peoples of Europe and handed to unelected bankers, bureaucrats and judges.

The people of Britain will never knowingly consent to be governed by those who do not speak their language, live in their country or depend upon their votes. The power of self-government, the right to hire and fire our rulers and the capacity to chart our own destiny, are inalienable birthrights. They should not be traded in for a mess of portage otherwise known as a back seat at a show called 'The Heart of Europe'. Our destiny is surely as a self-governing nation which trades freely with the world. The future is bright; the future is global. Our success in it is dependent upon the vision, self-confidence and calibre of our leaders, our business and our workforce."

{Perhaps it would be a good idea if the speaker of the House re-read his own analysis of the EU. He could then update the House of Commons in a more informative way as his position in the House requires.}

Does power come from the people

David Barnby

Power springs, or should spring, from the people. This is a given, if not, then common people are slaves – which they shouldn't be.

The notion is clearly accepted, as otherwise we wouldn't have law makers elected by the people in general elections.

Therefore, it follows that it is the people, not parliament, that are sovereign.

But politicians nowadays like to claim that it's parliament that is sovereign and simultaneously assert there is no written constitution. But this self-empowering claim has been rebutted by parliament itself on several occasions. Furthermore, MPs have used the Bill of Rights in their defence in the recent expenses scandals.

It is true that parliament has a limited sovereignty from general election to general election, but it has to return powers 'lent' from the people at the end of each parliamentary term. Furthermore, parliamentary power is, or should be, limited by the constitution which is generally recognised as including: Magna Carta, The Accession Oath (Coronation Oath), Declaration and Bill of Rights (1688(9), Act of Settlement 1700.

From time to time, governments decide that an issue is so contentious and so fundamental that it is beyond the power of parliament and the government to decide. On such occasions it has been the practise to turn the decision over to the people, again recognising the sovereignty of the people.

In 2016 the Government deferred to the electorate the decision as to whether the United Kingdom should remain in the European Union (EU) or leave. This was the second referendum on membership of a European institution, the first being 41 years earlier, in 1975, when the electorate was asked, retrospectively, whether they wanted to remain in the, then, European Economic Community (Common Market) a trading arrangement, not a governing body as the EU had become. This referendum was not before time, as much power had ebbed away through a series of treaties signed by the UK government in the intervening 41 years.

Voting areas across the country chose, overwhelmingly (68%), to leave, although the majority by numbers of voters was much less at some 52%.

After the referendum Professor Vernon Bogdanor, a constitutional expert, declared:

"After the referendum, the people, not parliament, are sovereign"

Professor Bogdanor got it half right; but what was wrong was his assertion that the people only became sovereign after the referendum.

Anyway, the decision to 'leave' (there were no conditions laid down in the Referendum Act, such as needing a 'deal' to do so) was a constitutional act made outside and above the remit of parliament and by a sovereign peoples.

The duty of the government after the decision to leave was simple: to implement the terms of Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty and ensure repatriation of powers from the EU at the termination of the Article 50 period. And since the decision to leave was outside the remit of parliament, - it having been entrusted to those whom they represented, there should have been no further part played by parliament and certainly it is unconstitutional for parliament to obstruct the 'leaving' process as it has been doing.

This was recognised by the Government and was using the instruction to leave and proceeding with the leaving process until pro-EU forces intervened and took the issue to court. We all remember what happened next – judicial activism intervened and an unconstitutional ruling was made that has led to defiance of the 'People's Vote' in 2016.

So where do we stand? The judicial ruling to hand the issue back to parliament is illegal and illegitimate for the reasons spelt out above. There should be legal action to reverse the judge's ruling, but that would probably be impossible if for the simple reason anti-Brexit forces have all the money (corporate money).

If Brexit *is* overturned (or we leave 'in name only') and we continue to be ruled by the unelected Brussels corporatist oligarchy, we are faced paying our taxes and obeying laws we played no part (through the democratic process) in making – an unendurable plight indeed.

Unendurable, because the government machinery can count on a tame media and forces of repression to do with us what they will.

How EU spends tax payers' money

According to the *Daily Mail*, European Commission president Jean-Claude Junker, chartered private jets for 21 out of 43 official trips between January and November 2018. Furthermore, travel costs for a 13-strong delegation one-night trip to Tunisia amounted to 36,000 euros and a dinner with world leaders in Finland before the European People's Party conference cost 26,000 euros. Air-taxis should only be used when no suitable commercial flight can be found.

Luckily for him his travel costs are unlimited.

Where the money will be found for all this extravagance after the UK no longer subsides the EU gravy train has not yet been explained. Perhaps the German's will decide to pay in more money, but more likely it is expected that those who receive EU payments will find they have to be reduced even those CAP payments.

What future for the eurozone

AS the EU celebrate twenty years of the euro currency it is time to take stock of the current position.

The eurozone economy is falling, according to the European Statistic Agency, Germany's economy contracted in the third quarter of 2018, dented by weaker exports.

Figures have shown that Europe's largest economy shrunk by 0.2% between July and September, as global trade disputes had a knock-on effect for Europe's largest economy.

It was the economy's first quarter fall since 2015.

Meanwhile, the eurozone economy as a whole grew by the slowest rate for four years in the third quarter.

What about future problems? One major problem could well come from the UK's intention of successfully implement Brexit and how this would affect the remaining eight members of the EU who have not adopted the euro?

In June 2018 the Franco-German alliance had proposed to set up a separate Eurozone budget, this was successfully objected to at the time by the non-euro members however, without the UK (being one of the larger members) will the remaining non-euro members be able to stop this proposal from eventually becoming activated? Time will tell but the omens do not look good!

The EU's aim of ever closer union drives its agenda for political and economic harmonisation, could well force the non-euro members to reconsider their EU membership.

The non-euro countries: Bulgaria, Denmark, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Sweden could well find that they could be forced to adopt the euro by the 19 members using the rules of unanimity or consensus in the areas like the EU multi-financial framework (MFF).

The EU's prime objective is to preserve the euro at all cost's and to increase the number of members in order to gain economic control over the whole of the EU. It appears that the three poorest members Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania are the most likely to join the euro first however, they will need to gain support from their public as well as improving their economic and structural situation prior to joining.

Excluding Denmark and presently the UK all the other EU members have already agreed legally to join the euro, luckily for them a timetable for this has not as yet being specified.

The Noe's have it...May's deal failed

Roger Wright-Morris - *Extract of an article from www.concordanceout.eu*

It has been said many times that life is simple with a reasonable approach and a strong Will - it takes politicians to make it seriously complicated and deceitful.

An evening of irony on the 15th January 2019 is the only way to describe the 'Meaningful Vote' afforded Parliament as the result of a citizen intervention with a legal process coupled with the Speaker's avoidance of tradition and established procedures in the normal working process of Parliament.

Calling, staging, and counting the Referendum Votes of the Electorate were the easy parts.

The 'Meaningful Vote' on the misguided [more Betrayal] Withdrawal Agreement has left everyone, Leave or Remain, unhappy; a 230 "Noe" majority.

The efforts of two and a half years work by our elected representatives and one leading Senior Civil Servant to implement the simple Will of the majority of the electorate – to Leave the European Union – has only resulted in the Will of the majority being frustrated, opposed, or ignored by all in Parliament. The EU played its unwilling inflexible part too.

The irony is that it took both sides in Parliament, the "majority Leavers" and the "minority Remainers" working together to end up defeating the Withdrawal Agreement.

The greater irony is that both government and opposition benches originally voted for the Referendum to take place. After the 2016 People's Vote produced a clear democratic result, these same politicians (for the most part Labour and Conservative) then campaigned in a general election to Leave the EU; on being returned to Parliament these MPs then assented to the essential and required Repeal legislation to act on the Referendum result on the 29th March 2019 – including approving the issue of the Notification Letter under Article 50 the EU confirming the UK's intention to leave the EU....

Note: The ECJ decision on legal rights regarding revoking Article 50 clearly states that there would be no further right to utilise Article 50 by that member state. Revocation is therefore out of the question for any further discussion by those Remainers seeking any excuse to prolong the UK departure period.

Irish reunification

Is the Irish government holding out on Brexit in the hope that they can get back Northern Ireland and reunite Ireland?

Ireland's Sinn Fein party leader, Mary Lou McDonald, is reported in the *Irish Times* as telling Brexit negotiator Michael Barnier that if the UK "crashes out [of the EU], there will inevitably be a hardening of the border" and that therefore, the next logical step, would then be for the government in Dublin to start preparations for a referendum on unification.

No deal Brexit not a problem

Open Europe's report:

" No Deal: The Economic Consequences and How They Could Be Mitigated"

In response to the fears of a "No Deal" Brexit" the *Open Europe* report of 5th October makes very informative reading.

"This macroeconomic study of the impact of a 'No Deal' Brexit concludes that a United Kingdom withdrawal from the European Union without a preferential trade deal would not be ideal and would bring some material costs. However, it would be a relatively mild negative economic event. Brexit will therefore not be the determining factor for the UK economy's medium-term growth prospects. Open Europe's strong recommendation remains that the Government seeks to secure a negotiated exit from the EU, while also being prepared for all scenarios including a 'No Deal' exit in March 2019.

Our model suggests that a No Deal Brexit would mean the UK economy continuing to grow but with an effect equivalent to an average annual drag of -0.17% on real GDP growth over the 13 years up to 2030. This could be reduced to an average reduction in growth of -0.04% a year if the government deploys maximum mitigation measures in the form of unilateral trade liberalisation. The economic impact of an exit on so-called World Trade Organisation (WTO) terms is, over a 13 year period, small. And as we go on to demonstrate, the effects are limited in comparison with the forecasting noise typically seen in GDP models.

Key Findings

Open Europe's new study of the macroeconomic impact of a No Deal Brexit comes to three important conclusions:

1) UK withdrawal from the European Union without a preferential trade deal is sub-optimal and would bring a small material economic cost equivalent to an annual drag on growth of -0.17% per annum for thirteen years to 2030. However this cost is limited in absolute terms, but also relative to other factors affecting medium term UK economic growth. To put this in context estimates suggest that the construction of an additional 30,000 houses per year would more than compensate a -0.17% drag on GDP. We agree with the Office for Budget Responsibility's conclusion that the impact of Brexit "is likely to be relatively small compared to the degree of uncertainty surrounding the underlying path" of UK economic growth.

2) This economic drag could be reduced to an average reduction in growth of -0.04% a year if the government deploys maximum mitigation measures in the form of unilateral trade liberalisation.

3) Whilst the costs of 'no deal' are material, they are much milder than is generally assumed and the terms of the UK's departure from the EU are very unlikely to be the determining factor for the UK economy's medium-term and long-term growth prospects.

There are two elements to this study:

The first quantifies the impact of a No Deal Brexit against a baseline projection of future UK economic performance. The modelling exercise includes the assumption that a tariff wall and customs border would be imposed between the UK and the EU, and accounts for the emergence of some non-tariff barriers to UK-EU bilateral trade.

The second quantifies the UK's ability to mitigate the effects of a No Deal Brexit by unilaterally removing UK tariffs on EU trade (as well as on trade with the Rest of the World) and unilaterally moving the UK to globally least-restrictive standards for services and foreign direct investment.

The modelling suggests that the cumulative effects of a No Deal Brexit would see the UK's real GDP growing overall but with the economy 2.2% smaller in real terms by 2030 than would have otherwise been the case. Unilateral liberalisation would see the UK recover up to 1.7% of that reduction in real GDP over the same period, with the net effect leaving UK real GDP 0.5% lower in 2030 than would have otherwise been the case.

Our study does not consider the one-time costs faced by government and business of adjusting to Brexit, nor does the model capture the sector-specific impact on deeply integrated UK-EU supply chains, such as on the automotive sector, which is likely to be negative. At the same time, these figures do not account for the cessation of the UK's net fiscal contribution to the EU budget, which would have a positive effect on UK GDP.

The size of these Brexit impacts is small compared to other long-term economic factors that are likely to drive future UK growth. For example, a June 2017 PwC study estimated that UK GDP could be 10.3% higher by 2030 as a result of advances in Artificial Intelligence.

In summary, we can see no relationship between the cold numbers of our economic analysis, which are in line with other comparable studies, and the rhetoric of those who argue that Brexit will make a dramatic difference to Britain's growth trajectory in either a negative or positive direction. Leaving on WTO terms is not Open Europe's preferred option but in narrowly economic terms it would not, according to this model, be an unreasonable path for the UK to take, if a negotiated exit was unavailable."

Yet again we see a sensible analysis of the threats to the UK economy from leaving the narrow world of the EU into the wider world are of little importance considering the gains.

Source: openeurope.org.uk

LETTERS

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

Parallel Marketability

Dear Sir,
Now MPs have rejected her EU 'deal' Prime Minister Theresa May has invited opposition parties to suggest ways forward.

This prompted me to wonder whether she asked the SNP contingent to brief her on the principle of "parallel marketability", which their party mooted as a possible route to maintaining Scotland's free trade with both the EU and the rest of the UK.

From paragraph 152 in the Scottish government document "Scotland's Place in Europe:

"The laws of the European Single Market would apply only to those goods and services traded between Scotland and the rest of the European Single Market. For instance, a manufacturer based in Scotland with customers throughout the remainder of the UK would continue to be able to trade freely. If the manufacturer also conducts business within the European Single Market they would be required to continue to demonstrate that their products complied with the requirements of relevant EU Directives and Regulations. In essence, this involves applying the principle of "parallel marketability" whereby goods and services originating in Scotland may be legally marketed in both the UK and the EEA."

This suggested sauce for the Scottish goose could equally well serve as sauce for the Northern Irish gander, making it possible to keep the Irish land border as open as now even if there were different product standards on either side.

And in practice rather than theory, as pointed out in past letters including some copied to the Prime Minister, this is how the border between Liechtenstein and Switzerland can be kept open for free movement of goods – a case which UK officials were said to be studying as long ago as last May.

Recently Andrew Marr in his show kept pressing Theresa May to agree that the UK government should compromise, but it is the EU which needs to compromise by accepting that what matters for the integrity of its Single Market is not what goods may be in circulation within Northern Ireland but only what goods cross the land border into the Irish Republic.

It is now the established EU mindset that you can only have frictionless trade in goods between two countries if they have full regulatory alignment of their entire economies; in fact that was not always the case, and it was largely through eurofederalist ECJ judgments that it became the EU norm to insist that standards must be "approximated" or "harmonised" whether goods are for domestic consumption or for export to other member states.

DR. D. R. COOPER
Berkshire

No deal

Dear Sir,
It strikes me as amazing that so-called intelligent politicians believe that if you rule out 'No deal' the other side will somehow want to make a deal.

In regard to the UK/EU situation it is very clear that the EU wishes the UK to remain inside the EU and continue subsidising its development into a single entity controlling all aspects of business and citizens lives. Therefore, ruling out a 'No deal' is exactly what the EU requires and will mean that the EU has no reason to offer any kind of reasonable deal to the UK. Furthermore, it would just encourage the EU to continue on its path to ever-closer union both political and economic.

Those politicians calling for a 'No deal' should be open about their desire to be ruled by unelected foreigners and do the honest thing, leave the UK government as they do not wish to represent the citizens of the UK.

The time has come to elect only those politicians that actually want to be able to make laws that UK citizens want and support. The referendum decision was clear and unambiguous, the people do not want to go in the direction the EU is travelling in and the time has come to leave now.

SALLY RICHARDS
Manchester

No need for delay

Dear Sir,
The idea that we should delay Brexit is both pointless and economically damaging!

Businesses and the people of the EU and the UK want to just get to the final destination as quickly as possible. The only way that businesses can continue to trade successfully and profitably is when they are certain of the result.

Delaying would just create more uncertainty and achieve nothing but more unrest, politicians would continue to play games with the situation as we have seen since the referendum vote of 2016.

DAVID SQUIRES
West Midlands

Negotiating folly

Dear Sir,
Since the 2016 referendum we have seen that the political elite have failed to understand how you negotiate.

The idea that you pay £39 billion first and then decide whether a trade agreement can be found is folly in the extreme, some may call it blackmail.

A mutually beneficial trade agreement should have been the first item on the agenda. Instead the UK allowed the EU to demand money first with little hope of a sensible trade agreement being reached. The UK will be paying £39 billion for nothing but a good will gesture.

CARLA GREEN
Plymouth

MEETINGS

The Economic Research Council in association with KPMG

Wednesday **27th February,** 6.30 pm

"The History of Tax Policy and its Future"

Gemma Tetlow, *Chief economist Institute for Government*

PUBLIC MEETING
Royal Overseas League, Royal Overseas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London SW1A 1LR
Admission by ticket
(Non-ERC members £15 - Students £10) please contact www.ercouncil.org

---

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **7th March**, 6.00 pm

"Politics and the Legal Profession"

Jo Delahunty QC, *Gresham Professor of Law*

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **13th March**, 6.00 pm

"Brexit and the Future of Britain"

Vernon Bogdanor, *Emeritus Professor of Law*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2
Admission Free
(Reservations Required)

The Economic Research Council in association with KPMG

Wednesday **20th March,** 6.30 pm

"The Half-Life of Economic Injustice"

Professor David Miles, *Imperial College, London*

PUBLIC MEETING
Royal Overseas League, Royal Overseas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London SW1A 1LR
Admission by ticket
(Non-ERC members £15 - Students £10) please contact www.ercouncil.org

---

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **2nd April**, 1.00 pm

"Political Spending on the Internet"

Professor Lori Ringhand, *University of Aberdeen*

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

Current Official date for completion of Article 50 negotiations between the UK and the EU and start of a possible 'Transition Deal' due to end in December 2020 — **29th March**

EU post-Brexit Summit Sibiu, Romania — **May**

EU MEP elections — **23rd-26th May**

Finland takes over EU Council Presidency — **1st July**

2020

Croatia takes over EU Council Presidency — **1st January**

Germany takes over Council Presidency — **1st July**

Current Official date for completion of EU/UK Transition — **31st December**

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
Concordance
www.concordanceout.eu
Democracy Movement
www.democracymovement.org.uk
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 means leave
www.leavemeansleave.eu
Leave.eu
www.Leave.eu
New Alliance
www.newalliance.org.uk
Open Europe
www.openeurope.org.uk
Save Britain's Fish
www.ffl.org.uk
Statewatch
www.statewatch.org
The Taxpayers' Alliance
www.taxpayersalliance.com
United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org

THE JUNE PRESS - BOOKS

Special Offers

Elephant In The Room
by David Challice
£6.99 -2016 - 311 pp
The EU 2008-16 in bite size chunks
(NOW ONLY £3)

Whip's Nightmare
Diary of a Maastricht Rebel
by Christopher Gill
£17.50 -2003 - 242 pp
A fascinating insight to how parliament pressures MPs to obey party directions.
(NOW ONLY £8)

Europe: A Concise Encyclopedia of the European Union
by Rodney Leach
£14.99 -2004 - 249 pp 4th Ed.
A jargon free guide to the EU speak and its organisations.
(NOW ONLY £7)

The Ratchet: A Cool Look at the EU
by John Rennie Stewardson
£6.99 -2000 - 144 pp
The way the EU works using the ratchet effect to snare power from its members.
(NOW ONLY £3)

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P
(UK only)

www.junepress.com

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 Democratic Imperative
by Robert Corfe. **£12.99**
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 Betrayal of British Industry
by J. Brian Heywood. **£3.00**
How government has failed to protect the UK industrial sector from foreign companies, putting at risk the long-term economic prosperity of the UK.

Costly Affairs In British Foreign Policy
The advantages of foresight
by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.00**
Why you do not need to go to war or take hostile action against any country whose regime you dislike

Tel: 08456 120 175

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.

The Euro's Battle for Survival
Entering the Red Zone
by Bob Lyddon. **£5.00**
Why the eurozone and its policies are facing a further financial crisis.

Moralitis
A Cultural Virus
by Robert Oulds and Niall McCrae. **£5.00**
How the forces of conformity are such that freedom is limited and the body politic has become infected with the methods of prevention and treatment.

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.

UK PLEASE ADD 10% P&P
Send payment to

JUNE PRESS LTD, PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA
Email: info@junepress.com
www.junepress.com

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 **020 7222 9000**
Rt Hon Mrs Theresa May MP

English Democrats **01277 896000**
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)

Green Party **020 7272 4474**
Jonathan Bartley and Sian Berry

Labour **020 7783 1000**
Jeremy Corbyn MP

Liberal **01562 68361**
Mr Rob Wheway

Liberal Democrats **020 7222 7999**
Rt Hon Sir Vince Cable

UK Independence Party **01626 831290**
Acting leader Gerard Batten MEP

ISSN 1361-4134
06 >
9 771361 413006