

Youth unemployment: one in six without work in euro-zone

ECB figures demonstrate frightening level of unemployment among under 25s

Overall unemployment in the euro-zone at the end of August 2003 was 8.8 per cent, higher than at any time in 2000, 2001 and 2002. That 8.8 per cent was 76 per cent higher than the comparable UK figure (5.0 per cent) and 44 per cent higher than the comparable US figure (6.1 per cent).

Youth unemployment climbed to a frightening level in August 2003: 16.8 per cent. Unemployment amongst the over-25s was a lot less severe.

In 2000, 2001 and 2002, job creation was enough to result in the numbers in work actually increasing. However, employment growth so far in 2003 has been zero. Since the euro-zone labour force is still growing faster than the rate of net job creation, unemployment has continued to rise.

The only sector of the euro-zone economy actually experiencing growth in numbers employed (though the rate

of growth is shrinking year by year) is in "Services". And within this broad category, as Table 3 shows, the only private-sector category to show actual

	2000	2001	2002	Aug 2003
Total	8.5	8.0	8.4	8.8
Under 25s	16.6	15.7	16.2	16.8
Over 25s	7.4	7.0	7.4	7.8

growth is "Finance & Business". Ominously, employment in the public-sector, the "Public Administration" category, whose salaries are paid mainly out of taxes, is showing steady growth.

The source of these figures is the October 2003 Monthly Bulletin of the European Central Bank. Its official figures almost certainly understate real

levels of unemployment. Studies in both France and Germany have estimated that real unemployment in those countries (which together account for over half of euro-zone GDP) may be as much as 50 per cent higher than the official level, which is hovering around ten per cent, way above the average for the whole euro-zone. In the Netherlands, whose official unemployment rate appears to be quite low, a quite implausible proportion of the population is on incapacity

benefit, so masking the real unemployment rate.

Lest we Brits are tempted to indulge in *schadenfreude*, it should be noted that most if not all growth in employment in the UK is happening in the British public sector, and that the proportion of our own work force on incapacity benefit is suspiciously high.

	2000	2001	2002	3rdQ 2003
Whole economy	2.2	1.4	0.4	0.0
Of which: Ag & Fish	-1.6	-0.8	-2.0	-2.0
Industry	0.9	0.4	-1.2	-1.2
Services	3.0	1.9	1.2	0.8

	2000	2001	2002	3rdQ 2003
All services	3.0	1.9	1.2	0.8
Of which: Trade & Transport	3.1	1.6	0.5	0.0
Finance & Business	5.8	3.9	2.3	1.2
Public administration	1.6	1.3	1.3	1.2

British rebate under pressure

Further evidence that Britain is likely to come under increasing pressure to surrender its EU budget rebate has been provided by Günter Verheugen, the EU Enlargement Commissioner speaking at the SPD party congress in Bochum on 16th November. Apparently oblivious to the

fact that Britain is in fact the second largest *net* contributor, he declared: "When we're talking about new financial perspectives in the EU, we must ask whether it is feasible that the poorest countries in Europe pay a rebate for a country ranking among the richest in the EU." Just in case anyone

did not get the point of his strictly rhetorical question, he added: "I do not find it feasible." The present deal on contributions to the EU budget expires in 2006 when a new funding formula will be negotiated.

EU whistle-blower honoured as new attempts are made to damage her reputation

But Marta Andreasen's claims are vindicated by the European Court of Auditors

As fresh attempts were being made to discredit Marta Andreasen, the EU Commission's former chief accountant, her professional colleagues recognised her courage and integrity by giving her an award and the European Court of Auditors provided further vindication of her claims by refusing to certify EU accounts for the ninth successive year.

Accountancy Age, whose readers voted Mrs Andreasen 'Personality of the Year', declared in its 13th November issue: "It seems that our readers respect those who fight against the odds... Andreasen's win is a vote for those who stand up to immense forces."

But while Mrs Andreasen, who has been suspended from her job for 15 months, was receiving the plaudits of her professional peers, the EU spin machine was moving into action.

Disciplinary Process

"It is a complex case and new facts are coming to light all the time", a spokesman for Mr Kinnock told the *Financial Times*. The spokesman declined to say what these were, but specifically denied Mrs Andreasen's claim that the Commissioner was deliberately spinning out the disciplinary process until after he leaves office next year. However, the reality is that 15 months after she was suspended and a year after she gave evidence to an EU investigating officer, she still does not know whether she will be disciplined and, if so, on what grounds. Mr Kinnock received the investigating officer's report last

March.

At the time of her suspension Mr Kinnock said that she had broken staff rules by going outside the Commission with her complaints about the weaknesses in the EU accounts system. Spokesmen also alleged that Mrs Andreasen who had earlier been threatened with dismissal when she refused to sign the Commission's 2001 accounts was 'disruptive' and 'attention seeking'. In June, however, Jules Muis, the Commission's internal auditor found that Mrs Andreasen's complaints - which were only made public after the Commission failed to act - were "substantive and correct".

Lost Opportunity

Lesser individuals would have been broken by the treatment meted out to Mrs Andreasen. But when Mr Muis announced his resignation, Mrs Andreasen, displaying high courage, applied for the job. Perhaps Mr Kinnock did not realise the significance of the opportunity he had been handed. Although this would have required a *volte face* on his part, given imagination and nerve he could have offered her the job, thus signalling, beyond any scintilla of doubt, his resolve to root out fraud and corruption. Instead, he permitted the disciplinary process to continue - but at a snail's pace

Defending his record as vice president in charge of reform in a lengthy and prolix letter in *The Daily Telegraph* on 21st November, Mr Kinnock denied the newspaper's claim that his mission of reform had been a

failure, even if the measures he had introduced were "not perfect or complete". "More objective assessors would recognise - frustratingly and realistically - that reform is a process, not an event", he said.

Just how much of a non-event Mr Kinnock has been in the role of reformer is clear from the 2002 Report of the European Court of Auditors which found that the 'rhetoric of reform' had not been matched by a genuine change of culture.

The Court also found that in the case of the CAP, payments were affected by "significant errors". Payments totalling 46 per cent of the CAP budgets including subsidies for olive oil, cotton, tobacco and dried fodder, rural development, intervention measures and export refunds were not subject to the new Integrated Administrative and Control System (IACS) and "therefore subject to greater risk". The Commission had undertaken a considerable number of audits - but follow-up measures were not rigorous, and the recovery of undue payments was 'slow'.

Central Control

In other words, it is simply not possible to know how much of the taxpayers' money is being misappropriated. However, we can be reasonably sure how the Commission is likely to react to growing disquiet. Since most final EU payments are disbursed by member states, it will claim that what is required to deal with the problem is greater control from Brussels.

Issues and frequencies

The next edition of eurofacts- Christmas double issue Vol 9 No 5/6 - will be published on 19th December 2003.

Is the UK on a slippery slope?

Why isn't UK growth as good as that of other Anglo-Saxon countries?

Britain, according to a number of reputable international economic league tables, is slipping. The World Economic Forum's 2003 Competitiveness Ranking puts the UK in 15th place - behind Germany (13th) though well ahead of France (26th).

Global Britain's EU 2002 Prosperity Rankings (issued on 31st October 2003 but probably still stuck in the past) shows the UK dropping two places, from fourth to sixth, between 2001 and 2002.

Martin Wolf, in an article in the

Financial Times (31st October 2003, "Economic luck that cannot last") notes that over the ten-year period 1992 to 2003, "Australia's economy grew by 50 per cent, Canada's by 44 per cent, that of the US by 41 per cent and the UK's by 36 per cent. Over the same period, the French economy grew by 22 per cent, the eurozone's by 21 per cent, Italy's by 17 per cent, Japan's by 15 per cent and Germany's by 14 per cent."

Why, one wonders, was British growth not as good as that of the other

major Anglo-Saxon economies? What were Australia, Canada and the USA able to do that the UK wasn't able to do? What is it that makes Australia, Canada and the USA different from the UK?

Well, one thing that makes them different is that Australia, Canada and the USA aren't members of the EU. Could that be what's holding Britain back?

Slump in French wine exports to USA

In the four months April to August 2003, French wine exports to the US slumped by 25 per cent compared with the same period in 2002. This was despite the fact that overall US wine consumption grew by 8 per cent. The French share of foreign wine exports to the USA fell from 23 per cent to 15 per cent; Italian and Spanish wines held market share.

Grands Crus from Bordeaux were not affected, but generic Bordeaux, Burgundies and Cotes du Rhone were badly hit. According to the French Federation of Wines & Spirits Exporters, it was not so much the average American boycotting French products as American distributors not wanting to risk having unsold French

stocks on their hands. But, apart from Iraq, there's another reason why French wines are suffering in export markets (and not just in the USA). French wines are seen as complicated (all those chateaux and appellation controlees!), expensive and of lower quality than those of Italy, Spain and the New World.

Another threat to French exporters (and others) is that, from 12th December next, all imports of agricultural produce, food and beverages have to be registered with the US Food and Drug Administration within 24 hours of landing, with documentation allowing their origin to be traced back if needed.

The French have plenty of experience

of applying that kind of non-tariff barrier in the name of health & safety, as British beef exporters found to their enormous cost not so long ago, so their vigneronns will probably cope with the new American rules. More worrying for British lovers of French wine, with all its quirks and complexities and subtleties, is that French winemakers may be even more tempted than they are at present to make copies (good ones too) of the high-volume branded Australian and South African wines. Excellent as the latter are, even discriminating eurosceptics may be inclined to think that life's too short to forego traditional French wine.

You know it makes sense...

The task of reading speeches by European politicians and bureaucrats is not the most enjoyable duty that falls to the editor of *euromagazine*, but it is one which is sometimes lightened by passages of such unreality that it is difficult to suppress gales of laughter. In this respect, the articles and speeches of M. Dominique de Villepin, the French Foreign Minister, who is the very parody of a French intellectual, can be relied upon to contain incomparable gems. The two

examples below are from an article by him in the French newspaper, *Les Echos* of 7th November.

"At a time when the world is hesitating between a universal ambition and the assertion of identities, the European adventure is demonstrating its ability to force the hand of destiny."

And: *"As Michelet noted, there is nothing less straightforward, less natural, more artificial, i.e. less inevitable, more human and freer in the*

world than Europe."

Protracted exposure to rhetoric of this kind has the curious consequence of making one appreciate the speeches of John Prescott. A bottle of champagne to any reader who can parody the contrasting speaking styles of these two European statesmen by producing a publishable verbatim account of an imaginary conversation between them on the subject, *Whither Europe?*

Destroying the myth of subsidiarity

A soundly argued pamphlet that casts a depressing light on British politics

This brief Bruges Group pamphlet performs a useful service, but there is something depressing about the light it throws on the state of contemporary British politics.

Its author, John Bercow, the backbench Conservative MP writes simply and well when describing a debate which has continued since John Major succeeded in including a clause on subsidiarity in the Maastricht Treaty. In this vein, he explains the background to what Mr Major regarded at the time as a considerable negotiating triumph and as the means of keeping a divided party intact.

As he points out, however, there was ample reason to doubt whether its inclusion could halt the erosion of national sovereignty or check the growth of European federalism. Its wording, according to Lord Mackenzie Stuart, a former President of the European Court of Justice, amounted to "a rich and prime example of gobbledygook". Although comprising only a couple of dozen words there was consequently considerable doubt about its meaning and implications. Even so, it should have been clear that the article could not achieve what was claimed for it. The relevant clause - Article G (5) - does not say that action would take place at the lowest level, but that the Community would take action in accordance with subsidiarity if it so decided. As Jacques Delors argued, that clause only makes sense in a federal setting since it constitutes an admission that real authority lies with a

Subsidiarity and the Illusion of Democratic Control

By John Bercow MP

EU Constitution Briefing Paper 03
Pamphlet, 20 pp

Available from *The June Press*

£2 00 + p&p see back cover

ISBN 0-9541909-8-X

European state possessing the authority to decide what powers shall be delegated.

As to the actual impact of the clause, few will dispute the author's conclusion: "*It is clear that repatriation of powers to the United Kingdom has not happened, cannot be expected and, in all probability, was never seriously intended*".

Bercow goes on to describe how the subsidiarity doctrine and its blood relative, proportionality, have resurfaced in the Amsterdam Treaty and the draft constitution where their true purpose is to conceal the further erosion of national sovereignty and to maintain the illusion of democratic accountability.

Although none of this will come as a surprise to readers of *euromatters*, Mr Bercow performs a useful function by placing such arguments in the public domain. The depression sets in as he moves from an analysis of treaty texts to more general matters. In this vein, his words could have come from a

speech given by any number of Tory politicians over the last 20 years. In fact, they could have come from a speech by Mr Major: "*Pervasive public cynicism ... time to stop and reverse the ratchet... there is a noble alternative...partnership of free-trading, outward-looking nations...vision, courage and leadership...such qualities have not been displayed...etc.*"

The sad reality is that the Tory party has expended millions of words on the subject of Europe without finding a rhetoric that resonates sufficiently in the country for EU membership to become a major issue with the public and without producing a coherent strategy that will enable Britain to establish a new and different relationship with its EU partners.

Pamphlets and monographs can play a part in this; by helping to change the political weather they can make it easier for politicians to do the right thing. As Keith Joseph demonstrated, those best suited to the task of changing the climate are those who combine humility and readiness to admit past error with intellectual rigour and boldness.

Mr Bercow should be congratulated for destroying whatever credibility the doctrine of subsidiarity may still possess, but he should learn to resist the temptation to take refuge behind yesterday's cliché when it gets to the difficult task of prescription.

Swedish MPs vote against referendum

The Swedish parliament has rejected a referendum on the draft EU constitution - by 159 votes to 120 - despite support for a plebiscite in all major parties. But having done so, it is coming to terms with the fact that it has no effective means of achieving a key objective, that of defeating the proposals for a permanent EU President. Most Swedish MPs want to preserve the system of rotating

presidents, fearing that the proposals for a permanent presidency contained in the draft constitution would favour the big member states. But having made clear that it does not want to put the constitution at risk over the issue, the Swedish government has no leverage in this or any other issue relating to the draft constitution. Sounding less than confident about her ability to convert other EU ministers to

the Swedish parliamentarians' viewpoint purely by her powers of persuasion, the Swedish Foreign Minister, Leila Freivalds told the Stockholm newspaper, *Svenska Dagbladet*: "I hope the Parliament can provide me with some very strong arguments to help me to convince the other 24 countries during negotiations that they are wrong. I promise to do my utmost."

£11 million a day - that's the cost of Britain's EU membership

Most of the UK's official statistics are compiled by the ONS, the Office for National Statistics, which is an agency of HM Treasury. The ONS boss is Len Cook, a New Zealander. The minister ultimately responsible for the output of the ONS is the Chancellor, Gordon Brown.

Each year, the ONS publishes "*The Pink Book: United Kingdom Balance of Payments*". The 2003 edition, with data for the whole of 2002, was published on the ONS website at www.statistics.gov in mid-October 2003, a couple of months later than usual. The paper version came out in mid-November.

The 2003 edition, which can be downloaded free from the website, contains as usual, at Chapter 9 on page 114 of the Pink Book, a "Geographical Breakdown of Current Account". This shows British exports ("credits" in the jargon), imports ("debits") and the resulting balances for the eleven years 1992 - 2002, analysed by country and by type of transaction: goods, services, income and transfers.

Separate lines, for "EU Institutions", show UK payments to (debits) and receipts from (credits) EU Institutions, and the resulting balances. "EU Institutions" comprise not just the "EU

Budget" administered by the Commission, but in addition an all-too numerous mish-mash of institutions, bodies and quangos like the European Parliament, the Court of Justice, the Central Bank, the Army-which-isn't-an-Army, the European Investment Bank and so on.

The latest figures show that, over the ten-year-period 1993 - 2002 inclusive, the UK paid over to EU Institutions, GROSS, cumulatively, £104 billion. (A billion is a thousand million.) Quite a lot of money - UK taxpayers' money. In those same ten years the UK received back, cumulatively, a lot less: £64 billion. So the UK's NET contribution over that ten-year period was £40 billion, or an average of £4 billion per year. (The 2002 net contribution was £4.3 billion.)

Staggering Numbers

That £40 billion, let us remind ourselves, was taken from UK taxpayers. Assuming an average UK population over those ten years of 59 million, that works out at £678 as the average NET contribution that every man, woman and child in the UK has paid over to "Brussels" in the last

decade.

Putting it another way, the UK has paid over to Brussels, net, in every single one of the 3,652 days (including two leap years) of the last ten years, £11 million. Or, if you prefer, £77 million per week.

How does one get one's mind round these staggering numbers? Well, a brand-new, fully-equipped, state-of-the-art 800-bed city-centre general hospital in the UK costs around £250 million. **If, instead of paying that cumulative net contribution of £40 billion (i.e. £40,000 million) over to Brussels, the government had spent it on brand-new hospitals, we would now be enjoying the facilities of one hundred and sixty of them, having in total 128,000 beds.** Who knows, we probably wouldn't even need to contemplate putting A & E patients in hospital car parks in blow-up tents, as apparently is happening now.

Of course, you could argue that £40 billion of net contribution to Brussels over ten years is value for money - well worth foregoing 160 new hospitals. Is it value for money? Don't bother to ask HM Government. They've been asked repeatedly. They won't tell you. They daren't.

Who will probe the investigators?

The EU's fraud office has itself become the subject of suspicion

In the 10th October 2003 issue of *Eurofacts* we suggested that in the absence of democratic accountability all EU institutions would remain vulnerable to corruption. At the time of writing we were mostly concerned with the allegations made against Eurostat, the EU's statistical arm. But since then the spotlight of attention has turned on Olaf, the EU's anti-fraud office.

A report adopted by the EU Budgetary Control Committee indicates that the claims about Eurostat - mostly in relation to the setting up of unauthorised bank accounts by senior officials - have been known about by

Olaf since 2000. According to the committee, this raised the possibility of a possible "sabotaging" of the investigation by Olaf officials.

Moreover, out of 300 investigators only 20 were used to investigate fraud in the EU institutions - which raises intriguing questions about what the others were doing. The committee also found that several inquiries could not be completed within the allotted nine month time span and could therefore be continued.

Olaf's boss, Franz Herman Brüner is also criticised for "wrong priorities" and for seeking to protect its turf by refusing to allow other agencies to

pursue minor wrongdoing so that it could concentrate on large-scale fraud. A similar criticism was recently made by the German magazine *Stern* which quoted an Olaf employee as saying: "*Catching the small and letting the big run - this is how he [Brüner] is running Olaf.*"

The fact that Brüner presently appears to have few defenders in Brussels, however, may well reflect the desire of senior European Union officials to deflect blame for the seemingly endless stream of allegations of fraud and corruption on to the investigators.

LETTERS

Tel: 01548 821402 Fax: 01548 821574 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

A Tory Reply to Nigel Farage

Dear Sir,

I have deliberately waited until after the Conservative leadership change in order to reply to Nigel Farage MEP, (*eurofacts*, letters 24th October) with whom I have always enjoyed debating. Nigel knows very well that as far as fishing is concerned, we can amend the European Communities 1972 Act, to take competency back from Brussels to Westminster, but whether we amend or repeal the Act, you need a majority in the Westminster Parliament, and to achieve that you need the Conservative Party.

Of course there has been, and still is, a very strong minority within the Conservative Party, who while they argue they want the Nation State, really want a new Nation called Europe. Why they are Conservatives I have never understood.

That is my very argument on why we need in the Conservative Party people prepared to stand up to these pretenders.

I do not believe leaving the CFP would be a breach of our Treaty of Rome obligations because under the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the section on Fisheries within the Rome Treaty is invalid.

Neither can the European Court of Justice do anything, because in the UK the court takes its authority by the will of our Parliament.

Today we are so intertwined within the EU, to leave it immediately would cause huge disruption. A far better way would be to extricate ourselves from it politically over the lifetime of a Parliament, to form a trading bloc, to take other Nations with us, and for the UK to become the East West trade link.

I am also pleased to report that Ann Winterton MP asked the new leader of

the Conservative Party if the Conservative Fisheries Policy remains, not just for National Control, but, by using domestic legislation, for repatriation, and he confirmed that that policy stood. Mr. Howard also said exactly that when writing in the May 1997 issue of the *European Journal*.

My original point stands: don't leave it to the "few" within the Conservative Party. As a Conservative Association chairman, I recognise that we need more within the Party to demand the truth about the European Union. In that sense, I am delighted the Scottish National Party now vigorously support National Control on the fishing issue. We Conservatives support competition, don't we?

JOHN ASHWORTH
York

The Foundations of Fraud

Dear Sir,

Your leader of 10th October 2003 considered one dimension of the fraud involved in the EU. The question of the amount of the fraud, its policing and exposure are in reality quibbles about thefts of the petty cash.

The larger dimension concerns the thinking of the Council of Ministers.

Liability rests upon them for approving and extending irresponsible, fraudulent, puerile and wasteful policies. Since inception in the 1950s fraud has secured every brick laid.

MALCOLM HILL
London

Demographics and Decline

Dear Sir,

Tim Congdon argues that "*it is the number of people of working age and the proportion of them that actually work which is crucial to any nation's capacity to produce*" (*eurofacts* 21st

November).

He was analysing Germany's economic decline and future prospects. This is now a familiar argument and used to justify mass immigration. Why does this argument disturb me so much?

Firstly, if life were that simple India would be one of the world's most prosperous countries in terms of GDP per capita. I started working there in 1982; the population was then around 740 millions. Today, it has a population of 1.2 billions and a birth rate of around 3 per cent. I come from the world of hi-tech. In this area, as in many other manufacturing and design industries, the need for people diminished as technology (computer power and robotics) improved. Optimum Population Level is a complex equation and Tim Congdon did not even scratch the surface. He ignored the demand side of the equation and the fact that Germany (just like the UK) is increasingly a service-based, high-cost economy. Growth is not simply a matter of headcount. The UK's population is now around 64 million and set to grow to 70 within the short term. Our GDP will not grow at the same rate and the present trend in tax levels is unsustainable. We (the UK) have the highest levels of debt in Europe, essential to meet Government revenue targets. I am worried by economists promoting this kind of strategy in a populist fashion. Time and time again they are shown to be wrong. It is a dangerously simplistic approach.

PAUL RHODES
London

The penny drops

"...the EU is an irrelevance to the major issues of our time",
Clare Short, writing in *The Times* on 26th November, 2003

MEETINGS

The Bruges Group 020-7287 4414

International Conference
"The EU Constitution and the UK's role
in Europe and the world"

Saturday **6th December 2003**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

Lord Blackwell, C.P.S.
**Christopher Booker, Journalist and
Author**

Tim Congdon, Economist

Hynek Fajmon MP, Czech Republic

Gerald Frost, Editor, eurofacts

Daniel Hannan MEP

Roger Helmer MEP

Michal Kaminski MP, Poland

Ruth Lea, Economist

**Barry Legg, Businessman and former
politician**

ALL DAY CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, King's College, London

Admission £20 Members

(£25 for non-Members)

Includes lunch and refreshments.

United Kingdom Independence Party 01503-230055

Monday **8th December 2003**, 7.00 pm

**Mike Faulkner, Ex-fisherman and local
businessman**

**Ashley Mote, Author of Vigilance &
OverCrowded Britain**

**Chris Venmore, Chairman of
Crustacea Council for Shellfish
Association of Great Britain**

PUBLIC MEETING

The Queen's Hotel, The Promenade,
Penzance, Cornwall

Admission Free

The Bruges Group 020-7287 4414

Monday **8th December 2003**, 7.30 pm

The Rt Hon John Redwood MP,
Former Secretary of State.

PUBLIC MEETING

The Bonar Law Club, The Two
Chairman Public House, corner of
Dartmouth Street and Old Queen Street,
Westminster, London SW1

(nearest tube, St James's Park)

Admission £2

United Kingdom Independence Party 01283-520502

Wednesday **17th December 2003**,
3.30 - 6.00 pm

Graham Booth MEP
**Christopher Gill, Freedom
Association, Hon Chairman**
Roger Knapman, UKIP, Leader
David Lott, UKIP, Chairman
**Dick Morris, American Political
Strategist**

PUBLIC MEETING

Hangar 1, The Aviator Hotel, Sywell,
Northampton

Admission Free

(Free Tea and Coffee)

8.00 - 11.00 pm

Evening Dance to Glenn Miller & swing
music from the 40's & 50's

Admission £9.50

(Tickets 01283 520502)

(Licensed Bar & Food Available)

Cross-Party Organizations 01628-666456

Saturday **24th April 2004**

March & Rally
calling for a
National Referendum
on the
European Constitution

10.30 am, Victoria Embankment

12.00 am, March

3.00 pm, Rally, Hyde Park

Speakers to be announced

MARCH & RALLY
London
All Welcome

DIARY OF EVENTS

2003
UK Parliament rises **18th December**

2004
Ireland takes over **1st January**
EU presidency

UK Parliament sits **5th January**

European MEP Elections **June**

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords 020-7219 3000

Monday **8th Dec. 2003**, 4.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Proposals for a
Commission for Equality and Human
Rights and other related matters*, from the
Rt Hon Lord Falconer of Thoroton QC,
Secretary of State for Constitutional
Affairs and Lord Chancellor.

Tuesday **9th Dec. 2003**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard on *Science and
International Agreements*, from Professor
Calestous Juma, Professor of the Practice
of International Development, Harvard
University and former Executive
Secretary of the Convention of Biological
Diversity; and Mr Juan Mayr, previous
Colombian Minister for the Environment,
President of Extraordinary Session of the
Convention on Biological Diversity.

Tuesday **9th Dec. 2003**, 3.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The
Accountability of Regulators to Citizens
and Parliament*, from Stephen Timms MP,
Minister of State, Minister for e-
Commerce & Competitiveness, DTI.

Wednesday **10th Dec. 2003**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard on *New
Approaches to the Asylum Process*, from
Keith Best, Director, the Immigration
Advisory Service; and the Immigration
Law Practitioners' Association.

Thursday **11th Dec. 2003**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *Current
Developments in EU Foreign Policy*, from
Dr Denis McShane MP, Minister of State,
Minister for Europe, FCO.

Thursday **11th Dec. 2003**, 14.00 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Science and
International Agreements*, from Mr
Andrew Swiger, Chairman and Production
Director, ExxonMobil International Ltd,
and Mr Nick Thomas, UK Public Affairs
Manager, Esso UK Ltd.

Wednesday **17th Dec. 2003**, 3.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The
Accountability of Regulators to Citizens
and Parliament*, from Ofcom and UK
Mobile Phone companies.

Note:
*Committee Meetings can
change from Public to Private
without warning*

Subsidiarity and the Illusion of Democratic Control

by *John Bercow MP. £2.00*

A critical examination of the concept of subsidiarity as implied in the draft EU Constitution.

The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union

by *Christopher Booker & Richard North. £20.00*

A comprehensive history of the European Union project.

An Analysis of the Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe

by *Anthony & Andrew Cowgill. £15.00*

The definitive guide to the draft of the proposed EU Constitutional Treaty.

Whip's Nightmare

Diary of a Maastricht Rebel

by *Christopher Gill. £17.50*

Former rebel MP gives an insight into the way politics works and why Britain's freedom is being surrendered.

The European Constitution and what it means for Britain

by *David Heathcoat-Amory MP. £7.50*

A review of the scale and scope of the proposed changes. How could any democracy accept this EU plan?

The Trojan Hearse

by *J. Brian Heywood. £9.99*

This book although a work of fiction - or is it? raises a multitude of awkward questions and provides some uncomfortably plausible answers.

A Constitution For Europe

by *Martin Howe QC. £5.00*

A clear and easy to understand assessment of the EU Draft Treaty by a Constitutional Lawyer.

A Constitution to Destroy Europe

by *Bill Jamieson. £2.00*

A financial expert examines the proposed EU Constitution.

Criminal Justice and the draft Constitution

by *The Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP. £2.00*

A review of the legal implications of the proposed EU Constitution.

A Critical History of Economics

by *John Mills. £19.99*

Mills's questions whether economists really do know the causes of economic growth. He sets out in simple language, the history of economic thought and its major influences.

OverCrowded Britain

by *Ashley Mote. £8.95*

This book looks at the facts and consequences of large-scale immigration.

Britain v Europe

by *David Winn. £11.99*

A factual account of Britain's fifty year dilemma over Europe and the development of the EU.

VIDEO

Shockwaves

by *Sanity*

Video £5.00

A clear thirty minute presentation of the EU threat to the United Kingdom.

Send Payment to

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**
Tel: 01548-821402
Fax: 01548-821574
Email: info@junepress.com
www.junepress.com

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY) Ring for foreign rates

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£14
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

Please send me *eurofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £..... to *eurofacts: PO Box 119 Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA*

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

Britain in Europe	020-7233 0123
European Movement	020-7881 8989
Federal Trust	020-7799 2818

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403-741736
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020-8922 0089
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071-663876
Campaign for an Independent Britain	020-8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020-7610 0865
Freedom Association	01746-861267
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020-7691 3800
New Alliance	020-7386 1837
Save Britain's Fish	01224-313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy	01372-453678
No Campaign	020-7378 0436

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020-7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk	

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020-7222 9000
Rt Hon Michael Howard MP	
Democratic Party	01684-891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Labour	020-7802 1000
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562-68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020-7222 7999
Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP	
New Britain Party	020-7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	020-7434 4559
Mr Roger Knapman	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006