

Heading for the Rocks?

The Tory refusal to change course may transform temporary UKIP support into a permanent shift of allegiance

What lessons are to be learned from the results of the elections to the European Parliament of 10th June? The most obvious was stated by Andrew Marr, the BBC's Political Editor on the PM programme on 14th June: "*The British public is more eurosceptic than the Westminster establishment realised in its wildest dreams.*"

But have the main parties grasped this lesson even now? Whether by design or obduracy, as we go to press, they appear to be going out of their way to give the impression of not having done so. The captain of the Titanic was blithely unaware of the hazards that destroyed his ship. Captains Blair and Howard have been given unambiguous warning of the perils they face - but positively boast that they will not vary their course. In the case of the Conservatives, the only consequence of their deservedly abysmal showing has been an announcement that they will be competing with their political opponents to spend more on the public services. Yet if UKIP retains only a third of the support that it achieved in the EP elections it could do enormous harm to Tory prospects.

Nevertheless, the party leadership maintains that Tory defectors to UKIP will return to the fold. Having first insulted them, and then taken pride in showing itself deaf to their entreaties, this sounds like hubris.

Commenting on the results as these came in on 13th June Michael Ancram, the Shadow Foreign Secretary, seemed even unwilling to acknowledge the anxieties and sense of outrage that turned Tory activists into UKIP activists overnight. Perhaps Robin

Harris, Mrs Thatcher's former policy adviser had Ancram in mind when, a few days later, he wrote: "*This discreditable, deceitful and demoralising trudge towards a European superstate has never prompted an apology from today's political leaders. Indeed the attitudes that accompanied it are still all too evident today.*" (*Daily Telegraph*, 16th June.

There is no doubt about Ancram's own role in this process. His negotiations to achieve a new deal in the EP with the arch-Federalist EPP fuelled the sense of outrage that helped produce the Tories' worst electoral showing since 1832. The threat to deselect Conservative candidates who did not sign up to this disreputable arrangement made matters still worse. It does not reflect well on the eurosceptics among Conservative candidates that they were willing to sign up to the deal, however reluctantly. One of them, Roger Helmer, however, is to be congratulated for making it abundantly clear what he thought of it and for bravely calling for a comprehensive review of European policy - the correct response to the Tory drubbing.

Tory Miscalculation

The results from elsewhere in Europe brought home the scale of the Tory miscalculation. Strong performances by eurosceptic parties, especially in Central Europe, confirm our judgement (*eurofacts* 14th May) that had the party acted on principle instead of out of political expediency Conservative MEPs could have led a grouping of like-minded parties that

would have held the balance of power within the EP. Instead, to its shame, it has paid the price for scuppering such a deal in order to remain allied to its political enemies.

By contrast, the problems facing UKIP are the problems of success. It cannot sit on its laurels for five years in the hope that it will do even better next time around; its present momentum will not last forever. Some UKIP members seem to favour cutting deals with other eurosceptic parties in the EP. But this would be to engage in a form of politics that UKIP wants to abolish. If successful, such endeavours would marginally improve a supra-national institution in which UKIP wants no part. By common consent there is a need for it to engage in some policy work. But does it really need to have a policy on every issue including playschools for the under fours? Our own view is that it should concentrate on those policy issues which relate directly to its central goal, which commendably, it never lost sight of during the campaign.

If its momentum is to be maintained it will need fresh electoral triumphs. But this does not mean that it should seek to contest every by-election or fight every seat in the general election. If its aim is to achieve a new and different relationship with Europe this goal will be best served by using its resources selectively, by avoiding the displacement of MPs with strong eurosceptic credentials, and by thinking seriously about the problems - not insuperable but real - which would be encountered on the political route marked "Exit." Our congratulations to all 12 UKIP MEPs.

Where do we go from here?

Anthony Scholefield, a founding member of UKIP, argues that electoral success must be followed by rigorous intellectual application and complete candour

The key insight behind the creation of UKIP - I was one of its founders and its Secretary from 1997-2000 - was that political parties only make strategic changes if they lose voters and seats. The reaction so far of the major parties is that 10th June has not hurt sufficiently to make them change. So what does UKIP do now?

The election of 12 UKIP MEPs in one swoop both telescopes the aspirations of UKIP over two or three Euro elections and, at the same time, takes the 'elect an MEP strategy' as far as it can be taken.

Whatever UKIP's strategic priority now it cannot be to add a few more MEPs in five years' time. Its goals will have to be pursued with the MEPs it now has. Paradoxically, success on 10th June increases the pressure on UKIP to act quickly and forcefully - but exactly where and how and when has yet to be settled.

The Party's most important task is to describe how it intends to withdraw from the EU and how, in the wake of its withdrawal, it will establish a new basis for relations with EU states. This will need to involve the wide canvassing of ideas and a strengthening of the party's intellectual base.

Scrupulous care will also be required in dealing with the issue of the Constitution and possible referendum. To try and make a referendum a vote on withdrawal from the EU will automatically risk losing the votes of those who would be against further integration but would also be against leaving the EU. It would mean surrendering the advantages always enjoyed by those defending the status quo - and to lose the referendum would be a quite shattering disaster.

UKIP also faces difficult decisions in relation to its General Election strategy. There are those who wish to repeat the mass charge of 400 plus candidates of 2001 while others advocate a more subtle strategy. This might involve concentrating fire on well-known europhiles or asking

candidates for a withdrawal pledge before determining whether to stand against them. The downside of such an approach is that UKIP must be seen to act forcefully or it will be in danger of fading. My own view is that to attack sympathetic eurosceptics and to fight in hopeless seats would entail a huge diversion of effort and would consequently reduce the Party's impact.

Finally, there is the question of whether UKIP should campaign more intensively on issues such as immigration reform (I note the huge and largely unreported BNP vote), find policies on the Blair government's constitutional mess and whether it really needs to invest a large amount of effort in developing policies across the board.

Exit Strategy

How does UKIP see its exit strategy from the EU? Traditionally it has put forward three possibilities: (1) UKIP wins a Westminster majority (2) one of the major parties converts to a withdrawal policy (3) in exasperation, an incumbent government decides to hold a referendum on British membership. However, it now appears that there may be other possibilities. The new Constitution may lead to enhanced co-operation and the creation of an inner 'core', a situation in which withdrawal proceeds naturally, possibly with other states. There are already those who think that the EU 'core' has already determined that the UK will never be a true aspirant to EU integration and would be prepared for Britain to leave by mutual agreement especially after a constitutional *debacle* in the referendum.

There has been considerable confusion in the UKIP ranks on what those future relations should be. For example, emphasis was put on stopping immigration from the new EU states but, logically, this must imply halting the free movement of labour within the existing EU states. Not so

popular, of course, but honest.

The pathway to withdrawal requires legislative proposals, the repeal of the European Communities Act and a standstill Bill, the European Communities (Temporary Continuation) Bill which would both give political legitimacy to the withdrawal process and signal a start to the immense untangling process. The key points in any future relations must be inter-governmental and any body set up to run trade agreements or other matters must be technical and subordinate. Second, there must be no ratcheting of the integration process.

There are other important realities which UKIP must now face. While trade may indeed be roughly in balance, 60 per cent of British goods exports go to the EU while for the EU core states Britain represents only 13-15 per cent of their market. Second, to obtain a free trade agreement in industrial goods with only major agricultural exporting countries may not be so easy. The central European countries already feel badly let down in their entry negotiations. One aim of the British government is promoting trade with the poor agricultural countries of the world while UKIP is promising a protectionist agricultural regime. It is likely that Britain's EU trade will become less important relatively even if there is an industrial goods free trade agreement - but this is a good thing because it will open up the process of re-orientating Britain's trade to the growth countries of the world.

On all these matters UKIP must be careful to talk straight on the difficulties and benefits of withdrawal. Robert Kilroy-Silk and others have been rather free with their comments on the 'lies' of the europhiles. UKIP must tell the truth even when this is inconvenient.

Campaign reflections of a UKIP victor

By Graham Booth

The result of the European Election will make a serious impact on Britain's political future.

For the first time in our history the two leading parties failed to gain 50 per cent of the vote between them, with Labour getting its worst result for 90 years and the Conservatives their worst for over 150 years.

So what has happened? The British people have spoken - 2.5 million voters have stated unambiguously that they want Britain to leave the EU.

As the results for the South West came into the Civic Centre at Poole, it very soon became apparent that a major shock was on the cards. Of the 46 voting areas, UKIP achieved first place in eleven (including Torbay with 34.7 per cent of the vote) and second place in another 21, ending up in a clear second place throughout the South West (on 22.5 per cent), behind the Tories (on 31.5 per cent).

An increase from 3 UKIP seats in the European Parliament to 12, when the total number of seats available in the UK had actually reduced by 9 (from 87 to 78) was astonishing.

So what does this excellent result for

the UK Independence Party actually mean?

It means that our message has finally got through - that Britain should be run by the British and that we must leave the EU in order to regain our independence.

An editorial in the (Torbay) *Herald Express* (June 14th) was perceptive:

"By any benchmark, the performance of the UK Independence Party in the Euro elections is remarkable. Its impact on the wider political scene over the next few years is likely to be seismic."

No doubt critics will produce statistical devices to prove that the result was a fluke, but over 2.5 million people have put down a serious marker and our established politicians will ignore that message at their peril.

We shall now be able to explain calmly and coolly, that withdrawal from the EU is not "a nuclear option" whatever that might mean; that 3 million jobs will not be at risk (over 4 million jobs in the EU depend on their trade with us); that "peace in Europe" has had little, if anything, to do with our EU membership and many other

things.

We shall also be able to explain precisely what benefits we shall gain as non-members and we relish the opportunity for full, open debate on the subject.

If our professional politicians decide to ignore the message they have been given and the electorate decide to give UKIP a mandate to run the country at the next General Election we shall do our very best - successive recent governments haven't set a very hard target to beat!

Once free of EU dominance, we could implement our full manifesto on domestic issues, which is currently being updated. Perhaps the British public really is ready for the breath of fresh air that a completely new approach would deliver.

Graham Booth is the United Kingdom Independence Party Member of the European Parliament for the South West.

Dehaene won't take no for an answer

Democracy implies the right to change your mind. In the 1970s the Left-wing of the Labour party was rightly condemned to obscurity for seeking "an irreversible shift" in the ownership and control of the British economy. But no such opprobrium attaches to those within the establishment of the EU who display an equal or greater contempt for the concept of self-government. Their remarks, though influential, go unrecorded in the British press.

In a debate on Brussels radio the former Belgian Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene criticised the decision of

the Belgian government to hold a referendum on the proposed EU constitution (which as one of two vice-chairman of the Convention on the Future of Europe he helped to write).

With an arrogance and sense of superiority almost equal to that of his boss Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, he declared: "*We know that nine out of ten people will not have read the Constitution and will vote on the basis of what politicians and journalists say. More than that, if the answer is no, the vote will probably have to be done again, because it absolutely has to be yes*" (*Irish Times*, 2nd June). If voting

makes no difference no wonder that so few turn out to do so. Never mind, the EU establishment can be expected to find a PR response to the "democratic deficit." Another conference, another summit, another report by a committee of wise men? Something like that.

Only die-hard eurosceptics will remember that the idea of the Convention on the Future of Europe which in turn led to the EU Constitution was born at Laeken, the European Union summit with the declared aim of making the EU 'more democratic.'

CAP 'reform' fails to cut spending

Despite 'reform' the CAP continues to account for nearly 40 per cent of farmers' incomes in EU countries

according to the OECD in its annual survey of member states' agricultural policies. In all, farmers in rich

countries received \$257.3bn in financial support in 2003.

Support grows for Franco-German plans for minimum company tax rates

France and Germany have made a major step forward in getting agreement for a minimum corporate tax rate by winning the support of Holland.

Dutch sources speaking to the *EU-observer* on 3rd June confirmed "that the Dutch government agrees with the initiative of France and Germany [to see minimum base rates for companies.]"

Gerrit Zalm, the Dutch Finance Minister, is expected to throw his weight behind the Franco-German plans when Holland takes over the EU Presidency next month. Joop Wijn, the

number two at the Dutch finance ministry with direct responsibility for tax policy, has already called publicly for a minimum corporate rate.

Recently France and Germany which have corporate tax rates of around 35 and 40 per cent respectively, have been coordinating their attempts to put pressure on countries with lower rates to accept the need for a common minimum rate. In May the finance ministers of the two countries Nicolas Sarkozy and Hans Eichel stood economic logic on its head when they wrote to the European Commission saying that a minimum rate "would in

no way stand in the way of a healthy competition between member states" - which presumably implies that the present competition is in some way unhealthy.

The Dutch change of heart is reported to have caused delight in Paris and Berlin - but will not cheer up Michael Howard who, during his interview with John Humphrys on 10th June said that there were signs that the Dutch were "saying the same kind of things that we have been saying."

EU's vanishing electorate

EU-wide turnout in the 10th June Election to the European Parliament fell for the sixth successive occasion. Final figures showed that 44.2 per cent of voters turned out, lower than the 49.8 per cent recorded in 1999. Since the first such elections in 1979 participation has fallen steadily from a high of 63 per cent.

In the 10 new states only 26 per cent cast votes. The lowest turnout of all

was Slovakia where only 20 per cent voted, followed closely by Poland with 20.7 per cent.

In Old Europe - the former '15' - 47.8 per cent of voters participated, despite the fact that in many states polling for the EP took place simultaneously with other elections or referendums.

In the UK participation was up at 39 per cent. This would appear to be the result of a combination of factors: the

experiment in postal-voting, the fact of simultaneous elections, the sense of outrage among Tory activists over the deal struck with the EPP and the fact that the intervention of UKIP gave the voters a unique opportunity of expressing their view about the desirability of EU membership, thus injecting a degree of genuine controversy and excitement into the campaign.

Norway adopts less than one in five EU laws

In describing the hideous future that awaits the UK should it be reckless enough ever to contemplate leaving the EU, ministers cite the example of Norway. Maybe not a good example since Norway is one of the world's richest nations, but you can see what they are getting at: "We wouldn't want to be in the same position as Norway - they have to accept all the EU rules,

but they have absolutely no influence over drawing them up. They call it 'fax democracy'."

As europhile arguments go this is more plausible than most - except that it overlooks the fact that Norway takes notice of less than a fifth of the faxes it receives.

In the years 1997-2003 Norway transposed into Norwegian law 2,129

EU laws out of a total of 11,511 (18.5 per cent) according to the Norwegian Foreign Ministry as reported in the Norwegian newspaper *Nationen*. Given its superior size and clout, if Britain had the same independence as Norway it could presumably expect to adopt a smaller proportion of EU law if it chose to do so.

A defining moment for Michael Howard?

John Humphrys: "So in other words, your position [on the central issue of whether Britain should remain a member of the European Union] is precisely the same as the Labour government's." **Michael Howard:** "Oh! Absolutely." (Today programme, 10th June 2004).

Do the British really loathe Europe?

Somehow the facts don't seem to square with the assertion that the rise of UKIP is driven by hatred or xenophobia

Even before the vote had been counted on 10th June *The Guardian* sought to explain the rise of euroscepticism by pointing to “the dislike of abroad and contempt for foreigners”. Apart from European football and continental holidays the British hated Europe and were now retreating into an island of the mind, its leader writer declared in that day’s issue. Writing in *The Independent* on the same morning Pamela Schlatterer, UK correspondent for a German television company analysed Britain’s “special brand of continental hatred”, overlooking the irony that here was a British newspaper offering a German journalist its front page to criticise British ‘xenophobia’ (Would *Die Welt* pay Simon Heffer or Peter Hitchens to write a front-page anti-German rant?)

According to Miss Schlatterer the only European topic in which the British are interested is Euro 2004 because this gives the British the opportunity to revel in past sporting victories over foreigners and to anticipate future occasions when John Bull will have the opportunity to humiliate Johnny Foreigner. And if this was true of London, matters were even worse in the provinces, or so Miss Schlatterer had been told by a friend who, unlike her, had been brave enough to venture outside the capital.

Scintilla of Truth

Is there even a scintilla of truth in all this? Judging by the people one knows, eurosceptics do seem to like Europe and to be as interested in its achievements as europhiles. Why, Ian Milne, the founder-editor of this very publication chooses to live in France for much of the year, obviously preferring aspects of French society and culture to those of Britain - and he speaks the language rather better than our europhile Prime Minister. Noel Malcolm, the distinguished historian, philosopher and noted eurosceptic speaks nine European languages and

knows more European history than has ever before been accommodated in a single human head. Roger Scruton, the Conservative philosopher and founder of the *Salisbury Review* speaks almost as many European tongues and has gone to considerable lengths to persuade his fellow scholars in Britain to take a more favourable view of Hegel. One could go on almost indefinitely.

Well, yes, but perhaps it’s actually the non-intellectuals who are responsible for spewing out the hatred and prejudice that *The Guardian*, *The Independent*, among others, detect all around us.

Kilroy- Silk

But that doesn’t seem to square with the facts, either. Robert Kilroy-Silk - no intellectual he - owns a large house in Spain, where he spends much of his time and admits to liking Spaniards. He is not the only one. Spain is a favourite of thousands of pensioners who have retired there. In all 890,000 UK pensioners now live permanently abroad - the vast majority in EU countries. Nearly 4,000,000 British subjects are thought to maintain a home outside Britain, and again, most of these are in Europe - and the number is growing. These are people who have not been drawn to Continental Europe because of economic opportunities, but because they actually like it. For whatever reason, there is little evidence that Frenchmen, Italians and Spaniards are quite as keen to live away from home.

Of course affection for foreign places and foreign culture, high or low, does not necessarily extend to the political sphere - nor should it.

Indeed, it may well be that when Graham and Joan from Solihull returned from eating a paella lunch on the beach at Nerja to complete their postal ballot prior to the 10th June elections they voted UKIP. Maybe they did so because they realise that the EU

means an end to national independence and the project of self-government, even if they wouldn’t quite put it like that. Perhaps they take seriously the continuous stream of revelations about corruption and excessive regulation and possibly they feel that while British institutions are not what they used to be, and standards in national public life are not as high as they once were, they are still preferable to those of the EU. And why vote for more EU integration when the process threatens our economic well-being and has already gone far too far? But hate Europe? In many respects they can’t get enough of it.

There is thus nothing remotely mysterious or phobic about such attitudes. Much more remarkable are the attitudes of those who can’t understand why Graham and Joan think and feel as they do and, in the end, reach the extraordinary conclusions that Graham and Joan are driven by hate.

Betrayal of Interests

Why should they think such a thing? George Orwell famously said that a large part of the British intelligentsia, unlike intellectuals in continental Europe, loathes its own country and is consequently prepared to betray its interests. Matters have not changed. *The Guardian* leader writer is an example of this enduring phenomenon - and because he cannot persuade or even understand those who do not share the object of his hatred, he concludes that they must be driven by irrational impulses. Hate may well be the key to understanding the gulf that exists between Graham and Joan on the one hand and *The Guardian* leader writer on the other - it’s just that the latter hasn’t understood that its true location is within himself.

LETTERS

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

UKIP's Way Forward

Dear Sir,

I must point out the obvious errors in your leader of 11th June. Firstly UKIP, recently having celebrated its 10th anniversary, preceded the Referendum Party by some years. Secondly, it has become much more than a home for disaffected Tories. *eurofacts* may not have noticed but things have moved on a bit since the days of Margaret Thatcher. Listening to the Tory Party, it seems that their thinking is similarly stuck in the past.

While it is true that UK Independence Party has had some very welcome success, we realise a great deal more is required if we are ultimately to achieve our goal - far more than we could ever entrust to another party. At home we have to ensure that future UK governments are not able to get away with the kind of deceit the electorate has been subjected to over the last 30 years. To do this we will need to completely remove the political class that is responsible, whether from the Left or the Right.

But it will not be enough to achieve our own independence unless we also spread our philosophy to a wider international audience, such that national democracies are respected and protected within the spheres of international interdependence and cooperation.

It is not possible for any of the old parties, Tory or Labour, to achieve these dual aims - so there will be no standing aside for other parties or their candidates. We need to make radical changes to the way we are governed and the sooner we can do this the better. This means that UKIP will have to take power. We are already embarked on that journey. It is for those eurosceptic, or should we say pro-democracy, members of other parties to decide if they wish to get on

board.
LAWRIE BOXALL
Berkshire

[We did not intend to imply that the Referendum Party pre-dated the UK Independence Party, only that, like the former during an earlier period of British politics, it could have a vital role in British politics without winning significant numbers of seats at Westminster. UKIP obviously includes a great many disaffected Tories; as to the actual proportion we are content to defer Mr Boxall's first hand knowledge - Ed.]

What Now, Mr Howard?

Dear Sir,

Congratulations to *eurofacts* for painting a very clear picture of UKIP's role in the UK's political process (11th June). I became involved with UKIP in the very early days but never joined. A few of us met in South West London and sat around discussing strategy. It became apparent at the outset that whilst there was unanimity on the question of EU membership there was to be no agreement on any other subject. The "manifesto" was therefore a bodge. Many years have passed and the situation is unchanged. UKIP remains the focal point for eurosceptics and even the most committed Tories realise that their party is committed to EU membership and that all talk of "influencing EU policy from within" is a nonsense. On all other issues UKIP is a "me too" party. Its administration remains very weak. It made good progress in the June 10th elections but as the *eurofacts* article described so well this simply acts as a warning signal to the two main Parties.

Michael Howard did himself and his Party a disservice by calling UKIP supporters "cranks and extremists".

What now Mr Howard?
PAUL RHODES
London

Vital Catalyst

Dear Sir,

In your leader of 11th June you question the point of UKIP. Clearly I cannot comment on the party as it now is but, as one of the comrades of Alan Sked back in the days when the party was founded, I can tell you what we intended then, an aim from which I believe it should never have departed. Given the nature of the British political system we knew that we could not hope to overturn the main parties and win a majority in Parliament, certainly not in time to prevent all power having been passed to Brussels. However Alan always believed that it was possible, by sticking to the line of outright withdrawal from the EU, refusing to engage with the institutions of the EU and ensuring that the party appealed to those from across the democratic spectrum, we could be the catalyst in what you yourselves describe as a major political realignment, which would see the anti EU majority in both main parties come together to save the nation.

Your readers must judge for themselves whether the party could still do this. For my part, I feel that in sending members to the European parliament and allowing a distinctive right wing agenda on immigration to be adopted, the party has compromised its founding principles and left itself in the position of being possibly able to win large number of Conservative votes but unable to appeal to a large enough section of the left to threaten the Labour Party. If this is indeed the case then the cause of British independence will founder because of short sighted policies which may win much to begin with but cannot carry through to victory.

COLIN BULLEN
Kent

MEETINGS

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

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)

CONSERVATIVE PARTY FRINGE MEETINGS

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

Monday **4th October 2004**

12 noon - 1.30 pm

Rt. Hon Lord Lamont of Lerwick,
Chancellor of the Exchequer 1990 - 1993

John O'Sullivan, *Former Special Adviser to Margaret Thatcher and Editorial Consultant to Hollinger International, Associate Editor of The Times and Assistant Editor of The Daily Telegraph. He is Founder and Co-Chairman of the New Atlantic Initiative.*

The Terrace Ballroom, The Marsham Court Hotel, Russell-Cotes Road, East Cliff, Bournemouth

Admission Free

Save Britain's Fish
01224-313473

Tuesday **5th October 2004** 11.00 am

Speakers to be announced.

The Cliffside Hotel, East Overcliffe Drive, Bournemouth

Admission Free

The Freedom Association
01746-861267

Tuesday **5th October 2004** 12 noon

Wednesday **6th October 2004** 12 noon

Speakers to be announced

The Hilton Hotel, Bournemouth
Admission Free

MEDIA COMPLAINTS

The Advertising Standards Authority

2 Torrington Place, London WC1E

Tel: 020-7580 5555

Fax: 020-7631 3051

complaints page: www.asa.org.uk

BBC

www.bbc.co.uk

[/info/bbc/complaints.shtml](http://info/bbc/complaints.shtml)

Broadcasting Standards Commission

7 The Sanctuary, London SW1P 3JS

Tel: 020-7233-0544

Fax: 020-7233 0397

E-mail: bsc@bsc.org.uk

www.bsc.org.uk

Independent Television Commission

33 Foley Street, London W1P 7LB

Tel: 020-7255 3000

E-mail: programme@itc.org.uk or

advertising@itc.org.uk

www.itc.org.uk

Press Complaints Commission

1 Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JB

Tel: 020-7353 1248

Fax: 020-7353 8355

How to complain page:

www.pcc.org.uk

Radio Authority

Holbrook House, 14 Great Queen

Street, London WC2B 5DG

Tel: 020-7430 2724

Fax: 020-7405 7064

www.radioauthority.org.uk

DIARY OF EVENTS

2004

Netherlands takes over EU presidency **1st July**

Lib-Democrats Party Conference **19-23rd September**
Bournemouth

Labour Party Conference **26-30th September**
Brighton

Conservative Party Conference **4-7th October**
Bournemouth

2005

Luxembourg takes over EU presidency **1st January**

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **29th June 2004**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *Irish Presidency of the European Union* from H.E. Daithi O'Ceallaigh, Ambassador of Ireland.

Tuesday **29th June 2004**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *The State of the Economy and Economic Policy, Long Term and Short Term* from Mervyn King - Governor of the Bank of England, Charles Bean, Marian Bell and Steve Nickell - members of the Monetary Policy Committee.

Wednesday **30th June 2004**, 10.45 am

Evidence may be heard on *Eurojust (the EU's Judicial Co-operation Unit)*.

Wednesday **30th June 2004**, 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on *Towards a Sustainable EU Policy on Climate Change* from (a) Mike Toms, Group Planning and Regulatory Affairs Director; Cathryn Barker, Head of Group Environment; and Stephen Hardwick, Director of Public Affairs, BAA plc; and (b) Paul Everitt, the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders; and Mike Hawes, Head of Corporate and Government Affairs, Toyota Motor Europe.

Wednesday **30th June 2004**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Parliament and the Legislative Process* from Dr Lewis Moonie MP and John Greenway MP.

Thursday **1st July 2004**, 10.45 am

Evidence will be heard on *Current Developments in European Foreign Policy* from Dr Denis MacShane MP, Minister for Europe, FCO.

Wednesday **7th July 2004**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Parliament and the Legislative Process* from Alex Brazier and Dr Paul Seaward, the Hansard Society.

Wednesday **14th July 2004**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Parliament and the Legislative Process* from Lord Grenfell, Chairman, the European Union Committee.

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

What if we say No to the EU Constitution?

by Lord Blackwell. **£5.00**

Britain can and should settle an arrangement with the EU that preserves its political, economic and constitutional independence.

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.

Saving England

by Vernon Coleman. **£8.99**

Coleman, who wrote *England Our England*, now exposes the way EU rules are affecting every walk of life.

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.

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.

The Essential Guide to the European Union

by Ruth Lea. **£12.50**

(Special launch price **10.00**)

A detailed yet accessible picture, right up to date, of how the European Union works now and in the future.

Britain and the European Project

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

Reflections on sovereignty, history, politics, psychology and economics. How they point to the UK regaining her independence.

The Fate of

Britain's National Interest

by Professor Kenneth Minogue. **£4.00**

The author argues that the national interest is being undermined by legal activists and international bureaucrats.

OverCrowded Britain

by Ashley Mote. **£8.95**

A look at the facts and consequences of large-scale immigration.

Health and the Nation

by Dr Lee Rotherham. **£2.00**

How the future of the NHS will be directed at European level.

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.

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 020-7491 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

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group 020-7287 4414
Global Britain

Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk
New Frontiers 020-7494 3000

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
Roger Knapman MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006