

Ignorance is Government's ally in referendum battle

Polling data from an unexpected source confirms the suspicion that the more people know about the EU the more they dislike it

"...this government believes that the British people, when provided with the facts about the constitutional treaty, will support it in the referendum ahead," Denis MacShane, the Minister for Europe declared in a letter to *The Daily Telegraph* on 29th January. In the same week an EU Commission spokesman labelled the British the most ignorant about the Union's prospective constitution. "One can see a strong correlation between level of knowledge and support for the text", he said.

Strong Views

The reality is quite different, at least in Britain: the more people understand about the EU in general and the constitutional treaty in particular the more they dislike them. This is borne out by the findings of a MORI survey which was commissioned by the BBC as part of the internal inquiry into the bias in its coverage of EU affairs. This not only demonstrates a high level of dissatisfaction with BBC coverage of European issues but provides valuable insights into the nature of opposition to the European project.

Describing the attitudes of the British public to the EU, MORI states:

The knowledgeable minority tend to hold strong views and distrust the media and the establishment. They often focus on perceived corruption and deception within the EU and British politics as a whole. They express the view that the BBC is both pro-Labour and pro-EU. Indeed, they

tend to feel that the BBC is in the government's pocket, and relate this to the perception that this is linked with the licence fee and funding.

This group tends to have a high engagement with news and current affairs, and have a high level of education. They tend to consume the BBC's news and current affairs coverage. That said, they feel there often is not enough depth, detail and balance in their coverage. They feel that television is least able to offer in-depth coverage, which they perceive as more the remit of radio and the internet.

This group perceive themselves as politically sophisticated. They can easily interpret concise and simple coverage as Government spin, or as a 'dumbed down' approach. They do not feel this approach is congruent with their self-image as educated people, both generally and in respect of the EU, who can make informed decisions. This group welcomes the idea of discussion and debate....

Clear Evidence

So here is clear evidence from an impeccably neutral source that in the case of the EU familiarity does indeed breed contempt. Moreover, the Government does often behave as if it were frightened about the consequences of being found out on Europe. Mr Straw demands that "a patriotic case for the EU" should be made, but steadfastly refrains from actually making that case. Mr Blair

periodically calls for 'battle to be joined on Europe' and, having once suggested that the Constitution was a mere tidying-up exercise now says the referendum presents 'a once in a generation chance' to settle Britain's relationship with Europe - but he stays well away from the sound of battle. Ministers routinely say that they favour greater public 'education' about the proposed constitution, but unlike their French counterparts they seem perfectly happy that the British public should vote on the matter without being given copies of it to read. Moreover, critics of the text can and do quote chapter and verse in support of their criticism; ministers make vague, unsupported and sometimes untrue generalizations asserting - quite falsely - that the Constitution will give national parliaments more control.

Blatantly Partial

The publication of the referendum question - 'Should the United Kingdom approve the treaty establishing a constitution for the European Union?' - appears to have allayed fears that the government would try to rig the referendum by wording the question in order to get the answer it wants. If the question does not appear to be as blatantly partial as some eurosceptics feared this can only be because they had such low expectations about the likely conduct of ministers. Nevertheless, those who framed the question do appear to have

Continued on P.2

EU economy is 'like the Airbus'

More than 68 million or 15 per cent of the EU population were living at risk of poverty in 2002 - and the situation could get worse, according to two reports from the EU Commission.

These suggest that the current figures could deteriorate as "the recent economic slowdown, with rising unemployment and fewer job opportunities, puts more people at risk of poverty and social exclusion and worsens the position of those already affected".

The documents acknowledge that employment is sluggish, labour productivity is falling, and social exclusion rising.

To meet the EU employment rate target of 70 per cent by 2010 - the goal established at Lisbon - Europe needs to create 22 million jobs. But not only will the mid-term target of 67 per cent

be missed, there is no chance of the ultimate target being met without a major change in trends.

These are said to be most serious in the EU '15'.

"While the US managed to combine strong employment and productivity growth, in the EU '15' it has fallen dramatically....the slowdown in productivity suggests broader underlying difficulties of the EU economies to foster and absorb innovation."

Despite the recent glut of truly appalling economic news, however, there is no evidence that the new Commission is prepared to consider radical change.

Dismissing the idea that the Commission should concentrate on encouraging competitiveness rather than on the social aspects of the Lisbon

strategy Mr Vladimir Spidla, the employment and social affairs commissioner said when introducing the reports on 27th January: "Europe is producing its economic growth thanks to its social model, not in spite of it. Our economy is like Airbus, as opposed to Concorde. To create the latter, all the effort was put on reaching a maximum speed. Instead, our plane might not be the fastest, but it is more economical and ecological. And in the long run, that has proved the best mix of qualities".

In the manner of a man who reacts to the news that the ship is sinking by continuing to whistle, Mr Spidla continued: "We have some targets. The fact that they have not been reached does not mean they are wrong".

A perfect role model

In answer to a query from a reader, the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands have never been part of the European Union. Their status is set out in protocols to the 1972 Accession Treaty between the UK and the then European Economic Community.

The offshore islands are self-governing Crown Dependencies. The

Channel Islands became part of the English Crown in 1066 (one of the titles of our present Queen is Duke - not Duchess - of Normandy). The status of the offshore islands as non-EU countries is confirmed in the draft EU Constitution in Protocol No 8 "on the Treaties and Acts of Accession of the United Kingdom...", which recites

certain provisions relating mainly to the free movement of goods.

As self-governing Crown Dependencies, the islands are free to set their own taxes; they don't for example have VAT and are not (unlike the United Kingdom) subject to EU tax harmonisation. The perfect model for when we leave.

Continued from P.1

Ignorance is Government's ally

succeeded in exploiting the 'yea-saying phenomenon' - the natural human propensity to say 'yes' rather than 'no' and the desire to appear positive rather than negative.

Nick Sparrow, the managing director of ICM Research commented recently: "The referendum question as the Government has announced it does point people towards a 'Yes' answer and uses warm words such as 'approve'." (*The Sunday Telegraph*, 30th January).

Robert Worcester, MORI's chairman has suggested in the past that the yea-saying phenomenon can make a difference of between five and ten per cent to the result.

The yea-saying factor may well go

some way to explain a disparity between the ICM Poll published in *The Sunday Telegraph* which exactly mirrored the Government's proposed wording and that which was conducted by Yougov and which appeared in *The Daily Telegraph* the previous day which did not. *The Sunday Telegraph* showed a very narrow majority - 41 per cent compared to 39 per cent - opposed to the constitution, while the polling data published by its sister paper showed 45 per cent opposed and 24 per cent in favour.

What does all of this imply for campaign strategists? Logically speaking, the Government's interests are likely to be served by a campaign that leaves voters more confused and

ignorant about the text and its impact on British sovereignty. The eurosceptic cause is served by respect for the facts, by encouraging the closest possible scrutiny of the treaty text and by keeping a close and unrelenting watch on the referendum arrangements.

Over the referendum the Government faces the risk of unprecedented humiliation. It is important that eurosceptics do not let it off the hook by losing sight of their central objectives or by permitting party or factional differences becoming so bitter that they cannot work with one another.

EU plans to bully Brits to vote “yes”

A European insider contemplates a second referendum for those who provide the wrong answer the first time around

After ten years as a Commissioner, first at the Internal Market portfolio, then at the Competition portfolio, Mario Monti left Brussels last November. Now he heads the EU's own think-tank, “Breughel” as well as presiding over Milan's Bocconi University. Monti is very definitely one of the EU's high-level “insiders”.

His interview in *Figaro* on 29th January is titled: “*My plan if the No vote wins*”. It's clear that the EU is seriously thinking through the consequences if one or more countries say No to the Constitution - especially, as Monti makes perfectly obvious, the UK. This is what he says:

“Some claim that if one or more countries say ‘No’ it won't matter, the rest can simply go ahead, as was the case with the euro and Schengen. But that won't work: the Constitution's quite different.

“What I'm proposing is that, in those countries holding a referendum on the Constitution, their governments publicly commit themselves, now, ahead of the first referendum on the Constitution, to hold a second

referendum, on a specific date, if the first one delivers a ‘No’. Those governments, ahead of the first referendum, would announce the precise wording of the second referendum question, which would be: ‘Do you want your country to remain in the EU by adopting the new Constitution, or do you want your country to leave the EU altogether?’.”

If the second referendum delivered a vote in favour of withdrawal, then, says Monti, “*that country's [EU] partners would undertake to negotiate the withdrawal terms in good faith; there would be no question of thrusting that country into purdah. The task would rather be to put in place with the country concerned a flexible form of association*”. Monti didn't spell out in this interview what he has in mind, but his language echos that of Article 57 of the draft Constitution, “The Union and Its Neighbours”, which envisages arrangements of the kind that Switzerland and Norway already enjoy with the EU.

Monti makes no bones about the purpose of undertakings by

governments to hold a second “in-or-out” referendum if the first one on the Constitution gives the “wrong” answer. The purpose, he says quite frankly, is to “encourage” the recalcitrant voters into voting the “right” way first time round and so remove the need for the second referendum. All of a piece with the EU's contempt for fair democratic process.

But just to fool people into thinking that at heart he's a “real democrat”, Monti says some harsh things about the joke second referendums forced on the recalcitrant Danes when they had the temerity to say no to Maastricht and on the Irish when they had the temerity to say no to Nice. “*More or less the same question was put a second time [in Denmark and Ireland], which, frankly, is not very democratic. It's not the EU's place to bully [exercer ce genre de violence are his exact words in French] recalcitrant member-states in such a way.*” How sweet of him. However, as we see above, it's perfectly all right to bully them in a slightly more subtle way.

Neil looks forward to a golden retirement

In previous issues we have described the truly impressive array of perks and legal immunities enjoyed by EU Commissioners and senior staff. Thanks to a question from Lord Pearson of Rannoch in the House of Lords we now know that their pensions are equally impressive and are subject to Community tax rather than national tax, as the following exchange reveals:

Lord Pearson of Rannoch: To ask Her Majesty's Government, what are the pension arrangements for former European Union Commissioners, including the amounts paid.

Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean: Former European Commissioners are entitled to a pension from the day they reach 65 of 4.5 per cent of the Commissioner's

final basic salary for each whole year of service in the Commission plus one twelfth of this amount for each additional month's service, subject to a maximum of 70 per cent of the final basic salary. The pension is subject to Community tax and exempt from national taxes. Former Commissioners may start drawing their pensions from the age of 60, subject to the application of a coefficient ranging from 70 per cent at age 60 to 95 per cent at age 64. Since 1st July 2004, the basic salary of a Commissioner has been 18,233 a month, for vice presidents 20,259 a month, and for the President 22,366 a month (*House of Lords Hansard, 21st January 2005*).

Applying this formulae, *eurofacts* calculates that the pension of recently

enobled Neil Kinnock who served two terms as a Commissioner, the second as vice president, will be 109,399 a year or 9117 a month, provided that he takes the pension at 65. At the current exchange rate of £1 = 1.43 that means he will receive a yearly pension of £76,503 before Community Tax.

The millions of UK citizens who currently face the prospect of shrinking pensions will no doubt take consolation from the fact that as Neil and Glenys (who, as a long-serving MEP will also qualify for a gold-plated pension) contemplate their sunset years, their biggest headache is likely to be over which winter cruise to take.

The dark heart of Italy

This book is not about the EU, but it tells you an awful lot about the EU. Tobias Jones lives in Italy and loves the country. He did not set out to write about Italy's "dark heart"; he wanted to understand and explain its politics, of which the Berlusconi phenomenon is the latest and most extraordinary manifestation. In peeling back the accreted layers of history Jones found that a civil war - "Fascists" against "Communists"- which began on one measure in 1941, on another measure when Mussolini came to power in the twenties, is still playing itself out through terrorism, corruption and the subsequent ongoing trials, enquiries and appeals. In this murky

The Dark Heart of Italy

By Tobias Jones

Faber & Faber,
2003 Paperback 266 pp
Price £7.99

ISBN 0-5712058 2 5

and confusing kaleidoscope of Italian politics the Mafia is almost a sideshow.

To describe for non-Italians the context in which Italian politics is carried out, Jones looks at the sheer inventiveness of the Italian language;

Italian football (the most beautiful in the world); Italian television (the worst in the world); Italian bureaucracy (the most infuriating in the world); the Church; business; food and wine; and the importance of the family. From all this, it becomes clear why the Italians have no respect and even less confidence in their own judicial system and government (which is partly why Italians are so keen on the EU).

This reviewer, to his great regret, hardly knows Italy, so is not able to assess the accuracy of Jones' account. This absorbing book makes it clear that Italian corruption is almost unimaginable in its depth and pervasiveness.

A year in the merde

Like *The Dark Heart of Italy* *A Year in the Merde* is not about the EU, but it tells you more about the EU than wagon-loads of bumph from the European Commission.

This is a comic novel, a very funny and very accurate account of what it's like as a Brit to go to Paris to take up a job with a French company. (Your reviewer did just that in the 1970s and nothing much seems to have changed.) As the blurb on the front cover says: "*There are lots of French people who are not at all hypocritical, inefficient, treacherous, intolerant, adulterous or incredibly sexy.....They just didn't make it into my book*". The book's hero is recruited by a French food-processing company to open a chain of English tea rooms called "My Tea is Rich". His account of French office life is spot-on, as are the descriptions of the perils of navigating the dog-poo-

A Year in the Merde

By Stephen Clarke

Bantam Press,
2004 Paperback 336 pp
Price £9.99

ISBN 0-5930545 3 9

strewn streets of Paris. Back in the 70s the joke amongst Anglo-Saxon expatriates went: "*Why are pavements called 'trottoirs' in French? Because that's where French dogs get the trots*"- a joke that didn't make it into Clarke's book.

Chapter headings include "*God save the cuisine*", "*A maison in the country*" (what it's really like to try to buy a run-down house in the country),

"*The joy of suppositories*" - (no joking matter, your reviewer can assure you), and "*Liberté, égalité, get out of my way*", which just about sums up France's EU policy. The plot concerns the hero's struggles with crooked politicians - "*...used to playing in a world-class league of double-dealers*" - dodgy notaires, bureaucracy straight out of Kafka, strikes - "*Going on strike really is the second national participation sport after pétanque*" - bad-tempered waiters, all the low-level corruption everyone's got to use just to survive, whether it's getting a flat to rent, queue-jumping, sweeteners or back-scratching. It works out all right in the end, with the hero finding that for all their faults, France and the French have a lot to commend them. Apparently, the book has been well-reviewed in the French press - so maybe there's hope for us all.

Government admission on loss of veto

In a parliamentary answer in June 2004 the Government said that 42 vetoes would be given up. However, an annex to the Government's *Commentary on the Constitution* lists 51 different areas where majority voting would be introduced.

And a reminder to Tony...

"*Every country must have firm control over immigration and Britain is no exception.*" Labour Party Manifesto, 1997.

You really couldn't make it up!

A eurofacts reader confounds EU spokesmen who deny the existence of absurd and unnecessary regulations

eurofacts does not normally offer gardening advice, but thanks to the EU, we are able to pass on two items of timeless wisdom. The first is that if you are buying a pair of gardening gloves the best way to ensure that they fit is to try them on. The second is that how well the gloves will protect your hands will depend on the job you are doing.

How have we come across such priceless pearls? The answer is that they are contained in a leaflet that the producers of gardening gloves are now obliged to carry with their product.

We are grateful to a reader, Mr Gerhard Banek of Cricket Wood, Hants for having pointed this out - at the very moment the Commission was claiming that stories about absurd or intrusive regulation were figments of the imagination of eurosceptic tabloid newspapers.

Mr Banek made his discovery when buying a pair of garden gloves for one euro during a recent visit to Germany. When he unwrapped them out fell the leaflet which he has translated for the benefit of readers:

Information leaflet for protective gloves in accordance with EG-Rule 89/686/EWC, annex II, sector 1-4:

This pair of gloves is, according to chapter 11 article 8 para 3 exempt of control as per building regulations and is deemed to be in category 1. It is

assumed that the efficacy against minor risks can be judged, and if and when they gradually appear, discovered without causing danger. The grade of protection depends on circumstances like mechanical, chemical or temperature or similar influences, which do not require a grade of protection according to category II. However, a risk analysis is required. By putting the glove on, one has to find out what size is necessary for the glove to fit. If additional material like a separate glove is used underneath one has to remember that this could have a negative influence.

The gloves need to be stored adequately, which means in cartons in dry storerooms. Conditions like dampness, temperature, light and natural change in the material during a certain time could mean, that the quality is changed. A timetable for this cannot be proposed since there is a correlation with the grade of use and the environment where it is used.

It is recommended to care for the item by using customary cleaning material like brushes, cleaning rags, etc. If you wish to wash or chemically clean the item it is essential that a renowned authority is consulted beforehand. If the conditions are altered by such a treatment the producer refuses to

accept any responsibility. Before another usage is attempted the gloves have to be inspected to detect any damage.

This article is delivered in a carton made of recyclable material. The smallest unit (i.e. a pair) is encased in recyclable plastic. So far, in connection with this product we are not aware of any substance which might have any effect on the health of the user. If skin irritations appear with particularly sensitive persons these have to be dealt with by separate analysis and special counselling.

You are obliged to add this information brochure to ANY article you hand over for further dealings or to hand it over to the end user personally. For this purpose this brochure may be copied unrestrictedly. Please contact for further information and guidance your nearest competent department "only for minimal dangers"."

Commission spokesmen may huff and puff about the way in which their rules are misrepresented by the British media but Mr Banek is surely correct when he says, "This leaflet shows better than any lengthy academic article how all-embracing the rule of the EU has become".

EU has offshore bank accounts

Why does the European Union need 662 bank accounts and why should 45 of them be offshore?

The existence of offshore bank accounts was revealed when an official from the European Court of Auditors was quizzed by Ashley Mote, who sits as an independent MEP for the South East during a meeting of the EU Budget Control Committee on 19th February.

Since then Mr Mote, who has raised the issues with the Serious Fraud Squad and the National Audit Office in London, has written to the EU

President Manuel Barroso asking where these are held and why the accounts are needed and to say how many of 214,000 accounts with which the EU has regular dealings are held offshore. He has also asked the EU President to confirm that all monies received by commissioners and senior EU officials are made directly and exclusively to onshore accounts.

His letter also challenges the president to comment on reports suggesting links between the acquisition of slush money by law enforcement and other government

agencies and of offshore bank accounts under the control of the European Union.

"Your comments would also be appreciated on the alleged involvement of the EU's own intelligence resources in these activities," it concludes.

Mr Mote commented: "It really is extraordinary that the EU should have so many more bank accounts than a huge-multi national company like Ford and that these should be in places which have nothing whatever to do with the EU".

LETTERS

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

Warped view of the World

Dear Sir,

Anybody who is unclear about the purpose of the Constitution for Europe may care to reflect on a recent comment from Mr Richard Laming, Director of the Federal Union and a board member of the European Movement in the UK.

Mr Laming sees the EU Constitution as part of "the campaign to overcome national sovereignty", which is "the modern-day equivalent of the campaign against slavery".

Is it hard to understand how anybody can have such a warped view of the world, that they believe "national sovereignty" to be morally equivalent to the evil of "slavery".

And would it still be the case, I wonder, if the EU member states agreed to surrender their sovereignty to the EU, so the nationality in question then became "European"?

MURIEL PARSONS
Berkshire

Notable Exception

Dear Sir,

You state that the Conservatives have said and written nothing about EU problems recently. May I refer you to my book "*Singing the Blues*" (Methuen 2004) which has a long section on how we need a new and very different relationship with the continental powers. I set out how we could hold a successful renegotiation, explaining the pressures we could exert and the things we need to bring back under UK control.

I will also be bringing out "*Superpower Struggles*" at the end of March, which will explain why the EU will seek to rival the USA and will fail. That book also sets out a different future for the United Kingdom and provides a strong critique of the European Constitution.

JOHN REDWOOD MP
Westminster

Gross Interference

Dear Sir,

The intervention of the European Commission in the debate regarding the Conservative Party's recently announced policy on immigration is a gross interference with British domestic politics. It is deeply worrying and has huge implications.

If the leader of Her Majesty's Opposition cannot make a major policy statement in the run-up to a General Election without the European Commission threatening the country with legal ramifications, what is the point in actually voting in the election? Moreover, what has become of the principle that one parliament cannot bind its successor?

It used to be the case that civil servants i.e. the bureaucracy worked under the direction of the politicians; now it seems the bureaucracy is telling the politicians what they can or cannot do, thus rendering our whole political process irrelevant. We are entitled to ask, in what other areas of policy the Commission will seek to intervene during the run up to the general election and during the campaign itself. If politicians cannot implement new policies the forthcoming General Election is little more than a charade and voters may very well decline to take part in it.

LORD STODDART OF SWINDON
Westminster

Repeal the Act!

Dear Sir,

United Kingdom Independence Party, the Campaign for an Independent Britain, the Democracy Movement, the Freedom Association and many other Eurorealists with limited resources have long been campaigning to warn the UK of its loss of governance to the corridors of European power in Brussels.

Mr Howard's attempt sensibly and reasonably to stem the flood of immigrants into the UK has been challenged by the European

Commission. The thousands of EU regulations and directives to which both the Conservative and Labour governments have signed up, deny us the means to run our country the way most of us wish.

There is no effective alternative to the repealing of the 1972 European Communities Act. When will the country wake up and insist the government takes this action?

R.S.GALLIANO
Buckinghamshire

Regionalisation by Stealth?

Dear Sir,

I write to alert you to a little known episode here in Southport which is part of Sefton local authority. A friend recently showed me an envelope bearing his name, street name, and the name of the town. This was followed in turn by the words "North West" followed by the postcode. Is this regionalisation by stealth, do you think? Have other readers found themselves addressed in this style?

MISS BETTY SYKES
Lancashire

Shrinking Minnows

Dear Sir,

Your readers may be interested to learn that almost all recent polls about likely voting behaviour have shown the figure for "Others" down again to a fairly standard 10 per cent. However looking at the specific other parties in the latest poll this 10 per cent breaks down as follows:

SNP 2%

Plaid Cymru 2%

Green 3%

UKIP 1%

Other [other others!] 2%

At the time of the euro-elections the "other" figure was around 19 per cent in many polls.

CHRISTINA SPEIGHT
London

MEETINGS

United Kingdom Independence Party
Newcastle-under-Lyme Branch
0170-820987

Tuesday **15th February 2005** 7.30 pm

“Regional Government”

Edward Spalton, *Anti-EU campaigner who monitors EU involvement with Eastern Europe and the Balkans*
George West, *Founder of Midlands Against Regional Assemblies*

Bignall End Cricket Club, Boon Hill,
Bignall End, Stoke on Trent
Admission Free
(Advance tickets available)

Anti-Common Market League
01787-376374

Thursday **24th February 2005** 7.15 pm

“EUSSR - The Soviet roots of European integration”

Vladimir Bukovsky, *Former political prisoner in USSR and author*
Pavel Stroilov, *Law student from Moscow and researcher in various Russian archives*

Committee Room 5, The House of Commons, Westminster, London SW1
Admission Free

Bruges Group and Democracy Movement
01300-341788

Thursday **3rd March 2005** 7.30 pm

“The European Constitution - Why Britain should say NO”

Marc Glendening, *Democracy Movement, Campaign Director*
Rt. Hon Oliver Letwin MP, *Conservative, Shadow Chancellor*
Cllr. Steve Radford, *Liberal Party, President*

PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall, Corn Exchange, High East Street, Dorchester DT1
Admission Free

The Freedom Association
01746-861267

Saturday **19th March 2005**
10.30 am - 4.00 pm

Spring Conference

Speakers to be announced

SPRING CONFERENCE
The Burlington Hotel, Birmingham
(Adjacent to New Street Railway Station)
Admission £40 before 31st January - £50 thereafter
(Includes morning coffee, two-course lunch and afternoon tea)

Gresham College
020-7831 0575

Tuesday **5th April 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Devolution and the territorial Constitution”

Professor Vernon Bogdanor FBA CBE, *Gresham Professor of Law*

Wednesday **25th May 2005** 6.00 pm

“The integration of Europe: Britain out, Britain in, Britain on the fence”

Professor Kathleen Burk, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

Campaign for an Independent Britain
020-8340 0314

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

“Defeating the EU Constitution”

Speakers to be announced

The Emmanuel Centre, 9-13 Marsham Street, London SW1P 3DW
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **22nd February 2005**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *Proposed reforms of the Stability and Growth Pact* from Stephen Timms MP, Financial Secretary, HM Treasury.

Tuesday **22nd February 2005**, 3.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Economics of Climate Change* from Dr Terry Barker, Cambridge Univ; and Dr Dieter Helm, New College, Oxford.

Wednesday **23rd Feb. 2005**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *Future Financing of the CAP* from the Lord Whitty, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Defra.

Wednesday **23rd Feb. 2005**, 3.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Proposed European Union Integrated Action Programme for Life-long Learning* from Julie Winyard, Head teacher, Benhall St Mary's Suffolk and others.

Monday **28th February 2005**, 2.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The December European Council and on the Subsidiarity inquiry* from Dr Denis MacShane MP, Minister for Europe, FCO.

Wednesday **2nd March 2005**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Energy Efficiency* from;
(a) David Welsh, Chair of the Energy Efficiency Working Group, CBI;
and
(b) David Pocklington, Director Industry Affairs, British Cement Association, David Harris, Secretary General and Mark Askew, Technical Manager, the Aluminium Federation.

Wednesday **7th March 2005**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *European Commission's Proposal for a Directive on Services in the Internal Market* from witnesses to be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005
UK takes over **1st July**
EU presidency

Germany's Four Reichs
by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Idiosyncratic history of Germany by Englishman, El Alamein, Burma, Bletchley (codebreaker), who knew Adenauer well.

The European Constitution In Perspective

by *British Management Data Foundation*. **£27.50**

Analysis and Review of 'The Treaty Establishing A Constitution for Europe'.

EUSSR The Soviet Roots of European Integration

by *Vladimir Bukovsky & Pavel Stroilov*. **£4.75**

Reveals secret discussions between Western and Soviet Union leaders.

Saving England

The Case for Independence: Why England Should Declare UDI
by *Vernon Coleman*. **£8.99**

Coleman, inimitably and deadly accurately spells it out in 85 short chapters.

Voting on the Constitution: What Britain should know about the consequences

by *Daniel Hannan*. **£7.00**

The implications of a British 'No' vote on the proposed European Constitution.

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 ECB and the Euro: The First Five Years

by *Otmar Issing*. **£10.00**

Provides an upbeat assessment of the euro by a member of the ECB.

The Missing Heart of Europe

Does Britain hold the key to the future of the Continent?
by *Thomas Kremer*. **£11.99**

Can nation states flourish in an integrated Greater Europe? A European businessman's view of the likely impact of divergent national cultures.

The Essential Guide to the European Union

by *Ruth Lea*. **£12.50**

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

EUROPE A Concise

Encyclopedia of the European Union
by *Rodney Leach*. **£14.99**

The fourth update of this highly informative and necessary directory.

A Cost Too Far?

by *Ian Milne*. **£8.50**

A fully worked out cost/benefit analysis of Britain's EU membership.

Galileo - The Military and Political Dimensions

by *Dr Richard North*. **£4.00**

A European satellite positioning technology that has hidden implications for the whole world.

A Guide to the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe

by *Stuart Sexton*. **£5.00**

A layman's guide explains the essentials of the Treaty in simple language.

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"

European Commission	020-7973 1992
European Movement	020-7940 5252
Federal Trust	020-7735 4000

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-1@globalbritain.org	
New Frontiers	020-7808 7772

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