

## Tories on course for collision with the European Union

*Michael Howard is too intelligent a politician not to realise the profound implications of his commitments on EU policy*

There were aspects of Michael Howard's speech on the European Union, delivered to the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Berlin on 12th February, that deserve closer attention than they received. It was a grown-up speech which, unlike so many of those by British politicians did not peddle the obvious falsity that the EU is largely a matter of cooperation between independent states. Nor did it advance the equally absurd proposition that that is what it might become as a result of British "leadership".

Howard frankly acknowledged the unabating integrationist zeal of France and Germany, but made it evident that not for a moment does he share the fundamental aims of the governments of those countries. And while the tone was emollient he made it clear that the difference was not one about the pace of change. Instead, seeking to breathe new life into the concept of 'variable geometry' he stated: *"I am not talking about a two-speed Europe. That implies that we are all agreed on the destination and differ only about the speed of the journey. I don't want to reach the destination that some of our partners may aspire to..."*

Of course, there is no "may" about it and what we are confronted with is not an aspiration but an objective whose relentless pursuit has shaped the direction of European politics over four decades and continues to do so. However, it is necessary to remember that Mr Howard is a party leader who does not wish to upset the sensibilities of europhile colleagues - even ageing and out of touch ex-front benchers - as he sets out to climb the political

Everest of a general election victory.

However, while accepting the right of individual EU states to integrate with others of similar persuasion, Mr Howard was nevertheless sceptical about the whole notion of a European identity - the prerequisite of a workable European democratic state. *"There is no European public opinion, no European national identity"*, he said. *"In the absence of a European demos, we are left with kratos: the power of a system that commands respect through the force of law, not public affection"*. Mr Howard may believe in the right of individual states to pursue the goal of further integration - though not to coerce others - but he evidently believes that not much good will come of it.

### National Control

Most importantly, for the first time a Tory leader has acknowledged the European project as it actually is, rather than as he, or she, would like it to be and has not pretended that British 'leadership' can take it in a new direction. The speech is to be welcomed for other important reasons.

First, the Tory leader pledged that an incoming Tory government would, as a matter of urgency, negotiate to restore national control over British fishing grounds - and he was remarkably specific about the objectives of the negotiations. He was also scathing about the CAP, the idea of a common foreign and security policy, the present plans for a European defence, and the record of EU foreign aid.

On the fundamental issue of Europe's

future political development he was explicit in confirming his Party's distaste for a European constitution and in recognising the enormity of what is proposed: *"It is quite dishonourable to pretend that this is all a tidying-up exercise. What is proposed is perhaps the biggest change in Britain's constitution since the 17th century"*.

Finally, he made it clear that like his predecessor he believes that any proposal for a European constitution must be the subject of a referendum.

In sum, his reservations expressed about the present direction of European politics go to the heart of the EU project. Mr Howard was adamant that he did not wish to leave the EU but if, as Prime Minister, he was consistently to pursue the goals described in his speech it is clear that he would be on course for a violent collision with our major EU partners of a kind that could not be avoided by minor compromise or concession. After the pieces had fallen and the air had cleared, such a collision could result in Britain reaching a new relationship with the EU outside the present political framework, perhaps as an Associate member. It is also possible to envisage circumstances in which such a collision would lead to the accelerating disintegration of the EU.

Mr Howard is too intelligent a politician not to realise the implications of his remarks and not to grasp that to go back on them when in office would constitute a major betrayal of principle and commitment.

**Continued on page 2**

# EU plans to spend millions on 'homeland security'

When Europe's superstate ambitions are frustrated the invariable response of the Commission is to open up new fronts on which to advance. Earlier this year plans for a separate European military planning capability were abandoned when the US Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld made it plain that such a course would be regarded as an attempt to undermine NATO. A compromise was consequently approved: there would be an EU planning capability but it would be housed at SHAPE in Mons.

On February 17th, however, the Commission announced new and vastly ambitious plans which, according to *The Independent* (17th February), would, if accepted, mark "a dramatic change in Europe's profile as a global player in defence and security". These would commit the EU to spending 2 billion a year of EU cash into defence and security

research.

The plans, included in a report drawn up at the request of Philippe Busquin, the EU Research Commissioner and Erki Liikanen, the Information and Technology Commissioner, anticipate the creation of a new programme to mount limited military operations, combat terrorism and police EU borders.

The report states: "National governments will only be able to tackle new security challenges if they combine their efforts".

Libertarians are alarmed that the plans include significant sums being spent on surveillance. Tony Bunyan, editor of *Statewatch* magazine which monitors EU developments said: "It looks like research towards creating a homeland security infrastructure...If you are going to start developing new communications networks this is going to impinge on people's freedoms".

Whether the proposals could ever be adequately funded is, of course, quite

another matter as the fate of the plans for the European Rapid Reaction Force demonstrate. The EU originally wanted a 60,000-strong rapid reaction force but the plans have had to be scaled back because of limited resources.

The intention now is to create a string of rapid-deployment combat units. Each of the battle groups will consist of 1,500 troops capable of deployment within 15 days and will operate under a UN mandate. Missions will last up to 30 days and will be "appropriate for, but not limited to, use in failing states". The British and French governments have indicated that they want the revised proposals approved by June 30th and the battle groups to be available by 2007.

Readers will be relieved to learn that the 'failed states' which the planners have in mind are those in Africa - not in the failing embryonic European state.

## Perfect start for new Swedish eurosceptic party

Even before it was formally launched on 12th February, a quarter of the Swedish population said it was prepared to support a new eurosceptic party.

A Gallup poll released by the Swedish television channel TV4 and the largest Nordic newspaper *Expressen* showed that 42 per cent of Swedes believed that the new Jullistan (June List) party was needed and 25 per cent said they were prepared to vote for it.

The party has been founded by a group of economists who played an important role in the campaign to keep

Sweden out of the euro when the issue was put to a referendum in September 2003. The party, which will only contest EU elections, is led by Niels Lundgren, the former chief economist of Nordbanken who describes himself as a social democrat. Former national bank governor Lars Wohlin will also be on the list of the party's candidates fighting the June EU elections.

The new party committed itself to three central aims:

- A referendum on the proposed European constitution
- Ensuring that the 'subsidiarity

principle' is enforced

- Respect for the September 2003 referendum decision on the euro

Since the Swedes voted against the euro, opposition to membership of the single currency has grown to 61 per cent, and 45 per cent of Swedes have become generally more negative towards the EU.

"We are saying we want a Commonwealth of Europe rather than a United States of Europe", Wohlin told the *Financial Times* (12th February).

Continued from page 1

## Tories on course for collision with the EU

For our part, we are inclined to accept them at face value. It is in that context that we view the remarkable decision of the British Conservative MEPs to continue as part of the pro-Federalist EPP. This it would seem is one of those

squalid and unprincipled decisions that is sometimes made for tactical reasons in the pursuit of larger and more important goals. Its aim was to create a display of party unity deemed essential to winning power, without which

nothing can be achieved. Whether it was justified will depend firstly on how successful it is in meeting that aim, and, secondly on whether Mr Howard remains true to the commitments contained in his speech.

# Why the EU ruling on airports will send fares sky high

*eurofacts asked Michael O'Leary, the boss of Ryanair, for his reaction to the EU's decision to order his company to repay the 'subsidy' it has received from Charleroi airport.*

*His characteristically robust response appears below*

The recent European Commission report on the Charleroi case was bad news for consumers, for competition, and disastrous for publicly owned airports who will now be prevented from competing on a level playing field with privately owned airports. The fact that this decision has been warmly welcomed by the trade associations representing Europe's high cost airports and the high fare flag carrier airlines testifies that it is good news for their members and bad for ordinary consumers.

The Commission's decision to force up costs and ticket prices at Charleroi is yet more inept political interference in the successful operation of a free market which benefits consumers. It continues the 50 year record of failed political interference and regulation in the European airline business which has resulted in our citizens being gouged for high air fares by their Government protected flag carriers.

Ryanair has not and does not receive subsidies at Brussels Charleroi. Five years ago before we flew there, the airport was essentially empty. It didn't matter if their "passenger charge was 2" or the handling tariffs "would normally be between 8 and 10" as the Commission claimed. If you have no customers it doesn't matter what your "normal charges" are. Who cares if your "normal rate" is 10 if no-one pays it? Ryanair rightly negotiated big discounts on these mythical "normal rates" (which nobody ever paid as nobody flew there) and it is these discounts (not subsidies) which the Commission now brand as "state aid". The Commission has falsely claimed that "a private investor wouldn't have been in a position to grant this type of aid and back-up" when they know the

opposite is the case.

Charleroi offered these discounts to Ryanair precisely because they were competing against a number of privately owned airports (all of which were offering similar and in some cases lower cost deals) to win our new route business. In recent years many other private airports in Ireland, the UK, Germany, Italy and Scandinavia have stimulated traffic and new route explosions, exactly because they are discounting to rates even lower than those at Charleroi. Like them, Charleroi Airport now has over two million passengers annually and is profitable. Yes,... it makes money. Is it discounting its passenger charges or its handling services below cost? No.... it makes a profit! Would a private investor do a similar type of "aid and back-up package".... of course they would and do. This is why Charleroi is no longer empty and it is now profitable!

## Poorest Sectors

This anti-consumer and anti-competition ruling will force up costs and airfares at all publicly owned airports. Even at Charleroi the Transport Commissioner herself claimed that the increase per ticket would be "between 6 and 8". Since almost half of Ryanair's tickets are sold for under 10, this decision will impose a 60 per cent to 80 per cent price increase on the cost of air travel for the most price sensitive passengers at Charleroi. Similar concern for the poorest sectors of our European family was last demonstrated by Marie Antoinette who suggested to the starving poor of Paris: "Well... let them eat cake!"

If you want equal treatment, then allow the public airports to reduce their

prices in order to compete. The Commission claimed this week that it was "going to guarantee equal treatment amongst airports" when of course it will do exactly the opposite. Publicly owned airports will now be subject to restrictions on their ability to discount and provide incentives, and thereby castrated of any ability to compete against privately owned airports for new routes and traffic, because the private airports will be free to operate in the FREE market and not subject to this Communist dogma of "equality". The former Eastern Bloc states applied this "equal treatment" ideology for 50 years and it resulted in economic ruin.

So if the Commission really wants a "level playing field" or truly believes in "transparency and equality for all airlines" as it claims then it should tell these complaining high fares airlines to move to Charleroi, and compete. Let them take advantage of the low cost base and reduce their prices. If a city centre business wants lower costs it moves out of town. This is how the free market works; and it works to the benefit of consumers.

The EU Commission ruling is legally un-sound; it is based on false claims and corrupts the operation of the free market to deliver lower fares to ordinary Europeans. Instead of promoting competition and the consumer interest this decision damages it. Fares will rise, and publicly owned airports will be prevented from competing with private airports. This decision benefits, and has been welcomed by, high cost airports and high fare airlines. The Commission should have used this case to endorse Charleroi's low cost base which has transformed an empty

**Continued on page 4**

# Will ex-communists be denied the privileges of office - or will they just feel at home?

By Dr Helen Szamuely

Remember all the fuss about the Austrian elections a few years ago when the Austrians had the temerity to vote (not in very large numbers but noticeably) for Jörg Haider's Freedom Party? The EU governments declared all kinds of sanctions, though it was hard to demand anything from the Austrian government, as, in fact, it had not done anything wrong. All suggestions that the Austrians could perhaps be allowed to vote according to their own opinions were shouted down with blood-curdling yells about fascism and nazism. Eventually, the boycotts petered out as the Austrian government went on in its own decent, more or less social-democratic fashion and showed no signs of building either labour camps or gas chambers. At the time several questions were asked in Parliament whether the same welter of abuse would greet neo- or crypto- or, even, former Communists in power in the aspiring East European members? The replies were always the same along the lines of we'll cross that bridge when we get to it.

Well, we have reached the bridge. Former Communists, who had actually, taken part in oppressive behaviour, rather than made ridiculous comments about them like Haider, have been or are in East European governments and the EU seems remarkably unbothered by it, claiming that anyone elected democratically has a right to be there. The question has arisen about former

Communists taking up positions in the European Union itself and there is something of a pothole about it. József Szájer, an observer at the European Parliament from the Hungarian FIDESZ party put a resolution to the 16th EPP Congress that would bar all those with a Communist past from taking up positions in political groups in that institution. The call was backed by various members of the centre and right-wing parties in Eastern Europe but the EU nomenclature was appalled as were those East European politicians whose past does not bear too much examination, such as the Hungarian Prime Minister, who has admitted to working for the Communist secret police before the fall of the regime. Jean-Luc Dehaene announced that barring anyone elected would be undemocratic. He was supported by Guy Verhofstadt and the Agriculture Commissioner Franz Fischler. The former Hungarian Prime Minister Gyula Horn, who had personally taken part in the suppression of the 1956 revolution, suggested that the West Europeans had nothing to boast about. After all, was not Spain's Popular Party, which "stems from the fascist movement of the late dictator Franco" part of the EPP? Indeed it is, but its members are no longer those who had taken part in any questionable political activity. There is a whiff of Marxist argument here: one must not blame individuals

but parties and groups en masse, the very opposite, one would think, of real democracy.

Apart from the European Parliament there is the question of the European Commission. The resolution extended to that, too. The Estonian nominee, Sim Kallas, for instance, was a member of the Soviet Communist Party from 1972 to 1990, an interesting time in the history of the Baltic republics.

In the end the resolution was watered down to a call "on all those who intend to assume a political function in the EU institutions to disclose their political and professional activities in former Communist states and to refrain from taking up a European post if they formed part of the repressive Communist enforcement agencies or were involved in crimes against humanity". To be fair this came at the end of a long and detailed document, clearly inspired by the new members of the EPP that equated Nazism and Communism and demanded the same justice for surviving victims and memorials to the millions who perished as had been given to the victims of Nazism. But I, for one, cannot wait to see how many former members of the repressive Communist enforcement agencies will put on sackcloth and cover their heads with ashes, refusing to participate in the new fleshpots of the EU.

Continued from page 3

## Why air fares will go sky-high

airport into a busy and profitable business which is saving 2 million passengers over 200m each year, while providing choice and competition to the high cost monopoly of Brussels Zaventem Airport (who were the original complainant in this case). The high cost airport wins, the

consumer loses and the Commission screws up. Welcome to European aviation.

We look forward to the European Court of Justice throwing this anti-consumer and anti-competitive decision into the rubbish bin where it belongs. The Court has a far better

record than the Commission at protecting the interests of consumers, promoting competition and rejecting self serving complaints from high cost protected monopolies such as the main Brussels airport.

# EU expenses: MEP expelled after blowing whistle on his colleagues

A socialist MEP who complained about his colleagues' regrettable habit of claiming attendance allowances even when not present at debates in the EU Parliament has been expelled from the Socialist EU parliamentary group.

Austrian MEP Hans-Peter Martin told reporters on 12th February: "*The fact is that MEPs last Thursday morning wanted to sign themselves on to an attendance list for a session that was cancelled. With one signing they have an automatic right to a daily allowance of 262 euros - even when the session does not take place*" (for a

comprehensive account of the lavish expenses available to MEPs see p.2 of 13th February issue of *eurofacts*).

Extraordinarily, the claims made by Mr Martin, formerly a journalist with *Der Spiegel* led to cries of moral outrage from his socialist colleagues. A note circulated by Rosmarie Müller, a German MEP said: "*We should not allow that he [Hans-Peter Martin] slanders us in public and presents himself as the 'clean man' of Europe while at the same time he uses his assistant to watch out and gather 'information' about us*".

On 11th February, at a meeting of the

Socialist group, members condemned Mr Martin's "*inquisitorial and policing methods*". Martin was expelled when he refused to apologise for his actions and ordered from the room by the group leader Enrique Baron Crespo.

Mr Martin, who says he has received hundreds of e-mails of support from Austrians urging him to stand as an independent in the June elections remains defiant, declaring that he will continue to speak out on the issue (*euobserver* 12th February).

## What losing sovereignty can do to your restaurant bill

Two years ago while campaigning for re-election as Head of State President Chirac promised the French electorate to reduce the rate of VAT on restaurant meals from 19.6 per cent to 5.5 per cent. The French restaurant profession, which was going through hard times, promised that if VAT were indeed reduced by 14.1 per cent it would use a good portion of the extra cash released to create new jobs, then as now badly needed in the restaurant sector and the French economy as a whole.

In the excitement of his campaign, Chirac didn't stress that the decision to reduce VAT was up to Brussels, not Paris. Worse, such a decision needed unanimity amongst the fifteen member states. Now, two years later, despite intensive French lobbying, the Germans, Swedes, Danes and others have refused to go along with the French proposal. The French government realised that it wouldn't be able to persuade Brussels of its case before the June 2004 euro-elections, or

even before the French presidential election in 2007. It was also - commendably - determined to fulfil a manifesto commitment.

So, on 10th February 2004, Prime Minister Raffarin announced the "temporary" reduction of the French equivalent of employee National Insurance contributions for the restaurant sector - a measure which the government believes it can take without permission from Brussels. The saving for the sector, over the next 18 months, is put at 1.5 billion (£1 billion), equivalent to what the saving from reduced VAT would have been. Paris will continue to lobby Brussels for the VAT reduction.

This episode is a stark example of the *acquis communautaire* or ratchet in practice. Once power has been abandoned to Brussels, it can never be returned, no matter what mad consequences flow from it. In the present case, a national government, trying to help a national industry in difficulties, is impotent. Yet no

competition issues are involved, except in the extremely theoretical case, in French frontier regions, where, say, a French family might choose to dine in a French restaurant charging 5.5 per cent VAT rather than driving into Germany to dine in a German restaurant charging 16 per cent. The even more bizarre fact is that at present different countries charge different rates of VAT on restaurant meals anyway, ranging from 25 per cent in Denmark and Sweden to 7 per cent in Spain and 3 per cent in Luxembourg.

France, the inventor of VAT, and supporter of EU "integration", having made its bed, must lie in it. Whether the French electorate continues to put up with this sort of nonsense indefinitely is another matter. Thanks to the French government, behaving, despite Brussels, like a sovereign power, British tourists will be able to afford seven restaurant meals in France for every six they enjoyed last summer.

## Correcting the record

In our last issue (13th February), under the headline "*Tory MEP leads fight against servile parties*", we reported that a group of 24 MEPs had filed a suit with the EU Court of Justice with the aim of blocking the use of taxpayers' money by trans-national

political parties. Our report explained that the move had been initiated by Daniel Hannan, the journalist and MEP and had been supported by MEPs from France, Scandinavia and some applicant countries. However, we failed to report the fact that the move

has been fully supported by all three United Kingdom Independence Party MEPs - Jeffrey Titford, Nigel Farage and Graham Booth.

We are glad to have this opportunity to correct the omission.

# LETTERS

Tel: 01548 821402 Fax: 01548 821574 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## MEPs: Time for a Cost-Benefit Analysis

Dear Sir,  
With the European Parliament elections in June, it is perhaps not too soon to determine a cost/benefit/influence analysis.

Each UK MEP serving in the European Parliament (EP) costs the UK taxpayer £1.06M annually (*Daily Telegraph* 2nd January 2004.). Currently, and until June 2004, the UK has 87 MEPs representing an influence of 13.89 per cent in the EP. From the next election, this number will decrease to 78 and influence will likewise decrease to 10.6 per cent as the total number of seats in the EP increases to 732 due to enlargement.

In 2007 when Romania and Bulgaria join the EU, the number of seats in the EP will remain at 732 but the UK's MEPs will fall still further to 72 or 9.8 per cent representation for the UK.

Polls indicate that some 18 per cent of UK voters intend voting in the June 2004 EP election (Mori, *The Independent*, 2nd February) which may reflect that they can see the cost/influence but have yet to see the cost/benefit aspect of the equation. No doubt the candidates standing for the EP will make the benefits clear to the voters in their election addresses.

By contrast, the cost to the taxpayer of each MP in Westminster is £425,000, and possibly the voter this time can see the cost/benefit but with the influence aspect of the equation being very much reduced by the Institutions of the EU. Adopting the EU Constitution will further diminish the influence of UK MPs in Westminster and be catastrophic to our democracy.

HARRY M RANDALL  
Dorset

## History's Lessons

Dear Sir,  
When Dominique de Villepin in his Lisbon speech on 6th January told the world that "After the failure of

Brussels France is ready to move forward. History demands this. Our citizens expect it. Consequently we must relaunch the work on the constitution.....". (*eurofacts*, 30th January) I wonder whether he was aware of this instruction given by a certain young Captain Charles de Gaulle to student cadets at the military academy of St Cyr in 1921/22:

*"Remember this lesson. History does not teach fatalism. There are moments when the will of a handful of free men breaks through determinism and opens up new roads. People get the history they deserve. When you lament a misfortune and fear that worse is to come people will tell you 'It's the law of history. It's the will of evolution.' They will explain it all very lucidly. Stand up, gentlemen, against such clever cowardice. It's worse than stupidity. It's the sin against the Holy Spirit."*

RONALD STEWART-BROWN  
Oxfordshire

## Why UKIP helps Federalists

Dear Sir,  
Nigel Farage may huff and puff to his hear's content against Conservative eurorealists like Frederick Forsyth, John Ashworth and Christina Speight (see letters 16th and 30th January) but the fact is that Britain's future will be decided by our Westminster Parliament, in which there are no UKIP MPs, and that there are more eurorealists amongst Conservative MPs than in any other party.

The Conservative Party demands a referendum on the European Constitution and opposes ratification of it if Blair signs Britain's sovereignty away without the consent of the British people. UKIP's policy of opposing eurorealist Conservative candidates in marginal seats can only benefit the eurofanatics.

LORD DERAMORE  
North Yorks

Dear Sir,  
Of course UKIP can't ever take Britain out of the EU! But it most certainly has

a role. This is to provide the voter with the means to punish the Tories if they are again tempted along the integrationist road.

However, it would be a folly if UKIP ever again sought to displace robust eurosceptic Tory candidates at a general election. How much better if, after the June EU elections, it concentrated all of its resources on campaigning to displace the three most high profile europhiles in the Conservative Parliamentary party. I would suggest that these are Ken Clarke (Rushcliffe), David Curry (Skipton and Rippon) and Ian Taylor (Esher). I believe that this strategy would discourage other wayward Conservatives from being influenced by this woeful trio.

WILLIAM FERRIS  
Sussex

## First Step in Disengagement

Dear Sir,  
Those of your correspondents who have recently been debating the best way to disentangle ourselves from the European Union should look at the Conservative Party website ([www.conservatives.com/news/article.cfm?obj\\_id=86456](http://www.conservatives.com/news/article.cfm?obj_id=86456)). This reports the fact that the Conservative Party has launched a new fishing advisory group with the aim of restoring national control over the industry.

Shadow fisheries spokesmen John Whittingdale is quoted as saying: *"In the long term we will come forward with details as to how a Conservative government will establish a management scheme outside the CFP"*.

Surely all UKIP supporters should support this initial step in disengagement.

D.E. NIXON  
Staffs

# MEETINGS

## UK Independence Party

North East Hertfordshire  
and Hertford & Stortford Branch  
01462-680481

Tuesday **6th March 2004**, 7.30 pm

“Should Britain leave the European Union?”

**Stuart Agnew**  
**Bryan Smalley**  
**Jeffrey Titford MEP**

PUBLIC MEETING

The Brotherhood Hall, Gernon Road,  
Letchworth

**Admission Free** ”

---

**The Bruges Group**  
020-7287 4414

Wednesday **17th March 2004**, 7.00 pm

“The Malcontente Cordiale: 100 Years  
of Anglo-French ‘Alliance’”

**Andrew Roberts**, *historian and  
broadcaster*

15th ANNIVERSARY MEETING

The British Academy, 10 Carlton House  
Terrace, London SW1

**Admission £10 on the door - or in  
advance (Refreshments included)**

---

**Campaign for an Independent  
Britain**  
020-8340 0314

Saturday **17th April 2004**, 2.30 pm

“European Union - the great deception”  
**Christopher Booker**, *Author and  
journalist*

**Neil Herron**, *Campaign Director  
Referendum 04 and Metric Martyr  
Defence Fund*  
Chairman, **The Lord Stoddart of  
Swindon**

PUBLIC MEETING

Upper Hall, The Emmanuel Centre,  
9-23 Marsham Street, London SW1  
**Admission Free**

---

## DIARY OF EVENTS

### 2004

Accession of ten new **1st May**  
member states

European MEP Elections **10-13th June**

## 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  
(Presentation of petition at No 10  
Downing Street)  
3.00 pm, Rally, Hyde Park

**Speakers to be announced**

MARCH & RALLY

London  
**All Welcome**

---

## UK Independence Party

Chichester Branch  
01243-532509

Tuesday **4th May 2004**, 7.30 pm

“Who Governs Britain?”

**Philip Benwell**, *National Chairman of  
the Australian Monarchy League*  
**Petrina Holdsworth**, *Barrister*  
**Ashley Mote**, *Author of Vigilance and  
OverCrowded Britain*

PUBLIC MEETING

Schola Grammaticus Hall, Midhurst,  
West Sussex  
(opposite the North Street car park)  
**Admission Free**

---

**The Bruges Group**  
020-7287 4414

Wednesday **5th May 2004**, 7.00 pm

**Carl Mortishead**, *Journalist with The  
Times*

Wednesday **9th June 2004**, 7.00 pm  
**Speaker to be announced**

Tuesday **13th July 2004**, 7.00 pm  
**Sir Andrew Green KCMG**, *Chairman  
of Migration Watch UK*

PUBLIC MEETING

The British Academy, 10 Carlton House  
Terrace, London SW1  
**Admission £10 on the door - or in  
advance (Refreshments included)**

## Gresham College

020-7831 0575

Thursday **6th May 2004**, 6.00 pm

“Dollarisation and Gresham’s Law: Will  
there in the future be just one or two cur-  
rencies?”

**Professor Avinash Persaud**

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London  
**Admission Free**

---

## UK Independence Party

Winchester Branch  
01962-711112

Monday **24th May 2004**, 7.30 pm

“European Union - the great deception”

**Christopher Booker**, *Author and  
journalist*  
**Nigel Farage MEP**

PUBLIC MEETING

The Guildhall, Winchester, Hampshire  
**Admission Free** ”

---

## SELECT COMMITTEES

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **2nd March 2004**, 10.35 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Economical  
and Financial Affairs and International  
Trade* from Mr Peter Sutherland of the  
WTO Consultative Board and Chairman  
of the WTO.

Tuesday **2nd March 2004**, 4.15 pm  
Evidence will be heard on The State of the  
Economy and Economic Policy, Long  
Term and Short Term from Jean-Philippe  
Cotis, Chief Economist, Organisation for  
Economic Co-operation and Development  
(OECD).

Wednesday **3rd March 2004**, 15.45 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *The EU  
Working Time Directive*.

Thursday **4th March 2004**, 10.45 am  
Evidence will be heard on *The EU  
Scrutiny Strategy* from the Foreign and  
Commonwealth Office; and the Ministry  
of Defence.

*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 employed 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 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.

**The Making of Europe's Constitution**

by *Gisela Stuart MP. £6.95*

An insider's insight into the proposed EU Constitution and a call for greater democratic scrutiny.

**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"**

<b>Britain in Europe</b>	<b>020-7233 0123</b>
European Movement	020-7881 8989
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020-7799 2818</b>

**AGAINST "EU"**

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403-741736</b>
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
<b>British Weights &amp; Measures Assoc.</b>	<b>020-8922 0089</b>

Campaign against the Single Currency  
07071-663876

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**  
**020-8340 0314**

Democracy Movement 020-7491 3072  
**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 0121 333 7737**  
Mr Roger Knapman

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006