

How the UK dodged a bullet by leaving the EU

At a conference especially established by the EU Commission to map out the future of the EU, the delegates decided upon more centralisation, more federalisation, and less national sovereignty. The EU which British Rejoiners want to go back to will no longer exist – it will be the EU they always denied would happen.

The Conference set a clear path towards a ‘United States of Europe’.

The EU which the UK left will no longer exist in the future – it will be even worse

Brexit Facts4EU brings you the details of what was decided at the ‘Conference for the future of Europe’ [they should have said ‘EU’ not ‘Europe’] in Strasbourg recently and what it means.

Arch-federalist MEP Guy Verhofstadt was overcome with joy, tweeting to the world what he sees as the good news:

Summary

‘Conference on the Future of Europe’ approves radical overhaul of the EU

- * End of unanimity and abolition of national vetoes

- * Launch of Joint Armed Forces of the Union

- * Transnational political parties – national parliaments will become more like local councils

- * European Parliament to have the right to propose legislation

- * More spending on climate change policies

More details on some of the

extremist measures decided.

There are currently many areas where the EU still requires unanimous voting at the Council of Ministers (attended by member states). Under the new proposals this will end altogether, meaning no member state will have the ability to protect their own interests in these areas.

The launch of the “Joint Armed Forces of the Union” confirms what is already in process – the creation of a unified military capability. It will mean a single army, navy and air force with no vetoes for countries to withdraw. This will be a real problem for neutral Ireland.

A further measure which was approved was that of ‘Transnational Lists’. This means the EU Parliament elections will have candidates and campaigns on an EU-wide basis, establishing EU party groupings and ultimately trans-EU parties, like the Democrats and Republicans in the USA. National groupings will wither away and national politics is intended to become a backwater, with emasculated national parliaments effectively becoming local councils.

Other proposals - It is our understanding there were 325 proposals accepted at the meeting and these include the EU Parliament being able in future to propose legislation rather than have it passed down from the EU Commission and Council of Ministers.

Together with the absence of national vetoes that would mean the ability of a majority of MEPs passing legislation that whole countries – such

as Poland or Denmark – might object to.

The non-left-of-centre parties walked out

MEPs representing the right-of-centre European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR) and the Identity and Democracy (ID) groups declined to support the proposals and walked out. The ECR was particularly damning in its statement released after the walkout:-

Statement by the European Conservatives and Reformists group

“The European project has been in crisis for at least the last two decades.”

“We reject the idea that the conclusions being reached represent an expression of the will of the Europeans and, in order to remain coherent with our values and principles rather than legitimising this undemocratic and artificial exercise, hereby withdraw from the Conference on the Future of Europe.”

ECR statement, 30th April 2022

The ECR listed many concerns and criticisms about this entire costly exercise.

- * Biased selection of citizens towards those in favour of federalism

- * Age-based discrimination of citizens in favour of those under 25

- * Biased selection of experts – mainly from organisations funded by the EU

- * No testing of the citizens’ recommendations with the wider public

Continued on page 2

How the UK dodged a bullet by leaving the EU

Continued from page 1

- * Imposed political agenda
- * Unequal footing given to different groups
- * Undemocratic character of the Conference
- * Limited time for reflection and debate
- * Extremely poor visibility of the Conference to the public
- * False consensus presented, no 'minority reports' possible
- * Lack of procedural clarity, organisational chaos
- * Lack of financial transparency – who funded this Conference?

One Swedish ECR MEP declared the whole process *“a farce”*.

Charlie Weimers MEP

“The Conference on the Future of Europe attracted mostly those who want to centralize more power in Brussels. Entire process plagued by self-selection bias. Critical voices ignored already at the planning stages. No consideration of repatriation of powers to Member States.”

“Pro-integration citizens and activist orgs (many funded by the EU) were mobilized to legitimize further power transfers to Brussels. These minority viewpoints should NOT take precedence over elections (and we know what elites think of referendums on transfers of power to the EU)”

“Out of touch elites are taking the EU project down the wrong road and undermining democracy. We need to repatriate powers to national level where there is a real connection between voters and decision makers. This was not up for discussion.”

- Charlie Weimers MEP, Twitter, 30th April 2022

The many extremist MEPs from the other groups were delighted, however *“The federal state of Europe will become reality!”* tweeted Green MEP Niklas Nienä. *“This will shape the world forever!”*

Observations

Brexiteers were right all along

During the run-up to the EU referendum of 2016 campaigners fighting to Leave were ridiculed as conspiracy theorists, fantasists and scaremongers for arguing the EU was planning to have an army and would become more federalist resembling a United States of Europe with nation states reduced to administrative inconveniences. Well, look who was right after all.

The EU Commission-organised event (called, with typical arrogance, the “Conference on the Future of Europe” rather than “the Future of the EU”) was set up to establish a consensus on how the EU should reform in the medium-to-long-term. It was no surprise that the federalists won the day. There was never any prospect that the suggestion of giving back powers to member states would flourish in such a setting. It was simply “not up for discussion”.

The next stage will be for a new treaty to be drafted putting in place the changes to procedures, such as member states losing their vetoes, which will then in some countries require to be passed by a referendum.

Just like the last time there was a new Treaty, some electorate will want to reject the proposals. And just like the last time the EU will undoubtedly have plans on how to get round such a democratic irritation.

British Rejoiners now face a dilemma

This turn of events will cause anguish among those who supported the UK remaining in the EU. Those who have not accepted Britain's democratic vote and still hanker after EU membership will be faced with the reality that it is the EU that is planning to diverge away from the norms – rather than the UK diverging away from the EU. This divergence towards a United States of Europe will turn more British people against the EU, while a hard core of Rejoiners will become excitedly vocal but also increasingly isolated.

While the EU will be in a democratic civil war about making and accepting a new treaty – possibly lasting years – British Rejoiners will have to decide if they back the old EU that will eventually no longer exist or the new one that the likes of Guy Verhofstadt want to create?

Neither position looks attractive or in touch with reality. Our recommendation is that we are all Brexiteers now – that people should recognise the vote was held, that we chose to leave the EU, and that we should all now get behind making a success of the outcome. To do anything else is to wish for the United Kingdom to fail.

Source: www.facts4EU.org

Boris and freedom

Boris Johnson is in hot water with pro-EU lobby yet again, who are as usual assisted by the BBC, that still yearns for EU membership.

Boris speaking at the Conservative

spring conference referred to the Ukraine situation as being like the pro-Brexit fight for self-government, democracy and freedom.

Many may well agree that although

the Brexit fight was not a military conflict the aims and objects of the people were truly those of people who wish to choose how they are governed and by whom.

The Belfast/Good Friday Agreement

Kate Hoey

The Belfast/Good Friday Agreement has been emasculated by the NI Protocol.

“Back in 1998 I campaigned for a Yes vote in the referendum on the Belfast Agreement. It wasn’t an easy decision as, like many people in Northern Ireland, I detested the early release of prisoners and the failure of the IRA to give up weapons. Ultimately the basis of my support, on balance was set out succinctly by Lord Trimble who said the following in 1998:

‘Northern Ireland’s place within the United Kingdom has been secured. The Act of Union, the fundamental piece of legislation defining NI’s place in the UK, remains firmly in place. The Act of Union is the Union.’

The principle of consent, we were told, prevented any change to Northern Ireland’s status as part of the Union, save for the consent of a majority of its citizens, with consent freely given without coercion.

This status within the Union was denoted – as set out by Lord Trimble – by the Act of Union, which is the Union.

A month ago however, the Northern Ireland Court of Appeal put beyond any doubt that all of us who supported the Agreement in 1998 had been fundamentally deceived.

The principle of consent does not in fact safeguard Northern Ireland’s place within the Union, rather it directs itself solely to the formal final handover of sovereignty.

Put simply, in relation to Northern Ireland’s place in the Union you can change everything but the last thing, the last thing being the final handing over of sovereignty. Salami slice after salami slice of what it means to be British can be whittled away with no

consent from Northern Ireland citizens.

In the Ireland Act 1949 two concepts in relation to the principle of consent were set out in the introductory text; it related to the ‘constitutional position’ and ‘territorial integrity’ of Northern Ireland. The former being the substance of the Union, and the latter being the symbolism.

But in 1998, unbeknown to unionists, the concept of constitutional position, and thus safeguard for the substance of the Union, was discarded as a result of the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement.

This, of course, means that the principle of consent would not even prevent law-making or judicial powers being transferred to Dublin, so long as Northern Ireland was nominally still territorially part of the United Kingdom.

The Court of Appeal confirmed the Act of Union had been ‘subjugated’ by the Protocol, and further affirmed that this fundamental erosion of Northern Ireland’s constitutional position within the Union (and indeed therefore of the Union itself) did not offend the principle of consent, which, as I said, in fact only applies to the final handover of sovereignty.

In hindsight, it is now apparent that the institutions created by the Belfast Agreement were designed to incrementally progress towards ever greater all-Ireland harmonisation and, functionally, a United Ireland – thus eventually allowing the formal and final handover of sovereignty either unnecessary or inevitable.

The position articulated in good faith by Lord Trimble, referred to above, was the product of an illusion, created to lure unionists into a ‘process’ designed by stealth to dismantle the Union.

That is why the Court of Appeal ruling is of such significance. It renders the Belfast Agreement obsolete, because no unionist could ever again conceivably work through its institutions or support it. It offers no protection for the Union at all, rather it actively facilitates its subjugation.

In addition, the Court confirmed that “NI is primarily in the EU market rather than the UK” and stated, in relation to the Protocol’s claims to preserve unfettered UK trade, that it “spoke with a forked tongue”, as all relevant trade is subject to provisions of EU law.

The Protocol has blown apart the Belfast Agreement and it has seen Northern Ireland colonised, left primarily in the EU. No tinkering with the Protocol will suffice.

The full restoration of Northern Ireland’s place within the United Kingdom via the Acts of Union is required. There is no prospect of a power sharing government being formed after the elections to the Assembly in May and the Government needs to understand the potential crisis unfolding.

That means the Prime Minister telling the EU that the UK can no longer support the Protocol as the damage to peace and stability in Northern Ireland is too great to tolerate. It really is time for action not words.”

Baroness Hoey is a non-aligned Peer. A former member of the Labour Party, she served as Member of Parliament for Vauxhall from 1989 to 2019 and was an active campaigner for a ‘leave’ vote in the 2016 EU membership referendum.

Source: www.brexit-watch.org

Royal Platinum Jubilee

The marking of the Queen’s seventy years on the throne of the UK 1952-2022 was quite rightly marked with true British pomp and ceremony.

Many world leaders would love to be respected and greeted by their public in such a manner.

The future for the monarchy under

Prince’s Charles and William looks assured. With William’s children George, Charlotte and Louis also showing real royal potential.

UK taxpayers' pay for lobby groups

Below is the introduction and key findings of a significant report by the taxpayers alliance showing how, without their consent the UK taxpayer is being forced to pay for the political lobby groups.

“Many organisations and charities which have a focus on public policy – such as the TaxPayers’ Alliance and Greepeace operate with no taxpayers’ money, relying solely on the donations of private individuals and groups.

A great deal of others receive funding from public bodies. Despite benefitting from this, these organisations often campaign for political outcomes, and lobby against policies of the elected government. The 2020 TaxPayers’ Alliance paper Taxpayer funded lobbying and political campaigning found that public bodies gave over £39.6 million to political lobbying and campaigning organisations.

By receiving funds from public bodies, taxpayers’ are effectively being forced to fund views they may completely disagree with. In some cases, organisations have gone further than just lobbying and have undertaken actions such as street protests.

Taxpayer funding of lobbying and political campaigning has a number of negative effects:

- * It distorts decision making in favour of the interests and ideological preoccupations of a narrow political elite.

- * It slows adjustments in the direction of policy in reaction to new evidence or circumstances.

- * It increases political apathy among the public.

- * Taxpayers are forced to fund views they may seriously disagree with.

This paper highlights how taxpayers’ money is being allocated to lobbying organisations with their own agendas rather than services that benefit the community. This is not an

exhaustive list of money received by politicised organisations and dispersed through public bodies, but is a collection of key examples to show the scale and type of public funding being given.

Key findings

- * 26 organisations which lobby for change in public policy received a total of **£49,011,318** from 192 public sector bodies between 2018-19 and 2020-21.

- * Six government departments provided **Migrant Help, Stonewall, Refugee Action, Hope Not Hate and Instalaw** with **£7,694,408** in grants from 2018-19 to 2020-21. Four of these organisations recently signed an open letter criticising the new Rwanda plan for asylum seekers. The fifth, Instalaw, issued judicial review proceedings in April 2022 challenging the legality of the Rwanda immigration deal. The government departments who provided these grants were: the Cabinet Office; Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport; Department for Education; Department for International Development; Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government; and the Home Office.

- * **NHS Confederation received £28,456,451** in grants and loans from 13 public sector bodies from 2018-19 to 2020-21 – the highest amount given to any organisation. They continue to campaign for the public to keep wearing face masks with their ‘Too Too Much To Mask’ campaign.

- * **Gendered Intelligence received £287,954** from 18 public organisations from 2018-19 to 2020-21. **The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport** provided the largest amount, contributing **£251,748** over 2018-19 and 2019-20.

Gendered Intelligence works in the policy and media sphere to promote trans rights, sending over 1,500 letters to MPs urging them to allow those under 16 years of age to consent

to bodily medical treatments.

- * **Age UK received £6,591,155** from six government departments from 2018-19 to 2020-21. **The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport** provided the largest amount, contributing **£3,195,184** over 2018-19 and 2019-20. Age UK advertises the fact it works with over 100 MPs from across parliament and has called for the pension triple lock to be retained.

- * **The Association of Directors of Public Health (ADPH) received £2,092,358** from 129 councils from 2018-19 to 2020-21. **Merton council** provided the largest amount of funding, contributing **£184,593** from 2018-19 to 2020-21. The ADPH is a member-led organisation that makes sure “the voices of the directors of public health are being heard by policymakers”. Significant amounts of councils’ directors of public health – though not all – choose to have memberships of this association, paid for by council funds.

- * The government department to provide the largest amount of funding was the **Department of Health and Social Care**, supplying **£30,340,668** in grants to five organisations: NHS Confederation; the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists; Age UK; Action on Smoking and Health; and the Royal College of Psychiatrists.

- * The devolved administration to provide the largest amount of funding was the **Welsh Government**, providing **£584,194** in grants to Action on Smoking and Health Wales, NHS Confederation, and the Royal College of General Practitioners.

- * The university to provide the largest amount of funding was the **University of Oxford**, providing **£209,883** in grants to the Royal College of General Practitioners, the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, Action on Smoking and Health, Gendered Intelligence, and the British Medical Association.”

Source: www.taxpayersalliance.com

EU police to get your photo and more

Police forces in the EU will be able to retrieve the photos of holders of driving licences held by other member states, according to the latest amendments to a proposal known as 'Prüm II', which will massively expand cross-border police access to biometric and other data. There is also the possibility for the UK to join the upgraded system.

The Prüm II proposals update earlier rules on the cross-border searching of DNA, fingerprint and vehicle registration data, and will add three new sets of data to the network: police facial image databases, broadly-defined "police records", and driving licence data.

The latest version of the text, circulated within the Council on May 3rd, says that member states "may allow access to facial images of driving licence owner if available," although limitations on search terms are retained. Other member states' driving licence databases may only be searched "with the driving licence

number or data relating to the driving licence owner (first name(s), family name(s), place and date of birth)."

A document previously published by *Statewatch* suggested that there were disputes over the legality of including driving licence data in the database network. That paper said the Council Legal Service has given the green light to the plans - which were not included in the Commission's original proposal but instead added by the Council - while comments from the Swedish delegation noted that "the Commissions [sic] assessment of the proportionality is disputed".

The Presidency has inserted relatively few other proposed changes into the text. A number of new recitals clarify the role Europol is to be given in the revamped Prüm network, while another says: "Data lawfully supplied and received should not be deleted by Member States or Europol if they are used in an ongoing investigation." Ireland has also notified its intention to participate in the legislation.

New articles concerning Europol's role, which correspond to the new recitals, have also been inserted. Two conditions are now to apply to searches conducted by Europol with biometric data received from third countries: that data will have to "have been cross-checked with data held by Europol," and the police agency will also have to "[transmit] the name of the third country which provided the data."

The searching and exchange of driving licence data through the Prüm network would be done via EUCARIS (European Car and Driving Licence Information System), which is also the medium used for the exchange of vehicle registration data.

The UK remains part of the existing Prüm system and has the possibility of joining an extended version, under the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement with the EU.

Source: *statewatch.org*

EU fraud and corruption

Nikolaj Nielsen

The head of the EU's financial crime watchdog, Laura Codru a Kövesi says Malta is paying lip service in its efforts to crack down on EU fraud and corruption.

Speaking to European lawmakers on 20th April, Kövesi said national authorities on the island-nation were unable to respond to simple questions.

"I visited Malta. I had meetings with the national authorities and after 2 days it was very difficult for me to identify the institution that is responsible for detecting crimes," she said.

"All of them said that 'it's not me. It's them.' And when I visited them, they said 'it's not us'," she said.

Kövesi heads the Luxembourg-based European Public Prosecutor's Office. The office is tasked to crack down on VAT fraud and other financial crimes dealing with EU money.

Launched last June, it has so far seized some €147 million in assets, made arrests, and currently has 515 active investigations totalling an

estimated €5.4 billion in damages.

Aside from Ireland, Hungary, Poland and Sweden, every EU state has signed up to the Luxembourg-based office to help fight the crimes. Denmark has a special opt-out.

But Malta stands apart because it is the only participating member that has not opened any investigation.

Luxembourg also has only one, posing questions on the quality and drive of national authorities to alert Kövesi's office of possible crimes. "You cannot find it if you don't search, especially revenue fraud," said Kövesi.

This stands in contrast to the 576 total cases opened across all other participating member states, including 120 in Italy alone.

She is now demanding a revision of the rules that underpin the European Public Prosecutor's Office, and says the rule changes are needed to guarantee the independence of her delegated prosecutors stationed in the respective member states.

The rules also need to be tweaked to simplify investigations in order to better tackle cross border probes, she said.

While her office is deemed competent to tackle tobacco smuggling, for instance, in one member state, it is not in another.

"It undermines our capacity to fight in particular the more serious criminal groups," she said.

Poland also stands out. With 23 cases, it has the most anti-fraud investigations among the member states that refuse to sign up to the Kövesi's office.

"Unfortunately, with Poland we have the highest number of the cases that are involved the non participating member states," she said.

Kövesi says they signed a working arrangement with Hungary and are soon hoping for similar agreements with Denmark and Ireland.

But Poland flat out refuses, she said, due to national legislation.

LETTERS

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

Ukraine

Dear Sir,

I was surprised and puzzled by many of the comments made by Roger Enskat in his letter about the war in Ukraine (*eurofacts* 13th May). Surely we would expect *eurofacts* subscribers, as Brexiteers eager to confirm our national independence from the Brussels kleptocracy, to feel an instinctive sympathy for Ukrainian patriots struggling against the brutal assault of the Kremlin kleptocracy.

I was surprised that Mr Enskat sought to place the 'Atlanticist viewpoint' in a negative light. Although we are frequently disappointed by the short-sightedness of some US politicians, we should see the values and principles that our country shares with our allies in the Anglosphere as forming the bedrock of the Western civilisation that successfully resisted totalitarianism over the decades since the Second World War.

Mr Enskat asserted that Mr Putin is 'putting the security of his country first'. Yet it is Russian troops that invaded Ukraine and not the Ukrainians who invaded Russia!

He claimed that the Russian action has been 'coming to the aid of Russian-speakers in the Donbass region'. Yet the invasion began with the announcement by the Kremlin that Russian-speaking civilians in the separatist areas of Donbass were to be evacuated. This evacuation was carried out in a brutal manner with the evacuees moved to inadequate accommodation in Rostov and then callously moved off by train to unknown destinations across the Russian Federation. The invasion that then followed has been particularly devastating in the Russian-speaking east of Ukraine. Cities targeted by Russian armour, such as Kharkiv, Kherson, Nikolayev and Odesa, are Russian-speaking. The cruelties inflicted on Mariupol, a city with a

very large Russian-speaking population before the assault on it, seem to have equalled in horror the appalling savagery recorded on the Eastern Front during the Second World War. The Ukrainian President, who has bravely led his country's resistance, Volodymyr Zelensky, is himself a native Russian-speaking Ukrainian. Mr Enskat's assertion that Mr Putin's invasion was motivated by concern over the well-being of Russian-speakers in the Donbass was absurd.

In fact it is obvious what provoked the Putin regime to invade its neighbour. When the Soviet Union broke up in 1991, it sadly left an appalling legacy of deep-rooted corruption in the Soviet successor states. For decades Ukrainians found their lives dogged by the corruption that permeated every aspect of government, including health-care, policing and education. Mr Zelensky was elected into office, not because he exploited any particular cultural or language group in Ukraine, but because he promised to push forward a campaign to eliminate the pervasive corruption.

The kleptocrats of the Putin regime could see that if the anti-corruption drive of Zelensky were to succeed in Ukraine, this would expose their own exploitation of corruption to further criticism inside Russia. If Ukraine was seen as a threat, that was not because it was a threat to the Russian nation, but to the kleptocrats who exploit and oppress the Russian people.

Far from NATO being a 'threat' to Russia, as Mr Enskat seems to believe, the NATO leadership was weak and confused at the start of the invasion, expecting President Zelensky, for example, to flee Kyiv. Meanwhile, as we might expect, the response of the appeasing EU leadership has been despicable.

Mr Enskat buttresses his argument by reference to NATO blunders in Yugoslavia, Libya and Afghanistan. These interventions may well have

been blunders, but the governments responsible have long since gone and been discredited. They are not relevant when assessing the urgent need to give aid and solidarity to a brave nation facing a tyranny as brutal, deceitful and unscrupulous as any of those of the 1930s and 1940s. Just as Britain's struggle for freedom from Brussels has been a beacon for all those across Europe fighting self-interested bureaucracy, incompetence and dishonest financial accounting, Ukraine's struggle for freedom from the Kremlin is a beacon for all those fighting the unrestrained corruption and murderous oppression across the Russian Federation and beyond.

GEOFFREY LITTLEJOHNS

Nottinghamshire

US interference

Dear Sir,

How dare the US try to blackmail areas of the UK into remaining under the control and legal regulations of the European Union!

The talk from members of the US government that any UK Free Trade Agreement with the US has to be linked to the Northern Ireland Protocol (NIP) is clearly an act of blackmail and must be resisted at all cost.

The UK is within its authority to pursue a change to the NIP as this protocol is causing constitutional problems for both NI and the UK. Article 16 was inserted into the protocol by the EU and the UK due to the possibility of future problems arising that would require changes to be made in order for the protocol to work effectively for both sides.

These changes can easily be put in place without the need for changes to the Good Friday Agreement that avoids a permanent border between the Republic and NI. Sensible trade negotiations on both sides can easily achieve this goal.

MALCOLM MORRIS

Gloucestershire

LETTERS

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

How to return illegal immigrant's to EU

Dear Sir,

As an illegal immigrant coming across the the channel must have entered an EU country, the simplest solution is to debark them in Belfast and after recording their details, bus them to Dublin where they will be back in the EU. If the Republic doesn't like it, they can remonstrate with France.

JOHN COOKE

Gilsland

Eurovision

Dear Sir,

The result of the Eurovision song cost that voted Ukraine's song to be number one was inevitable due to the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

Eurovision has always been about politics and not really songs, the UK getting to number two was probably due to the UK's solid support of Ukraine and not so much the song.

Those who think this is a softening

of European political behaviour towards the UK will surely be disappointed in the years to come.

REBECCA BANKS

Wiltshire

UK backs down again

Dear Sir,

It appears that the UK Foreign Secretary Liz Truss has backed down on the proposal to unilaterally implement new trading arrangements with the EU. Yet again we see the government failing to take action to create a true Brexit for the UK from the EU.

Instead, we hear she is going to simply start a new round of talks with the EU regarding the current situation.

The EU has made it absolutely clear that it is determined to keep the Protocol in place and any idea of a true negotiation is just UK wishful thinking.

Meanwhile, the Northern Ireland Secretary Brandon Lewis has said the current Protocol situation "isn't

sustainable" and that, "We have got to ensure that products moving within the UK can do so freely and ensure that goods that are moving into the EU via Ireland are properly dealt with, but not products that are staying within the UK".

SHAUN O'CONNOR

Londonderry

Boris on notice

Dear Sir,

Boris Johnson's ability to remain as Prime Minister is now on a knife edge.

Despite winning a no-confidence vote in the House of Commons last week by Conservative MPs voting by 211 to 148, it will not silence those who wish to see him go before the next general election.

However, due to his actions over Covid, Ukraine and his recent movement to help the financial woes of those less well off could yet save him. Time will tell!

RICHARD ROBERTS

Essex

USEFUL WEB SITES

Brexit Watch

www.brexit-watch.org

Briefings For Britain

www.briefingsforbritain.co.uk

Briefings For Freedom

www.briefingsforfreedom.co.uk

Britain First

www.britainfirst.org

Bitish 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.cibuk.org

Civitas

www.civitas.org.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.ccc.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

Brexit Facts

Facts4eu.org

Fishing News

www.fishingnews.co.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

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.eurosafeguards.com

Leave means leave

www.leavemeansleave.eu

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Policy Exchange

www.policyexchange.org.uk

The Reform Party

www.reformparty.uk

The Red Cell (Think tank)

www.theredcell.co.uk

Statawatch

www.statewatch.org

The Taxpayers' Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Veterans For Britain

<http://www.veteransforbritain.uk>

Handshakes not Handcuffs

Edited by Lionel Bell

£6.99 - Pamphlet 2002 - 96 pp

Proposals for alternatives, with a full depth of reasoned opposition to the EU.
[Special Offer £5.00]

The End Of The English

The European Superstate
by David Brown

£6.99 - Pbk 2008 - 111 pp

Written as an apology to all grandchildren, it analyses how the EU planned for control of UK democracy.

Reflections on the Revolution in Europe

by Christopher Caldwell

£14.99 - Pbk 2009 - 363 pp

How mass immigration affects Europe culture and religious values.
[Special Offer £10.00]

The City of London in retreat

by Tim Congdon

£4.99 - Pamphlet 2014 - 36 pp

In retreat due to mainly excessive and unfriendly EU regulation.
[Special Offer £3.00]

All Books plus 10% P&P (UK Only)

Cheques to June Press Ltd
PO Box 119, Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

A Challenge to the Pseudo-Liberals

Time For A Change
Before It's Too Late
by Christopher Hoskin

£4.00 - Pamphlet - 2020 - 33 pp

How Political Correctness and Multiculturalism in all its manifestations has come to dominate society and the world of politics. Without consultation with the people and the dangers it exposes for the future.

Worlds Apart

by Mica Jay

£7.99 - Pbk -2017 - 111 pp

An intriguing novel about how a cosmic explorer who crashes to earth in the Amazon jungle becomes a cosmic celebrity and his effect on a remote tribal community.

Triumph and Tragedy 1991-2016

The Wokingham Mental Health Crisis
House Twenty-Five Year History
by Pam Jenkinson

£11.99 - Pbk 2016 - 299 pp

One woman's fight to help the so-called mentally ill back into a real life working and living situation. With true proven examples. How self help can work successfully if properly supported by truly caring voluntary people not the unsuccessful state system.
[Special Offer £7.00]

Montgomery

and the First War on terror
by Robert Oulds

£9.99 - Pbk - 2013 - 287

This book details a little known period of Monty's career how he fought his wars on terror. How those lessons could just as easily be used in today's war on terror.
[Special Offer £6.50]

Climate

All Is Well, All Will Be Well
by Jeremy Niebor

£14.99 - Pbk - 2021 - 71 pp

How the dogma of global warming was first conceived and why. He argues how and why CO2 is not the real source.

Corbyn's Britain

Land of the Superwoke:

A Travel Guide to Corbyn's Britain
by Lee Rotherham

£13.99 - Pbk - 2019 - 265 pp

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

Untouchable

by Pierre De Villemarest

£15.95 - Pbk -2005 - 506 pp

A former intelligence officer, examines who protected Bormann and Gestapo Muller after 1945.

Online from ww.junepress.com or Tel: 08456 120175 email info@junepress.com

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£30
Europe (Airmail)	£42/€50
Rest of World	£55/\$95
Reduced rate (UK only)	£25

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 **The June Press Ltd, 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
Futurus	www.futurus-thinktank.com
Global Britain	www.globalbritain.org
The Red Cell	www.theredcell.co.uk

POLITICAL PARTIES

Brexit (Reform) Party	0800 414 8525
Richard Tice	
Conservative	020 7222 9000
Boris Johnson MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Co-leaders: Carla Denya and Adrian Ramsey	
Labour Party	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
Neil Hamilton	

ISSN 1361-4134

