

## Legal changes to the Brexit deal are possible

Despite the EU's constant assertion that nothing can change on the deal currently offered, the history of the EU tells a different story.

In a briefing note (February 2019), Open Europe's Dominic Walsh examines previous occasions when the EU has shown flexibility to facilitate the domestic ratification of a contentious treaty, and argues something similar is needed now on the backstop.

### **Legal changes to the Brexit deal? Four examples when the EU revisited deals they had already signed off.**

"The briefing includes a foreword by Nick Herbert, the Conservative MP for Arundel & South Down.

After the Withdrawal Agreement was voted down in Parliament on January 15th by 230 votes, the UK Government has focused on seeking changes to the Protocol on Northern Ireland and Ireland, known as the 'backstop'. It remains the case that, unless and until the UK ratifies the Withdrawal Agreement, or revokes Article 50, the legal default remains that the UK will leave the EU without a deal. The European Council President has said that the EU's "most important task is to prevent a No Deal Brexit". How can that be done?

Parliament has sent some mixed signals recently about what it would require to ratify an agreement with the EU, but it has never shown a majority

for revoking Article 50 directly or via a referendum. However, the decisive majority in favour of the Brady amendment showed that with further clarifications on the operation of the backstop, a potential majority exists for a version of the negotiated Withdrawal Agreement.

This paper outlines four historical precedents when the EU agreed additional legally-binding protocols or instruments, in order to help secure ratification of treaties or agreements which had already been signed off by its leaders. None offer an exact parallel for the UK's current situation, but they show how the EU has been able to act flexibly in the past.

One such scenario involved Ireland itself, which required changes to the Lisbon Treaty to allow it to complete domestic ratification. Although the protocol which the EU then agreed did not directly contradict that treaty, it did in fact rule out certain options which the treaty had created as the default (namely a reduction in the number of EU commissioners). It changed the legal position.

Another important example comes in the case of Denmark's ratification of the Maastricht Treaty. At that time, some Danish parliamentarians and critics sought commitments in international law not just because of their concern about what the EU might do in future, but as a protection from their own government's ability to pursue further integration measures without popular consent. That has parallels to the current impasse where

some within parliament, such as the DUP, want to see assurances on how the UK government will operate the backstop in the future, particularly in relation to East-West checks. Some of these assurances have already been promised as a matter of policy or domestic law by Her Majesty's Government. However, the DUP seek commitments in international law – which the EU can provide by offering legal recognition to UK commitments.

There are also two more recent examples of EU flexibility which are explored in this paper. These are the Joint Interpretative Instrument to the EU-Canada trade deal (agreed to reassure the concerns expressed by the Wallonian Parliament), and the Dutch addendum to the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement.

Some have argued that while the EU is prepared to make concessions for existing member states in order to conclude an internal or external treaty, it will not – or should not – make such a concession for a departing member state. But this is a political argument rather than a substantive one, and risks making a virtue of inflexibility. It also remains the case that the UK is currently an EU member state, albeit one that has decided to leave. Finding a solution that is acceptable to both parties is key to building a sustainable long-term relationship between the bloc and its former member. The stakes are high, and the case for a compromise is strong."

Source: [openeurope.org.uk](http://openeurope.org.uk)

# Germany's defence policy

David Banks

Germany's low defence spending is a natural consequence of its leaders' *Weltanschauung* (world view), which has prioritised the supranational over the national, especially in defence and foreign policy.

Germany has put considerable political capital behind the aggregation of defence policy towards the EU institutions. Many of the component parts of the aggregation plan were conceived in Germany – not least Angela Merkel's CDU party friend and colleague Elmar Brok MEP, who as chairman of the European Parliament Committee on Foreign Affairs is credited with inventing PESCO.

German leaders are happy to keep their forces in a state of dilapidation. The only incentive for maintaining an Armed Forces at all is Germany's interest in asserting a leading position and therefore influence in 'Common Defence' once the EU Council and Commission complete it in five years' time.

'Common Defence' means placing defence as an EU competence, with a central budget within the EU Multiannual Financial Framework. (German budget predictions appear to

end at 2023, but that might be a coincidence).

Observers should note the crucial difference between two similar sounding concepts: Common Security and Defence Policy, and Common Defence. In EU jargon, Common Security and Defence Policy is the policy programme or 'journey', whereas Common Defence is the end goal or 'destination'. The Lisbon Treaty describes this as follows:

*'The (European) Union's competence in matters of common foreign and security policy shall cover all areas of foreign policy and all questions relating to the (European) Union's security, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy that might lead to a common defence.'*

Meanwhile, the EU has identified 2025 as a date by which Common Defence could be achieved. Although this was proposed as one of three 'options' in the EU's 2017 Reflection Paper on the Future of EU Defence (the other two being little change from status quo), the mechanisms towards this 'option' are actually already well underway – via (for example) the integration of defence capabilities;

defence industrial functions; joint budgets; and a new military HQ. The EU appears not to be entertaining the prospect that the more modest options for CSDP will be applied.

Statements from the Berlaymont (the EU Commission headquarters) and the European External Action Service (EEAS, the EU's diplomatic service and foreign and defence ministry) increasingly reflect this accelerated timetable towards Common Defence, after the EU president initially presented it as a mere 'option' a couple of years ago.

Few defence commentators talk about this as it sounds far-fetched, and they mostly don't take EU Commission planning documents seriously.

Common Defence is however a reality. The EU has used Brexit as cover for rapid manoeuvres in defence integration – in the same way it was seen after 9/11 to push Justice and Home Affairs policies and new competencies which had been formally binned by the Council in the preceding year.

Source: 12th April, [www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk](http://www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk)

## Puppet Parliament

We reproduce below an article posted by Sir John Redwood MP on the 13th April which he headed:

### The puppet Parliament becomes more pathetic

"This Parliament is determined to thwart the will of the voters who decided to leave the EU. It is equally determined to show it does not want to take back control. MP's queue up in debates to tell us EU laws and rules are best, and try to find ways of extending or protecting them. They have no faith in our collective ability to choose wise and good laws for ourselves. They doubt Leave MPs when we assure them we will keep the good laws from the EU, as they will all be incorporated

into UK law. What I want to change are some of the VAT laws that make us impose tax on green products and domestic fuel, the corporation tax decisions that cut the tax we imposed, the fishing laws and the others that have done economic damage to us.

The behaviour is worrying and bizarre. Why get yourself elected to a body designed to make laws and to influence government policy if you want our laws to be made across the Channel instead? Why draw a salary if you think you cannot improve on what the EU does?

Parliament usually wants the government to spend more on the favoured causes of MP's and some of their constituents. Yet when it comes to finding a big pot of money to spend at

home by stopping sending large sums to the EU, most MP's flip over and tell us we must keep on sending as much money to Brussels as possible, even after we have left.

Many MP's have torn up their promises to their electors from 2017 when all Conservative and Labour candidates fought on a ticket of implementing the referendum. They have done so knowing they will alienate the Leave majority in the country, and will not impress the many Remain voters who want Brexit finished with and who accept the majority verdict. It is difficult to grasp why so many only want the votes of the minority who reject the verdict of the referendum who presumably voted Lib Dem in 2017."

# The exit deal - Defence risks

According to Veterans for Britain posting an article on the 27th March headed “**The Exit Deal - Defence Risks and Booby Traps**” as shown below should indeed be an area of great concern for the UK electorate.

“The Withdrawal Agreement and Political Declaration would harm British defence autonomy because they contain implied commitments to new EU Defence governance structures. They call for UK participation ‘to the extent possible under EU law’ in;

- \* The European Defence Fund - defence purchasing budget and a tool for policy compliance;

- \* EU Permanent Structural Cooperation - permanent integration of defence capabilities and control;

- \* EU Defence Agency - promotes integration via EU defence policy and acts as governance body for the EU Commission’s defence budget schemes.

The first two are new since the Brexit vote, and the third has seen its remit greatly expanded. All of this has

happened with UK ministers bypassing Parliamentary scrutiny to provide consent at EU Council. This alone should never have happened.

## Extent possible under EU law

EU law permits non-EU states to participate in the above if they commit to the wider EU Defence policy structures which is enshrined in EU Council agreements and being rolled out gradually in the months and years ahead. This includes;

- \* A mechanism for steering participant states’ Defence budgets (CARD);

- \* A new military HQ (MPCC), notwithstanding the UK’s past veto;

- \* Centralised intelligence sharing for projects and missions the EU chooses to undertake;

- \* Budgets; Cash-for-compliance, bribing states with their own money (Athena, CARD, EU Defence Fund + incentive link to PESCO); Further financial schemes to integrate EU member states’ military spending programmes, such as Cooperative Financial Mechanism;

- \* A larger EU role in developing,

purchasing, licensing and using defence technology (ERDP);

- \* Defence industrial rules enforcing transnational contracting (tighter EU Defence Directive);

- \* Politically tying in UK funds still sitting in the European Investment Bank;

- \* The UK adopts new decisions under EU defence policy and is even obliged to allow EU defence policy to be ‘promoted’ through Government and officialdom. (ESDC);

- \* New governance structures for EU programmes, where EU institutions such as European; Defence Agency set budget, appoint advisers and managers and control licensing rules;

- \* Obligations to participate in European Defence Agency-led integration schemes via EU defence policy.

Ministers have created future UK participation arrangements for all these structures and have even entered trials for most of the new ones.

Source: [www.veteransforbritain.uk](http://www.veteransforbritain.uk)

## Halloween Brexit

The Brexit can has been kicked down the road yet again with the European Council agreeing to a Brexit extension to 31st October - Halloween. The proposed extension was formally agreed in a letter to Donald Tusk from the UK’s ambassador to the EU Sir Tim Barrow, despite prime minister Theresa May telling the House of Commons last month that she was “not prepared to delay Brexit any further than June 30th”. Her word proves worthless yet again...

If we don’t get a new leader soon, expect Halloween to simply be another stopgap ahead of another extension, much as April 12th was. Remember we were meant to leave on March 29th. We were then told the exit date was tomorrow unless we passed May’s wretched withdrawal agreement, which we did not.

With a European Council scheduled on October 17th, expect another delay to March 31st 2020 ahead of EU budget discussions in April unless we find ourselves with a leader with the vision and courage to take us out of the European project without a deal.

The Tories remain in free fall in the opinion polls because of May’s horrific mishandling of the Brexit process. A new poll from BMG Research shows the Conservatives down ten points to 29% while UKIP and the Brexit Party both surge. Labour are also down three points, but command a two point lead over the Tories.

What an absolute shambles. With May handing control of Brexit over to Corbyn with cross-party talks, it’s only appropriate that her incompetence might well usher in a Marxist-led government too.

The need for fresh leadership in the

Tory Party is clearer than ever. If May doesn’t have the decency to resign today, her hand might well be forced by enterprising Conservative backbenchers. Due to a quirk in the Conservative Party constitution, May is presently immune from another leadership ballot until January next year.

But the constitution does have a provision to amend the constitution with a petition of 10,000 Tory members. The *Telegraph* reported several MPs are trying to organise such a document to pave the way for an early leadership vote, working with friendly association chairmen to spread the word. We wonder if they’ve taken any inspiration from our deselection campaign – which, incidentally, may claim another victory shortly,

Source: 30th April, [www.leave.eu](http://www.leave.eu)

# UK top investment destination

Ewen Stewart

**G**lobal Britain has uncovered good news for the UK that the government appears not to be interested in.

GB top investment destination (despite Brexit, of Course) - 28th April

“Another week and another piece of good news in the real world – not the parallel, unproductive world of Westminster. Last week the UK was acclaimed as the global number one for investment – displacing the US, an economy nine times our size. But surely it can’t be true – the UK is leaving the world, after all; are we not shutting down as a result of Brexit!

We operate in parallel universes. While much of Westminster, our civil service and media spout daily tales of woe as Brexit is alleged to put up walls (Chancellor Hammond used that very phrase just the other week in a speech in the US), destroy opportunity and economic prosperity in the real world – the opposite has happened.

A central plank of the Remain case was that to leave the Single Market would make Britain irrelevant to the rest of the world and destroy inward investment. It really was that simple. Why would anyone invest in little Britain when they could go to the mighty France or Germany, as part of the EU?

This claim was repeated time and time again using the simplistic logic that we needed to be part of something big to trade with other countries. This logic is both defeatist and deeply flawed.

Trade and investment is about rule of law; stable governance; transparent, relatively low and stable tax; defensible property rights; educational, scientific and cultural excellence – and of course hard work, a good idea and strategic advantage – amongst many other variables. Trade deals were of pretty minor tier two importance in our view and as the UK trades at a surplus with the world – but has a £96bn deficit with the EU – under any sensible negotiations, a zero

tariff mutual regulatory respect deal should easily have been possible. If Canada – which trades less than 10% as much to the EU as the UK does – can achieve it, why not the UK?

We only have to see how the EU prevaricates and quakes at the very thought of a so-called ‘no deal’ to know this to be true. Sadly the defeatists in our Government and Parliament don’t see it that way.

Global Britain argued, rather modestly, that Brexit in itself was no big economic deal. Brexit is not a panacea. It is a process, but one that gives an opportunity for the UK to do so much better than the dull, under-performing conformity of the EU.

Like a tool used properly, Brexit could enhance Britain’s global position and prosperity, but only if reasonably open, stable and non-arbitrary policies were adopted. There was much to go for, over time, as the EU’s regulatory regime doubled down by stifling innovation, choice and prosperity. You can already see that is the trend the EU is taking. Misunderstanding the EU’s direction of travel is why we were one of a small number of commentators to argue a vote to leave would enhance prosperity not detract from it.

It is now over two and a half years since the UK voted to leave the EU and the evidence is increasingly overwhelming. The Jeremiah’s of Remain were completely and totally wrong on almost every front: on growth, on City jobs, on total employment, on wage growth and now on investment.

Indeed, the polar opposite to their projections has happened. The global consultancy EY’s annual survey of investment trends, now in its tenth year, for the first time ever has put the UK as the world’s top investment destination – extraordinarily topping even the US, an economy far, far bigger than ours. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) increased 6% in 2017 (the latest available figures) over the previous year, creating an estimated 50,196 new

jobs. There were 1,205 new projects against 1,138 in 2016 and only 700 in 2012. Growth was strongest outside London, especially in the South East, East and South West. The UK is the clear European market leader in attracting FDI with 18% market share. FDI created 50,000 jobs in the UK, 31,000 in Germany, 26,000 in Russia, 24,000 in France and 23,000 in Poland. When surveyed about Brexit, 6% of investors said it decreased their attraction to the UK, while 7% said it increased their attraction.

The UK is the market leader in attracting US investment (24%) against second-placed France (16%) – with the level of investment going up from the US, Germany, China, India, Japan, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Spain. Only investment from France and Ireland saw declines. Key areas for investment, again perhaps counter-intuitively, were consumer products, industrials and financial services.

In short, global investors have flocked to the UK since we voted for Brexit – contrary to the Treasury and Bank of England claim that there would be an immediate lurch into recession.

The vote to leave has, if anything, encouraged investment into the UK. Doubtless our opponents will argue ‘well we haven’t left yet, so it is no surprise’. That argument simply will not wash. Investment decisions are not made on a whim, but on long-term analysis of opportunity. One does not invest tens of millions of pounds in hard capital and plant on a short-term view. Investors have known the UK was leaving and have voted with their wallets. They are here for the long term and that is despite a pathetic response from our Government.

Ironically, some of the biggest investors in the UK have been companies from the EU. Siemens of Germany has invested £200m in its new rail factory in Goole, with 700

**Continued on page 5**

# UK top investment destination

Continued from page 4

direct and a further 1,700 supply-chain jobs expected as a result. The Spanish company CAF has opened its £30m Newport factory, creating 300 jobs, Bombardier from Canada is increasing production, creating another 300 jobs and Talgo is committed to opening a new £40m factory in Fife and a hub in Chesterfield, creating 1,000 jobs.

Boeing opened its first European factory in Sheffield last year following £40m of investment. Boeing supports 74,000 jobs in the UK – a 33% increase in the last five years – and spends £1.8bn with UK suppliers. And now, despite all the supposed worries about Brexit being a threat to British car manufacturing, BMW is considering expanding its Goodwood production of Rolls Royce cars after record worldwide sales.

These stories are just a snapshot of real news being released every week. The reality of what is happening in British investment – and especially manufacturing – is completely at odds with what is being presented by the opponents of Brexit and much of the media. It is often said UK doesn't make anything anymore but the statistics say different: manufacturing employs 2.7 million people, contributes 11% of GVA, accounts for 45% of total exports (£275bn), is responsible for 69% of business R&D – making the UK the ninth largest manufacturing nation in the world.

It is also instructive that one of the key areas of investment has been financial services. Of course, the consensual voices claimed Brexit would destroy the financial services industry as it moved to Frankfurt. They also claimed that when the single currency was born. How ironic that overseas investment in the financial services industry is one of the top three sectors for investment.

How often can these official

forecasters, who are given so much media airplay, be wrong? Why are they given so much weight by the media? There are numerous independent forecasters with consistently better records. We at Global Britain like to think we are one of them!

Global Britain argued that with the right policies Brexit was an opportunity for the City in the long term and in the short term perhaps 10,000 jobs might be at risk. Others, including the Treasury, claimed 70,000 jobs would be lost, an absurd near-quarter of all City of London financial services employment. The reality is we were too pessimistic. The decision to leave has had almost no measurable impact at all on the City, which continues to enjoy almost total dominance in European financial services. As the EY survey shows, this is the case across the economy too.

Let us look at what has happened over the last two years:

- \* Inward investment – the UK for the first time ever is the global number 1, displacing the US;

- \* Investment is broadly based across numerous sectors including manufacturing, IT, financial services and business services;

- \* Unemployment is now the joint lowest since 1974;

- \* Total employment is now 32.7 million – the biggest ever, growing by 800,000 since the referendum – contrasting with the Treasury's predicted 500,000 fall in employment immediately on a leave vote – a positive gain of 1.3 million jobs over what was predicted;

- \* Wage growth in February was 3.5% – the joint highest on record (with 2008) – ahead of inflation which was 1.9% in the same month;

- \* The UK minimum wage is the highest of any major country in the EU and twice that of Spain, three times that

of Poland and six times that of Romania. No wonder the UK is a beacon for workers; and, GDP has grown each and every quarter, in contrast to the absurd Treasury forecast of a fall of 5%.

Contrast this with the EU:

- \* Unemployment is over twice the UK level;

- \* Germany and Italy flirt with recession;

- \* Monetary policy remains at an all-time extreme. 10-year German bonds yield 0.05%. Despite this, the German economy stagnates;

- \* Failure to stabilise the EU banking system: significant unresolved stress in Italy, forced banking mergers in Germany – and Greece on life support, with that economy 23% smaller than a decade ago; and,

- \* Continuing migration away from the EU's south to the UK and the north – where the opportunity is.

Of course the UK should not be complacent; much needs to be done to strengthen the public finances and tackle regional variances, but our opponents' theological attachment to the EU is creating a false reality. Their lens is based on a utopian vision of what the EU is not. As the Americans say, 'look at the maths'.

Leave has been right about economic outcomes on almost every front. The latest inward investment numbers are further proof, if it be needed. Bizarrely the Conservative Party is so in awe of its failing Brussels cousin that it has lost the confidence to demonstrate our own strengths. The Conservative Government is snatching defeat from the jaws of victory based on a false reality and shameful distortion of the facts.

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

## UK growth forecast raised

The Bank of England has raised its UK growth forecast for this year,

in part because the outlook for the global economy is a lot brighter.

The Bank now sees growth of 1.5% up from February's forecast of 1.2%.

# LETTERS

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

## Local elections

Dear Sir,

At the time of writing this the result of the local elections have just been announced.

The evidence from these results and especially the spoilt election cards shows just how much the public has lost faith in those elected. Brexit has exposed the giant gulf between the people and the politicians!

We now have to await the outcome of the so-called Conservative/Labour negotiations. The problem with this is that it is likely to be the idea of a form of Custom Union with the provision for a further referendum.

A Customs Union with the EU will be really just a form of remain and a second referendum will be directed in such a way that the outcome will also be restricted to the way the question is asked. A meaningful referendum would only be acceptable if the question was repeated remain or leave, no if's no but's.

The problem for the politicians is that they wish to remain, so their plan will be to offer just May's bad deal or

remain. Possibly adding a further offer of a different deal to split the vote and get a majority for remain.

DONALD SUMMERS  
Lancashire

## UKIP or Brexit Party?

Dear Sir,

The local election showed us that the United Kingdom Independence Party is failing to show true leadership in the fight to leave the EU. Its reduced share of the vote and its current leader Gerard Batten decision to offer himself up for a leadership challenge in June, will probably lead to more unrest.

What about the newly formed Brexit Party launched by Nigel Farage? Well at least it is only interested in the fight to get the UK out of the grips of the EU.

The upcoming European elections are a chance to clearly tell the UK government that Brexit is more important than party loyalty.

I have been a supporter of UKIP for many years but with a heavy heart will be voting for the Brexit Party at the elections. My reason being that the

Brexit Party has more chance of forcing the current UK government into actually leaving the EU. Whereas, UKIP has too many internal problems that stop it from being an affective organisation and the influence of some of its far-right and far-left members make it unelectable at this time.

Neither of these parties are ever likely to form a UK government and are only, in reality, a pressure group to influence the main parties over our EU membership.

SUSAN DAVIES  
London

## Leadership

Dear Sir,

While much talk is given to replacing Theresa May or for that matter Jeremy Corbyn, what really matters is having leaders of any party that actually believe in the UK. The present leadership fail to act in the national interest as requested by the electorate but spent most of their time attacking each other.

STANLEY STUBBS  
Coventry

## The EU and Switzerland

The EU is currently trying to alter the EU-Swiss relationship.

In an interview to *am Sonntagage* in April Perre-Yves Maillard, president of the Swiss Trade Union Confederation

stated that the draft treaty was not acceptable to trade unions and that "This text is dead". Adding that "ultimately there is no way around fresh negotiations".

Switzerland already has the highest wages in Europe and could not allow uncontrolled opening of the Swiss labour market due to risk of wage pressure.

## Greece seeks reparations from Germany

Following an election pledge by Tsipras in 2015 and ahead of national elections scheduled in October, Greek lawmakers are trying to seek financial reparations from Germany.

Voting on 17th April the lawmakers have given a mandate to the government to seek reparations from Germany for the Nazi occupation during World War II.

Greece's Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras told lawmakers that demanding reparations is "a historic and moral duty in memory of the heroes of the past...above all at a time when the extreme right, nationalism, and racism threaten Europe".

The vote, the first by parliament on the emotionally-charged issue, has tasked Tsipras' government to take "every appropriate legal and

diplomatic action to satisfy Greece's demands".

The Greek-German relationship may well become strained as a result. However, no figure has yet been put upon the request but Greece's General Accounting Office estimated in 2015 that Germany owed it €278.7 billion in reparations with an additional €10.3 billion to reimburse a wartime forced loan.

# MEETINGS

**The Brexit Party**  
www.thebrexitparty.org

A number of public meetings are being arranged across the country

## PUBLIC MEETINGS

Further details on dates and times are available by visiting the web site.  
www.thebrexitparty.org

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **4th June**, 6.00 pm

*“The Treaty of Versailles a Hundred Years Later”*

**Professor Margaret MacMillan**,  
*University of Toronto*

## PUBLIC MEETING

The Museum of London, London Wall,  
London EC2  
**Admission Free**

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **5th June**, 6.00 pm

*“Mergers and Acquisitions - Do they create or destroy value?”*

**Alex Edmans**, *Gresham Professor of Business*

## PUBLIC MEETING

The Museum of London, London Wall,  
London EC2  
**Admission Free**

## The Economic Research Council

Wednesday **12th June**, 6.30 pm

Title - *“To be announced”*

**Elizabeth Truss MP**, *Chief Secretary to the Treasury*

## 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 **18th June**, 6.00 pm

*“The Weimar Republic - Germany's first democracy”*

**Professor Sir Richard Evans FBA**,  
*Provost*

## PUBLIC MEETING

The Museum of London, London Wall,  
London EC2  
**Admission Free**

## FREE Advertising Space

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

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

## DIARY OF EVENTS

EU MEP elections **23rd-26th May**

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

Labour Party **21st-25th September**  
Conference  
Brighton

Conservative **29th Sept-2nd October**  
Party Conference  
Manchester

At the time of going to press!  
Current Official date **31st October**  
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

## 2020

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

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

Should May's deal pass!  
Current Official date **31st December**  
for completion of  
EU/UK Transition

## USEFUL WEB SITES

### Brexit Party

www.thebrexitparty.org

### 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.eurosafeguards.com

### 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

## Special Offers

**Anthony Fisher: Champion of Liberty**  
by *Gerald Frost*.

**£20.00 - Hdbk 2002- 268 pp**

Fisher founded the IEA, which influenced public policy and the views of Reagan, Thatcher and others.  
**(NOW ONLY £10)**

**Britain and Europe:  
Choices for Change**

by *Bill Jamieson & Patrick Minford*

**£8.50 - Pamphlet 1999 - 97 pp**

The EU's global decline, how if we do nothing it will drag the UK down and the choices we can make.  
**(NOW ONLY £4)**

**Lost Illusions; British Foreign Policy**  
by *Ian Milne*

**£4.00 - 2002 Pamphlet - 25 pp**

Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.  
**(NOW ONLY £2)**

**Vigilance: A defence of British Liberty**  
by *Ashley Mote*

**£12.95 - Pbk 2001 - 279 pp**

What is done by the EU to Britain, why it matters and how Britain could emerge  
**(NOW ONLY £7)**

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P  
(UK only)**

**Seizing the moment**

by *John Ashworth*. **£4.00**

The opportunities for UK fisheries after Brexit with the restoration of the 200 nautical mile/midline resources zone.

**Germany's  
Fourth Reich**

by *Harry Beckhough*. **£8.00**

Code-breaker and former spy explains the real drive by Germany for control over Europe without war.

**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**

How, 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.

Tel: 08456 120 175

**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

**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.

**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](mailto:info@junepress.com)

[www.junepress.com](http://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	<a href="http://www.conservativesforbritain.org">www.conservativesforbritain.org</a>
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	<a href="http://www.britishfuture.org">www.britishfuture.org</a>
Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	<a href="http://www.globalbritain.org">www.globalbritain.org</a>
Global Vision	<a href="http://www.global-vision.net">www.global-vision.net</a>
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

