

The Northern Ireland problem

The Rt Hon The Lord Trimble PC

The border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, together with the abuse and misuse of the Good Friday Agreement (GFA), has been used as the Trojan Horse by which the EU has sought to undermine the UK's attempt to gain back sovereignty. The plan was cleverly crafted. First of all the EU insisted that talks on the future relationship could not commence until three issues were agreed. The first was the UK's contribution to the "Divorce Bill". The second was the rights of EU citizens living in the UK and UK citizens living in the EU and, finally, there was the question of the Northern Ireland (NI)/Republic of Ireland (RoI) border.

This land border was given an importance out of all proportion. In order to safeguard the integrity of the EU Single Market, goods flowing across this border would need to be monitored so that the EU could collect any tariffs due and ensure the goods were compliant with EU rules, standards and regulations. The arrangements to carry out such checks, it was argued, would mean putting a hard infrastructure along the border and this would be a contravention of the Good Friday Agreement (GFA). The consequences would be catastrophic because they would amount to tearing up an international agreement, would alienate nationalists in NI and would give terrorists targets to attack, causing the peace process to collapse and leading to a return of the terrorist campaign in NI. Then came the clever part. The only way of avoiding such a scenario was for the UK to remain part of the EU Customs

Union so that there would be no need to collect tariffs and the UK would not be able to do trade deals with other countries which involved standards different from those pertaining in the EU. Furthermore, to avoid the need for regulatory checks, the UK to some extent would continue to apply EU Single Market rules and NI would need fully to comply with them.

The Theresa May deal was rejected by the Boris Johnston administration. The new Protocol stipulates that NI must remain fully compliant with the EU single market regime for goods. This arrangement was spelt out in the Protocol, which had 78 pages of EU Regulations, interpreted at the whim of the ECJ (and in some cases under the executive authority of the European Commission). Also any future changes of law would automatically apply, with no input into the formation of the new rules either from the UK Government nor the NI Executive, since the UK would no longer be part of the EU and therefore play no part in the decision making. The UK Government would not be free to rule on huge swathes of economic and social policy in NI and there would be no democratic accountability as to how EU rule in that part of the UK was exercised. In theory, these arrangements could be dismissed by a vote in the NI Assembly, although this would be after the newly minted rules had been applied for at least 4 years and this anyway begs the question as to what would happen and what new arrangements would be required if such a vote took place, or indeed whether such a vote would then be judged as a breach of an international

agreement in the absence of some replacement....

The UK acquiescence to the operation of the new Protocol has significant implications for the exercise of government policy in the UK as a whole, because the EU's State Aid provisions contained in the Protocol would apply not only to NI but to any State Aid provided throughout the UK as a whole. As a result of the State aid requirements in Article 10 of the Protocol any UK business selling in NI or investing in NI will be subject to EU State Aid rules, and the application of State aid could (at the ECJ's discretion) be even wider than that. So, for example, a tax policy which makes it cheaper to a GB firm to sell goods which may be in competition with other goods made in the EU within NI could fail to be considered under EU State Aid rules and require to be notified and approved by the Commission before it can be implemented. So the EU's interpretation of the GFA, its insistence on that interpretation being accepted by the UK Government, and the Government's willingness to adopt that interpretation, resulted in a Protocol which has thrown the door wide open to the EU being able to use the ECJ to stymie UK economic, fiscal, regulatory and trade policies. The astonishing and disturbing fact is that the WA and, in particular, the Protocol completely undermine the central premise of the GFA. The whole purpose of the agreement was to give stability to NI by embedding in this international accord a promise that it was up to the people of NI to choose

Continued on page 2

The Northern Ireland problem

Continued from page 1

the constitutional status of the country. It stated that the UK and Irish governments “recognise the legitimacy of whatever choice is freely exercised by a majority of the people of NI with regard to its status, whether they prefer to continue to support the Union with Great Britain or a sovereign united Ireland.” The assurance to the Unionists was that the constitutional position of NI as part of the UK was guaranteed. The agreement made it clear that “[i]t is hereby declared that Northern Ireland in its entirety remains part of the United Kingdom and shall not cease to be so without the consent of a majority of its people voting in a poll held for that purpose”. The promise to nationalists was that if there was evidence that the people of NI wished to see the position changed, there would be a referendum to establish if that was the case and the referendum result would be honoured by the UK Government.

The agreement stated “the Secretary of State shall exercise the power [to hold a poll] if at any time it appears likely to him that a majority of those voting would express a wish that Northern Ireland should cease to be part of the United Kingdom and form part of a united Ireland”. In the meantime, recognising that in a divided society there will always be controversial and divisive issues, measures were put in place for voting when deciding those issues. The voting arrangements involved “either parallel consent, i.e. a majority of those members present and voting, including a majority of the unionist and nationalist designations present and voting; or a weighted majority (60 per cent) of members present and voting, including at least 40 per cent of each of the nationalist and unionist designations present and voting”. The WA clearly rips the GFA apart. Since the laws governing 60 per cent of economic activity in NI will no longer be made at Westminster or by the devolved Assembly, but by an outside law-making body, the EU, and those

laws will be subject to interpretation by a non-UK court, clearly the constitutional position of NI has been changed without the consent of the people of NI as required by the GFA. Furthermore, there is no way in which the people affected by those decisions will even have a say in the making or application of them. Those who support the WA argue that, while this is true, it is a necessary consequence of the Brexit referendum result, and that NI is still part of the UK. This totally misses the point of what the Union is about. The whole purpose of having a common Crown and common Parliament was to create a common UK market. Article 6 of the Act of Union outlines the economic importance of the Union. Subjects were to be on the same footing with respect to trade and treaties with foreign powers. There were to be no prohibitions on the export of articles or manufacture between England and Ireland. Trade between the countries of the UK were to be duty free. In other words, central to being part of the UK is access to the benefits of the UK single market and any erosion of this alters our membership of the UK - which is of immense significance to the livelihoods of the people of NI. It undermines and contradicts that central commitment of the GFA that “Northern Ireland in its entirety remains part of the UK”. Taxes will be imposed on goods coming into NI from GB. Certain GB manufactured goods will not be allowed to be traded in NI because they do not comply with EU standards. NI businesses will be required to adopt EU regulations rather than UK regulations, which will have an impact on the ability of NI manufacturers to sell their output in GB - competitively or at all. Any trade deals that the UK does with third countries may see NI excluded if aspects of those deals mean goods being included which don't conform to EU standards. And all of these implications of the Protocol undermine the ability of NI to participate in the UK single market, contrary to the Act

of Union and in a way highly damaging to the NI economy, which is five times more dependent on GB for trade than it is on the EU. The WA undermines the GFA in another way in that it removes the safeguard central to the working of the NI Assembly when it comes to voting on “key decisions”.

The WA makes it clear that the NI Assembly could vote to end the arrangements in the NI Protocol but it sets aside the cross-community voting arrangements so vital to the providing of “safeguards to protect the rights and interests of all sides of the community”. These voting safeguards were removed at the insistence of the Irish government and the EU. They knew that when the Customs territory and Single Market arrangements in the Protocol came up for renewal in the NI Assembly, given their implications for the Union and the economy, they would never command the cross-community support for such a key decision. The democratic wishes of the members of the NI Assembly stood in the way of keeping in place their Trojan Horse to facilitate an assault on UK sovereignty. So, a central premise of the GFA had to be removed. It is ironic that those who promote the application of the unmodified Protocol use the GFA as a cover for it, when in reality the Protocol and the voting mechanism to keep it in place subvert the central pillars of that agreement. Only by invoking the GFA has it been possible to get successive UK governments to acquiesce in the surrender of vital powers to the EU in the negotiations so far. It is important that in the final deliberations the Government steels itself to remove the unacceptable concessions made on the GFA and the damage done to the UK's aim to take back control from Brussels in the Withdrawal Agreement.

Source: *Extract of part of a report by The Centre For Brexit Policy. Lord Trimble is a former First Minister of Northern Ireland and received the Nobel Peace Prize for his work leading to the Good Friday Agreement.*

A true concern for all UK citizens

Derek Sterling

This pamphlet is a timely reminder to all those who promote Multiculturalism and Political Correctness that the public have never been consulted on these issues.

We are constantly being subjected to changes in the cultural values and social norms that UK citizens have always supported and accepted. Now however, according to Hoskin's observations these values are being changed by influential lobby groups, and peer pressure to force the public to accept without question or debate of any kind the implementation of these new controls on civil liberties.

He starts with a serious look into religion in all its manifestations and questions the way that most religions claim a revelation from God for their existence. In fact it is only claimed to be the case from their prophets or followers and not actually from God.

Richard Dawkins book 'The God Delusion' is also examined especially the part where Dawkins seems to think that if it were shown that God does not exist then religion and the conflicts

A Challenge To The Pseudo-Liberals

Time For A Change Before It's Too Late

by Christopher Hoskin

June Press Pamphlet 33 pp 2020

Available from

The June Press

Price £4.00 + 10% p&p

(see back cover)

ISBN 978-0-9927501-7-6

associated with it would disappear.

The West's dominate religion Christianity is considered in detail followed by pseudo-science and secular religions. Nazism and the sinister attraction of Communism is considered as is the way that Christianity is being effectively replaced by other religions mainly due to the latest trends or fashions.

Hoskin's then looks into the way that the emotional reaction to past events like the British Empire, Slave-Trade, the Holocaust and World War

has effected the views of society today. He includes Individual Human Rights, changes in sexual behaviour and the effect of Nation States in his investigation.

The changing face of British Industry, Immigration and the pressures to accept the rights of immigrants to bring into the UK their social norms, culture and often strong Islamic values are also considered.

In this short but educational pamphlet he expresses the fears and worry that the indigenous citizens are being subjected to under the guise of political correctness and inclusiveness.

In recent days one only has to look at the way the BBC have considered changes to the last night of the proms in order to satisfy those who don't like certain songs being song or heard.

He ends with food for thought by the addition of an interesting acute observation made by John Milton that Satan was a fallen angel. Every harmful movement that has come into the world has always had some virtue or benefit by which naive or unwary can be tempted.

Fears for the pig industry

A highly contagious porcine disease that reached Europe before the coronavirus and with a high mortality

rate, no existing treatment or vaccine, has devastating consequences for society and economies, is African

Swine Fever. Estimated to have claimed a quarter of the world's pig population in 2019 is rising in 2020.

ID cards

Yet again we hear of calls for ID cards but this time using coronavirus as the reason. The idea is to create a digital identification for every person on the planet. One that is tied to fingerprints, birth certificates, medical records, education, travel,

bank accounts and more.

Bill Gates, a man who has been at the forefront of a push for mass vaccination of the planet, has also floated the idea of 'digital certificates' that could be used to prove COVID-19 vaccination status:

"What we'll have to have is certificates of who's a recovered person – who's a vaccinated person, because you don't want people moving around the world where you'll have some countries that won't have it under control."

Time for action

On the following pages the dangers inherent in the European Union Withdrawal Agreement (WA) are explained.

Action is now required to change or if possible remove the WA, this can be

done Michael Gove MP the Co-Chair of the UK-EU Joint Committee has the power and the opportunity to change the WA and all the commitments of the post Transition Period, without the need for Parliamentary approval.

Failure to make changes will leave a perfect opportunity for future governments who may be more EU orientated to return the UK into the clutches of the EU without consulting the electorate.

The inherent dangers of the Withdrawal Agreement

Bob Lyddon

You thought your no-fault divorce would be a clean break and let you move on. You had agreed, as part of the share-out, to make a series of pension top-up payments to the other party, and to let them keep an investment portfolio.

Later you discover that the top-up payments were elastic, and that the other party could claim back losses from you on the investment portfolio, without a reasonable ceiling, and with no absolute time limit. Moreover these provisions were not reciprocal: they could work in the other party's favour but not in yours. The other party keeps all the profits but you share any loss.

Sounds like a bad deal? Indeed it is. But that is the position the UK is in as it prepares to exit the European Union. The UK has agreed to a "divorce settlement" of a reported figure of £36bn, which is acknowledged if resented by Brexiteers. What is not widely appreciated is firstly that £36bn is not an absolute number: it is an estimate by the Office for Budget Responsibility, of which the major portion is pension payments. Hence the analogy of the UK agreeing to make a series of pension top-up payments to the other party in a divorce.

Secondly there are the future liabilities lurking in the small print of the Withdrawal Agreement (WA) and, in the analogy, these relate to the investment portfolio: if the EU's investments fail to pay out full value, the UK would be asked to share the loss....

Furthermore, ...the WA includes a section on the UK's future financial liabilities under the Withdrawal Agreement (WA)....

It comes down to this: during the UK's EU membership, different parts of the EU apparatus have made long-dated loans, or have entered into long-term financial commitments. In an adverse case these all resolve

themselves into cash investments that are worth less than the EU paid for them, and the UK will have to cover part of the resulting loss.

The loans contain the risk that interest and principal may not be paid in full: some loans have been made by the EU direct, others by the European Investment Bank (EIB) under EU guarantee. Should the latter default, the EU would reimburse the EIB and then the EIB would act to the EU's order to try and recoup the funds from the borrower.

The financial commitments come in two forms: guarantees in favour of other financiers in respect of monies lent to or invested in enterprises, and commitments to buy shares in enterprises. These enterprises are predominantly ones constructed on the EU's version of the Private Finance Initiative model, which is known as InvestEU. Under that model it is the European Investment Fund (EIF) – a subsidiary of the EIB – which makes the investment, but the EU that takes the first risk of loss.

By its nature, a call on either a guarantee or on a commitment to buy shares will only materialise when the enterprise is in financial trouble.

Where the EIF issued a guarantee to a financier and the financier called the guarantee, the EIF would pay cash to the financier and be reimbursed by the EU (direct or through the EIB). The EU's investment would then be the same claim on the enterprise that the guaranteed financier was holding: the EIB/EIF effectively buy the claim at face value from the financier, are reimbursed by the EU, and then act to the EU's order to try and monetise the claim.

In the case of a commitment to buy shares, the EIB/EIF buy newly issued shares in the enterprise at a price fixed in advance, are reimbursed by the EU, and then hold the shares to the EU's

order.

In both cases the EU and EIB/EIF would make use of a legal technique called subrogation: the EU is the beneficial owner of the investment whilst the EIB/EIF act as the owner of record, and operate the rights and remedies at the EU's behest.

Given that the enterprise was in financial trouble or bankrupt, both the claim deriving from a call on a guarantee and the shares would be worth less than the EU had paid out, and would cause a financial loss within the EU Budget. The EU Budget cannot be in deficit and the EU member states are jointly-and-severally liable to make good any deficit. The WA saddles the UK with a responsibility to continue to be part of this mechanism as regards losses deriving from operations undertaken during the UK's period of membership, regardless of whether the UK benefited from the operations.

Furthermore, the marker point for the UK's being responsible is not the end of the Brexit transition period, but the expiry of the loan/financial commitment itself, or of the facility or fund out of which the loan/financial commitment was made.

The only limitation is that the loan or financial commitment must have been granted while the UK was an EU member. However, this limitation is of little comfort: a loan agreed before 31st December 2020 but drawn later will be chalked up against the UK's liability.

The WA states that the UK should have to pay a portion of the amount at risk through the EU Budget, in line with its historical share of the cash budget, or about 12%. But this 12% figure must be regarded as elastic, as it could increase markedly (perhaps double) if, in the midst of a crisis, the likes of Italy, Spain, Cyprus, Greece, and Ireland were not able to pay their shares. Indeed, it is lower than the 14.67% which was the UK's share of

The inherent dangers of the Withdrawal Agreement

EU-28 Gross National Income in 2018, and which would have served as the guideline for the UK's portion of the EU's 2021-27 budget – the subject of the recent EU summit.

The UK's liability now amounts to (i) an elastic portion of €159bn through the EU Budget and (ii) the UK's €37bn in subscribed-but-not-called capital in the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the European Central Bank (ECB). Additionally, in a crisis, the UK probably would have its paid-in capital of €3.6bn in the EIB and ECB written off.

But there is more. The liability amount of €159bn through the EU Budget could rise by €224bn to €383bn during 2021 thanks to the headroom in and carry-over provision for the 2014-2020 EU budget period.

If all of that headroom were to be mobilised, the UK's liability would be 12 per cent of €383bn plus €40.6bn for the EIB/ECB, or €86.6bn in total, noting the elasticity of the 12%.

If none of that headroom were to be mobilised, the UK's liability would be 12 per cent of €159bn plus €40.6bn for the EIB/ECB, or €59.7bn in total, noting again the elasticity of the 12%.

In addition, there are elements within the liabilities that are largely unquantifiable – eg,

* As regards limitation in time, there are funds and facilities (such as the European Financial Stability Mechanism and the Macro-Financial Assistance) that have no end date and can be redrawn over and over again: the longest-dated loan out of such a fund is to Ireland maturing in 2042. Even worse, there are portions where the respective EU organisation has issued an undated commitment: the “equity commitments” of the EIF into its InvestEU projects

* InvestEU is a major source of risk: rapidly increasing spending, almost none in the UK, and with the EIB and EIF accepting an ever higher risk of losses from their projects –

losses they would pass on to member states through the mechanism of the EU guarantee

* The coronavirus crisis raises the likelihood of loss across the board on loans and financial commitments within the EU, as elsewhere.

The EU has already begun the process of mobilising part of the headroom of €224bn in the 2014-20 MFF. The EU's proposed response to the coronavirus crisis is not limited to the €750bn Coronavirus Fund. Plans had already been announced to make an extra €200bn available through the EIB and EIF, using the same financing template as InvestEU, and to raise the Macro-Financial Assistance by €0.3bn.

In the InvestEU template the EIB/EIF take high risk positions in each financing, and their doing that enables the enterprise to raise funding from other sources in a proportion of 19:1: the EU guarantees for InvestEU of €26bn already enable a total InvestEU funding amount of €500bn. A new EU guarantee of €16bn has been discussed to support a €200bn coronavirus response from the EIB, so the leverage in that case is slightly less at 12.5:1. However there have also been discussions about a further InvestEU-related guarantee of €10bn to enable an extra €200bn of “normal” InvestEU funding by the end of 2020.

So EU guarantees, which would be marked against the UK's WA liability, of €26bn are already in formulation, which would enable a funding amount of €400bn, over and above the €750bn Coronavirus Fund. The Coronavirus Fund is being marked entirely against the 2021-27 EU Budget period, by which time the UK will (hopefully) have exited.

The new guarantees, if they materialise, would raise the UK's liability through the EU budget from €159bn to €185bn, reducing the residual headroom from €224bn to €198bn. It is to be hoped that the UK

government has signalled to Brussels that any further mobilisation of the headroom would tempt the UK towards a “No Deal” Brexit.

Nevertheless, the immediate EU coronavirus response – as well as the headlong expansion of InvestEU - is being mobilised through the exact same mechanisms where the UK liability could in theory continue to rise through to the end of 2021: the EU itself, the EIB, and the EIF. The UK will thus act as a financial backstop at least for the immediate part of the EU's coronavirus response.....

Meanwhile, the UK will be paying for all of our own coronavirus response....

The Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) made a calculation of the “Brexit Divorce Bill” deriving from the WA of around £36bn. They issued a chart for when they believed the payments would materialise, and stated that most of the payments related to pension costs, thereby assigning a very low likelihood of payments being made to Brussels for the reasons described above. The OBR's apparent confidence does not seem to be based on any detailed study of the financings being made through InvestEU or the EIB – and crucially it pre-dated the coronavirus crisis.

The WA saddles the UK with a potential liability, at best of €60bn, theoretically of €86bn, and of a lot more if other EU member states are unable to meet their shares in a crisis. Should payments to Brussels be demanded, an equal-and-opposite reduction in public spending in the UK would result.

The result is manifestly unfair when the UK has drawn so little benefit from the EU's various loan and financing schemes.

Source:

Extract of a Brexit-watch article by Bob Lyddon 30th July 2020.

LETTERS

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

Scottish propaganda

Dear Sir,

As a true Scotsman who believes in the UK but having watched the BBC and its promotion of Scotland's First Minister Nicola Sturgeon MSP at her mid-day so-called coronavirus updates, I have formed the opinion that this is just a further push for her and the SNP's Scottish Independence mantra.

She has used this time to simply make a case for Scotland being treated differently to the rest of the UK although in almost every aspect she is copying the UK performance often just being a week or two in front or behind in application.

Sturgeon has never missed an opportunity to knock the UK government and its handling of the coronavirus during her BBC slot.

Her use of these promotion slots has given the SNP free publicity for the upcoming May election without allowing her competitors any equivalent air time, so much for BBC impartiality. This has allowed her to simply pretend that she is some kind of president who knows best. The continued daily briefing ceased to be of use months ago but still the BBC continue in to give her maximum publicity.

Just like its coverage of Brexit the BBC agenda is clear to see. Surely the time has come for the license fee to be abolished and to allow people to decide if they wish to pay for watching the BBC propaganda machine.

DAVID McDONALD
Edinburgh

Voting influence

Dear Sir,

We are constantly being bombarded by information about outside pressures and influence being used on elections and referenda. In the main this is put down as being instigated from Russia or China. However, the biggest

influence in UK elections and especially the Brexit referenda was the European Union (EU) added by the fear and doom merchants.

Why then are we constantly hearing calls for enquiries into Russian and foreign influences while at the same time totally ignoring the EU's part in all UK voting areas?

The only answer one can come up with is that we must not complain about the EU and its push for world wide control and power because, much of our own political leaders are still hell bent on being inside the EU sphere.

MICHAEL EDWARDS
Dorset

Liberal Democrats

Dear Sir,

The Lib-Dems appear to be completely unaware as to why the electorate abandoned them at the December 2019 General Election.

The previous leader Jo Swinson MP led her campaign on remaining inside the EU, she not only lost most of the voting public but lost her own seat. Yet the contestants for leadership of the party; Sir Ed Davey and Layla Moran both appear to hold the view that they need to campaign for the UK to rejoin the EU but accept that it is likely to be a ten year project. With this mind-set the Lib-Dems will find themselves so far removed from the UK electorate that they will become unelectable.

The hope for the party is based on the idea that the younger voters are often reported as supporters of the EU. They may be surprised to learn that the older generation were once supporters of the EU until they learned the truth about the problems and dictatorship mentality of the political organisation referred to as the EU. The undemocratic nature of the EU and its lust for imperial power is a danger to the free world.

What should be remembered is that the UK is constantly being attacked for

its imperialist past but the UK actually gave back democracy and independence to the countries that it once ruled. Only true democracy and independence can allow any country to flourish and serve its citizens in a way that suits their requirements and cultural values.

The result of the leadership battle has just been announced and Sir Ed Davey is now the official leader of the Liberal Democratic party.

DEBRA DAVIES
London

UK/EU trade talks

Dear Sir,

The fiasco of trying to agree a trade deal with the EU continues with the EU expecting the UK just to roll over and accept the EU's rules and regulations. Therefore, the UK should just stop talking and leave, even World Trade terms are better than anything that may be offered by the EU. The sooner we leave the better.

The EU negotiator (an interesting title for someone who wants no change in current terms) Michel Barnier, has said that the EU fishing industry would be devastated unless they have continued full access to the UK waters. However, he conveniently forgets to mention the devastation caused to the UK fishing fleet when we joined the EU. That was the price paid by Edward Heath as a membership fee.

BARRY STEVENS
Hull

Coronavirus trickery

Dear Sir,

Coronavirus has been used by the Banks and many other organisations to force the public to use on-line cashless shopping and banking. The loss of cash will help bank profits and government spying on the public's spending habits.

PAMELA COX
Cornwall

MEETINGS

This year as all large group meetings are not possible due to the coronavirus, it is anticipated that all the autumn political party conferences will be virtual and available on line, but some main stream television content will also be available.

Contact details for the main UK Westminster political parties and conference dates

Conservative Party
www.conservatives.com
3rd-6th October

Labour Party
www.labour.org.uk
To be announced

Liberal Democratic Party
www.libdems.org.uk
To be announced

Scottish National Party
www.snp.org
To be announced

UK Independence Party
www.ukip.org
To be announced

FREE Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **1st October**, 6.00 pm

"Does the State Really Care When It Kills You?"

Leslie Thomas, Gresham Professor of Law

PUBLIC MEETING (ONLINE)
@gres.hm/state-killing
Registration required at:
www.gresham.ac.uk

USEFUL WEB SITES Continued

Policy Exchange
www.policyexchange.org.uk
Statewatch
www.statewatch.org
The Foundation for Independence
www.foundationforindependence.com
The Taxpayers' Alliance
www.taxpayersalliance.com
United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org
Veterans For Britain
<http://www.veteransforbritain.uk>

DIARY OF EVENTS

Possible UK Parliamentary Recess for party conferences
Sept/Oct
To be announced

EU latest proposed date for completion of UK trade talks 31st October

Current date for completion of EU/UK Transition Deal and exit from the EU 31st December

2021

Portugal takes over EU Council Presidency 1st January

Slovenia takes over EU Council Presidency 1st July

USEFUL WEB SITES

Brexit Party
www.thebrexitparty.org
Brexit Watch
www.brexit-watch.org
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
Concordance
www.concordanceout.eu
Democracy Movement
www.democracymovement.org.uk
EU Observer
www.euobserver.com
EU Truth
www.eutruith.org.uk
European Commission (London)
www.cec.org.uk
European Foundation
www.europeanfoundation.org
Fishing For Leave
www.ffl.org.uk
Freedom Association
www.tfa.net
Freenations
www.freenations.net
Futurus
www.futurus-thinktank.com
Get Britain Out
www.getbritainout.org
Global Britain
www.globalbritain.co.uk
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

Obituary

During the summer recess we heard of the death of Stuart Wheeler an ardent and financial supporter of the Conservative party and especially the

campaigns for leaving the EU.

Stuart died on July 23rd from stomach cancer, he will be seriously missed by his family and all those who

like *eurofacts* new him.

He set up IG Index and went on to be a well respected businessman and a superb Bridge player.

Special Offers

Costly Affairs In British Foreign Policy

The advantages of foresight
by *Christopher Hoskin*.

£3.00 - Pamphlet 2018 - 23 pp

Why you do not need to go to war or
take hostile action against any country
whose regime you dislike
(NOW ONLY £1.50)

Handicap, Not Trump Card

The Franco-German
Model Isn't Working
by *Keith Marsden*.

£5.00 - Pamphlet 1999 - 28 pp

The French and German Finance
Minister said in 1999 said "We are
convinced that the European social
model is a trump card, not a handicap."
Keith Marsden proves them wrong.
(NOW ONLY £3)

The Trojan Hearse

by *J. Brian Heywood*.

£9.99 - Pbk 2003 - 330 pp.

A work of fiction - or is it? Raises a
multitude of awkward questions and
provides some very plausible answers.
(NOW ONLY £5)

**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
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.

A Challenge To The Pseudo-Liberals

Time For A Change Before It's Too Late
by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£4.00**

How Multiculturalism and Political
Correctness now dominate UK politics
without the electorate having ever
being consulted and the threat to
civil liberties that it exposes.

Tel: 08456 120 175

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 & Niall McCrae*. **£9.99**

How tradition and common sense have
been marginalised by an illiberal elite,
whose supposedly progressive ideology
has degenerated into a collective malady.

Corbyn's Britain

Land of the Superwoke:

A Travel Guide to Corbyn's Britain

by *Lee Rotherham*. **£13.99**

With a foreword by Jacob Rees-Mogg
MP, a glimpse into the past and possible
future of a Hard Left Government.

Escape From Brussels

Memoirs of a Freedom Fighter and

the Friends He made on the Way

by *Hugh Williams*. **£10.00**

How and why he fought, names and
organizations of those that helped.

**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

Brexit Party	www.thebrexitparty.org
Nigel Farage MEP	
Conservative	020 7222 9000
Boris Johnson MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Jonathan Bartley and Sian Berry	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Sir Keir Starmer MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Sir Ed Davey	
UK Independence Party	020 3476 9564
Freddy Vacha	

ISSN 1361-4134

