

European integration bypasses the democratic process

The leaders of the main parties have collaborated to ensure that 'Europe' does not feature in the general election campaign

As we go to press 'Europe' does not remotely look like featuring as an issue in the remaining days of the general election campaign. As so often in the past the ongoing process of European political integration is bypassing the democratic process - which is precisely what is intended. By agreeing to a referendum on the European Constitution a year ago, Tony Blair helped to ensure that it would not become an issue. At the time party strategists warned of the risks he was taking. But his U-turn undoubtedly helped him to buy time and to disperse the head of steam that was building up behind the issue. In keeping 'Europe' off the agenda he has enjoyed the tacit cooperation of both the other main parties which for quite different reasons have not wanted to talk about European matters either. He has also been helped by the failure of UKIP to capitalise on its impressive success in the June 2004 elections to the European Parliament and that party's subsequent loss of momentum.

It is not surprising therefore that 'Europe' receives only cursory attention in the manifestos, the only exception being that of UKIP. Predictably, those parties keenest on European Union have the least to say about it. The Liberal Democratic Party which declares membership of the European Union to be "hugely important" devotes a single bland paragraph of eleven lines to the subject, plus a quotation from two

obscure Lib Dem MEPs which is almost meaningless. The Labour Party manifesto runs to 113 pages but devotes only five short paragraphs to Britain's relations with the EU. In its much shorter manifesto the Tory Party devotes four paragraphs to the EU and Michael Howard makes the following pledge in his introduction: "We will settle our relationship with the European Union by bringing powers back from Brussels to Britain".

eurofacts does not presume to advise its readers how to vote. But we include key passages from the party manifestos together with our comments:

From the Labour Party Manifesto:

We are proud of Britain's EU membership and of the strong position Britain has achieved within Europe. British membership of the EU brings jobs, trade and prosperity; it boosts environmental standards, social protection and international clout. Since 1997 we have gone from being marginal players, often ignored, to leaders in the European Union. Working hard with Labour MEPs, we are determined to remain leaders. Outside the EU, or on its margins, we would unquestionably be weaker and more vulnerable.

The new Constitutional Treaty ensures the new Europe can work effectively, and that Britain keeps control of key national interests like foreign policy, taxation, social security and defence. The Treaty sets out what

the EU can do and what it cannot. It strengthens the voice of national parliaments and governments in EU affairs. It is a good treaty for Britain and for the new Europe. We will put it to the British people in a referendum and campaign whole-heartedly for a 'Yes' vote to keep Britain a leading nation in Europe.

We will continue to lead European defence cooperation. We will build stronger EU defence capabilities, in harmony with NATO - the cornerstone of our defence policy - without compromising our national ability to act independently. We will ensure the new EU battle groups are equipped and organised to act quickly to save lives in humanitarian crises.

Comment: If membership of the EU brings jobs why is the unemployment rate in the eurozone amongst the highest in the developed world? If it brings prosperity why are growth rates so feeble? And if it brings trade why is Europe's share of world trade shrinking so rapidly?

Since 1997 much of the debate in Europe has been about whether there should be a constitution and what should be in it. The UK's initial position was that a constitution was not desirable, but we lost the argument. We then opposed the incorporation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; again the argument was lost. Blair's attempt to wrest leadership away from the Franco-German alliance by creating a

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: Nigel Lawson on the fight for the rebate p.3 - Driving up the price of a car p.3 - CAP an "historical relic" - but UK Government still supports it p.4 - Signs of desperation at Britain in Europe p.4 - Finance chiefs against the Constitution p.4 - What would be the consequence of a French 'No'? p.5 - Constitution 'completes European project' p.5

EU integration bypasses democracy

British-Italian-Spanish axis also ended in failure. So much for Britain's 'leadership role'.

If the Constitution is ratified Britain will lose its right of veto in more than 50 areas. National 'control' over foreign affairs, taxation, social security and defence will be further weakened. Far from bringing clarity about the limits of power the treaty is prolix, complex and opaque. However, where disputes occur between nation states and the institutions of the EU the matter will be settled by the European Court of Justice.

The reference to a 'whole-hearted' campaign in favour of the constitution has been interpreted as a decision to compel all cabinet members to play an active role in the referendum campaign, unlike the situation in 1975 when Labour ministers were allowed to act and speak according to their consciences.

It is an illusion to suppose that a European defence capability can be created without damaging NATO; decisions about defence procurement are currently being subordinated to the needs of political integration.

Our overall judgment is that this is the most dishonest of all the manifestos, but one which is unlikely to influence the decision of a single voter.

From the Conservative Party Manifesto

Conservatives support the cause of reform in Europe and we will co-operate with all those who wish to see the EU evolve in a more flexible, liberal and decentralised direction. We oppose the EU Constitution and would give the British people the chance to reject its provisions in a referendum within six months of the General Election. We also oppose giving up the valuable freedom which control of our own currency gives us. We will not join the Euro.

In a reformed Europe, the restrictive employment laws of the Social Chapter will have to give way to more flexible working. We will ensure that Britain once again leads the fight for a

deregulated Europe by negotiating the restoration of our opt-out from the Social Chapter.

The common policies on agriculture and fisheries are unsustainable, damaging to free trade and conservation, and waste huge sums of money. The CAP needs further and deeper reform. And, because fisheries would be better administered at the national level, we will negotiate to restore national and local control over British fishing grounds. We are determined to ensure national control in this area.

We will also build on the success of enlargement, making Europe more diverse by working to bring in more nations, including Turkey.

We value Britain's membership of the European Union, but our horizons extend much further. A key element of British foreign policy under a Conservative Government will be fighting world poverty...We believe Britain's aid programmes are among the best in the world, so we will negotiate to increase British national control over our international aid spending.

Comment: This is a more comprehensively eurosceptic document than the Tory 2001 manifesto, even if Michael Howard's personal convictions about the issue seem less deeply rooted than those of William Hague. As a result of the upsurge in support for UKIP last summer Tory policy and Tory rhetoric became more strongly eurosceptic. As the threat from UKIP has diminished, however, this process appears to have come to a halt.

We note that in the manifesto the commitment to 'renegotiate' certain EU policies has been replaced by the commitment to 'negotiate' them. Perhaps this is intended to convey the impression that the process is a simple and painless one. This is unlikely to be the case; the weakness of the Tory manifesto is its failure to explain what a Tory government would do when it meets predictable resistance in seeking to restore key aspects of British sovereignty and for assuming, against

all the evidence, that the character of the EU can be 'reformed.'

From the Liberal Democratic Party Manifesto

Make Europe more effective and democratic. Membership of the EU has been hugely important for British jobs, environmental protection, equality rights and Britain's place in the world. But with enlargement to twenty-five member states, the EU needs reform to become more efficient and more accountable. The new constitution helps to achieve this by improving EU coherence, strengthening the powers of the elected European parliament compared to the Council of Ministers, allowing proper oversight of the unelected Commission, and enhancing the role of national parliaments. It also more clearly defines and limits the powers of the EU, reflecting diversity and preventing over-centralisation. We are therefore clear in our support for the constitution, which we believe is in Britain's interest.

Comment: The constitution extends the powers of the EU, rather than limiting them, while weakening national parliaments. The Lib-Dem manifesto combines economic illiteracy with apparent ignorance of the constitutional text.

From the United Kingdom Independence Party Manifesto

This alien system of government is bad for our economy, our self-respect and our prosperity. Yet all the old political parties remain firmly committed to the EU. They still pretend that, despite the experience of 30 years of 'negotiating', it can be shaped in Britain's interests. But the EU is a one-way street towards European government.

It is undemocratic, corrupt and unreformable. The only way for Britain is UKIP's way: we must leave. Until this is done, individuals and our businesses will continue to be strangled by all the ill-conceived intrusive regulation, supposedly to protect our environment, to ensure our

Continued on P.3

Nigel Lawson on the fight for the rebate

On the reason for the EU:

Lord Lawson of Blaby: "...perhaps I can say something about the historical background [to the EU Budget].....The object, as everybody knows, of the European Union is entirely political, above all in its origins to prevent another European war."

On the justification for the EU Budget:

Lord Lawson of Blaby: ".....My own view is that there is virtually no connection between European spending and the sort of reforms that European economies need if they are going to perform better.....Indeed, in so far as there is a connection, it is

likely to be an inverse relationship....".

Lord Radice: "In other words, the Commission is wrong to suggest increasing the budget?"

Lord Lawson: "Certainly. The Commission is interested in empire-building, just like any Whitehall department; and just as every spending minister wants to increase his budget, so does the Commission. That is perfectly natural, and one would be astonished at anything else."

On how Lady Thatcher secured the British "rebate" at Fontainebleau in 1984:

"You have to remember how hard it was to win the rebate.....it would never have happened if we had not made it clear that if we did not get satisfaction, we would withhold our contributions. I

think it is widely known that we had a draft bill printed to give us the legal authority to withhold our contributions. It was never published, but it was printed. It was discreetly made known to those who we negotiated with that this is what would happen if we did not get satisfaction.....without that threat to withhold our contributions, to the extent of having the law officers produce a bill, we would not have got [the rebate]."

Future Financing of the European Union, House of Lords European Union Committee, HL Paper 62, 9th March 2005, evidence to the Committee by The Rt Hon Lord Lawson of Blaby, www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_commitees.

Driving up the price of a car

Over the next five years car manufacturers will face no less than 282 separate pieces of EU legislation that will add between 4,000 (£2,700) and 6,000 (£4,100) to the price of a car, according to Cars

21, a group of manufacturers and government officials which meets to moderate the impact of legislation and red-tape on car production. The EU produces every third car in the world, and its car industry sustains two

million jobs. But productivity is lower than its rivals in Asia and America, labour costs are among the highest and traditional plants are being abandoned in favour of cheaper plants in the east.

Continued from P.2

EU integration bypasses democracy

health and safety, to uphold all our 'rights' and, most recently, to protect us from terrorism.

Formal withdrawal from the EU will be achieved by repealing the 1972 European Communities Act. This will release us from obligations under EU treaties and reestablish the precedence of UK law over EU law. We shall immediately stop paying into the EU budget and we shall resume full independent participation in international bodies such as the World Trade Organisation. It will be possible to scrap some EU rules like the working time directive without delay.

However, many other changes following independence will take more time. We would aim for a transition period of 2 years with the work managed by a cabinet committee,

assisted by interested parties from all relevant sectors of the economy.

Comment: This is UKIP's best manifesto to date. In contrast to the evasiveness and prevarications of the other party manifestos UKIP sets out its objectives clearly and persuasively, and gives the refreshing impression that it is written by people who believe in what they say. However, the fact that UKIP is doing badly in the polls is a reflection not only of Blair's skill in defusing the European issue, but the fact that UKIP had no clear strategy for capitalising on the momentum it achieved prior to the European parliamentary elections - and so missed an extraordinarily important opportunity. It has also been damaged by the row with Robert Kilroy-Silk and the subsequent defections from its

ranks. Many who feel tempted to vote UKIP may be inhibited by the agonising dilemma that many eurosceptics find themselves in. On the one hand they feel that they cannot fully trust the Tories and that the existence of a viable eurosceptic alternative is necessary if the Conservative party is to be pressed to do what is required; on the other they fear that by voting UKIP they may let in a europhile candidate. This dilemma may endure as long as Britain's membership of the European Union. One of the most regrettable aspects of the present campaign is that it offers few unambiguous opportunities to those who believe that the main purpose of political activity in this country should be towards bringing that membership to an end.

CAP an “historical relic” - but UK Government still supports it

“Failure to open up markets imposes significant costs. Estimates suggest that existing barriers to external trade and investment, such as tariffs, quotas and restrictive standards could cost consumers up to 7 per cent of EU GDP, or around 600 - 700 billion a year. The costs of protectionism are particularly high in agriculture with the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) costing the EU public some 100 billion each year, or around 1,000 a year for the average family of four. The OECD has recently identified CAP reform as a priority to boost growth in Europe. The CAP also inhibits economic development in some of the world’s poorest countries.

“...Freer agricultural trade would be a big step forward in promoting fairer trade. Aid flows to the developing world amount to approximately US\$ 60 billion a year, yet subsidies to farmers in developed countries are 6 times greater and equivalent to the

entire income of sub-Saharan Africa.....The CAP is still not right for Europe or for the world. It distorts the EU economy, it distorts international trade, it inhibits international development...and is very costly to the EU.....On the basis of the most conservative estimate cited by a recent European Commission paper, the CAP will leave the EU over \$120 billion poorer over the seven years of the next financial perspective than it otherwise would be.”

Long-term global economic challenges and opportunities for Europe, HM Treasury, March 2005, sections 4.33 & 4.37

“...the predominance of the CAP lies behind the three biggest criticisms of the budget. The first is that it is backward-looking - hence the Sapir Report’s assertion that it is an ‘historical relic’. As Mr Martin Wolf of the Financial Times put it to us, the EU Budget is inappropriate because of the

‘extraordinary allocation of resources to a declining and economically insignificant sector of the EU, namely agriculture’. The second is that the CAP.....fails any test of value-added: it has been needlessly expensive, its subsidies have gone overwhelmingly to large farmers, it has done little to arrest the decline in farm incomes.....yet [the Commission] proposes to keep farm spending broadly constant in cash terms over the whole period 2007 - 2013. The reason....is an agreement reached between Jacques Chirac and Gerhard Schroder, subsequently endorsed by the European Council in October 2002 (including by the UK) to freeze CAP spending until the end of the next financial perspective.”

Future Financing of the European Union, House of Lords European Union Committee, HL Paper 62, 9th March 2005, chapter 3 paras 48, 49, 51.

Signs of desperation at Britain in Europe

There have been signs of increasing desperation at Britain in Europe for many months. But a new posting on its website suggests that its hopes for victory in the battle over the Constitution are so low that it is banking on divine intervention.

Under the title “A Great European Ascends” Alan Riley of Nottingham Law School notes that the representation of Catholic bishops to the EU has recommended the adoption of the treaty.

“The treaty has received further backing from French bishops and it is inconceivable that if John Paul II felt differently such public support would

be forthcoming.

“The Pilgrim Pope has ended his journey. His steps can be continued by those like him, Catholic and non-Catholic, who can embrace both the spirit of internationalism and the love of one’s country, and walk without fear.”

In life Pope John Paul studiously avoided EU controversies, offering no endorsement of either the eurosceptic or europhile case; nor did he ever comment upon the constitutional treaty, (despite the fact that an increasing number of his fellow Poles are turning against it).

But for the crass bad taste of Britain

in Europe we would not have mentioned it, but the fact is that Pope Paul did bring to an abrupt halt moves to beatify Jean Monnet, the former French Foreign Minister, despite a highly organised and well-funded PR-drive to make the EU’s founding father a saint. The Pope did so on the grounds that there was no evidence that Monnet had performed miracles.

eurofacts can report that it has got wind of two further Britain in Europe ‘exclusives’ from beyond the grave: ‘EU and British sovereignty: Why I was wrong’ by E. Powell, and ‘Why we need QMV’ by Princess Diana.

Finance chiefs against the Constitution

A poll by MORI shows that seven out of ten finance directors are opposed to Britain signing up to the EU Constitution. A survey of around 200 finance directors found that 30 per

cent of respondents were “firmly opposed” and 38 per cent were “generally opposed”. 26 per cent were generally in favour of the Constitution but “could be persuaded against it if

they thought it would be bad for Britain”. Only 4 per cent were strongly in favour of Britain adopting the EU Constitution.

What would be the consequences of a French 'No'?

A sequence of economic and political events could mean that control of the European agenda could slip from the grasp of the Franco-German leadership

What would be the consequences of a French 'no'? Many observers have assumed that while a French rejection of the EU constitution on 29th May would produce a serious crisis it is one that would be managed without fundamental change to the European project. As in the past, France and Germany would meet in order to ensure that events did not detract from the overriding goal of political integration. In the circumstances, this would probably mean laying plans to establish a hard-core of states that would move quickly to harmonise taxes and to build a "social Europe." This would leave political leaders such as Blair who have promised to hold referendums irrespective of the French outcome with the acute dilemma of having to choose between risking humiliation by pushing ahead with a referendum that was doomed from the start and denying voters an opportunity granted to millions of others.

In other words, the outcome of a French 'no' would be messy but not catastrophic from a europhile perspective. Europe's political leadership would vow never again to permit the voters to have such an important say but might still feel confident that the European project would not be permanently derailed.

This scenario is perfectly plausible, but fails to take into account a number of economic and political factors. One of these is the impact of the uncertainty about the French referendum result on the currencies of those new EU states that have been struggling to achieve economic convergence prior to

membership of the euro. Earlier this month Norbert Walter, chief economist of the Deutsche Bank told the German edition of the *Financial Times* that there could be speculative attacks on the currencies of the new EU states sparked by fears that a rejection of the treaty could jeopardise their plans for an early entry into the euro.

"These countries would then have to raise their interest rates. It could cause enormous exchange rate fluctuations," he said.

"One problem is that the EU has absolutely no strategy about how to react to a failure in the Constitution referendum."

Anti-EU sentiment

If Norbert's forecasts are correct the economic impact on the new EU members could lead to increasing anti-EU sentiment, especially in Central Europe, and to demands that the plans for euro entry be abandoned despite the fact that this would directly contravene the terms of the Accession Treaties. The influence of critics of the EU such as Vaclav Klaus, the Czech President, who has been actively campaigning against the Constitution, would be strengthened while that of fragile pro-EU Central and Eastern governments would be weakened.

But it is not only the financial markets of Eastern and Central Europe that are likely to be unsettled by anxieties about a French rejection of the treaty; ultimately the credibility of the euro is at stake. Partly as a result of political uncertainties the euro has been falling against sterling and the US dollar

since late December.

Adding to the political uncertainties created by the obvious impatience and dissatisfaction of the French electorate are forecasts that the elections in North Rhine Westphalia, Germany's most populous state, could result in the Berlin coalition parties being swept from power.

A few weeks later, on 1st June, the Netherlands votes on the EU constitution; the latest polls suggest that the result could be too close to call.

What all of these suggest is a confluence of political events that could have a cumulative impact on political and economic prospects of a kind that is scarcely likely to help the cause of political integration and which could lead to a process of political unravelling.

"There is an accumulator effect in the eurozone", said Jacques Caillouz, an economist at J.P Morgan. *"What we are seeing is the emergence of political risk at the eurozone level - uncertainty in investor's minds about whether the region might become paralysed or even show signs of falling apart"* (*Financial Times* 15th April).

None of this is to imply that Europe's political leadership is set to treat a French *non* as a reason to reconsider first principles or to return to the political drawing board, or that the political initiative can be wrested from it. It is to suggest that in an increasingly uncertain political and economic environment EU-wide cohesion and unity will be pipe-dreams and the control of events will increasingly slip from its grasp.

Constitution 'completes European project'

"The project of the founding fathers is complete: the economic Union is becoming a political Union...The consequence of a 'no' vote is a return

to Nice, the pursuit of the current Europe, without ambitious common policies, and the undoubtedly lasting abandonment of the whole European

constitutional project."

Nicolas Sarkozy, leader of the French UMP and Presidential hopeful, *Le Figaro*, 14th April.

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Don't Split the Vote!

Dear Sir,

In what may be the last edition before the election, permit me the hospitality of your columns to make two points.

Your readers will have noticed with some surprise that as an issue Europe is a non-subject for all three main parties. There is a reason for this. Labour and Lib-Dems are terrified of it. The Conservative HQ is simply terrified that the massively and treacherously disloyal Euro-fanatic rump in the party would destroy the party's united front *at the very moment it is needed to persuade waverers to vote Conservative.*

But it has not gone away. Just the reverse. It waits like an iceberg, and it is going to sink Blair's Titanic when the time comes. If the chance does occur...that introduces my second point.

There are 170 winnable marginals being targeted hard. Over ninety per cent of candidates in them are fiercely patriotic and thus Euro-sceptic hardliners. The selection committees have done a good job. If even 100 of these young Turks come to Westminster the character of the Tory party on this issue will be revolutionised. The Euro-fanatic rump will become a complete irrelevance and can do what they wish.

Which is why it is so crazy for UKIP to stand against us - because of what Major, Heseltine and Clarke did 13 years ago. That was then, this is now. So let me appeal to UKIP: save your talent, your passion, your fire, your commitment, your energy and your funds until we can all fight shoulder to shoulder to bring down the Constitution and Blair once and for all.

And to UKIP voters I say: a vote for UKIP in a tight race is only a vote for Blair and that means a vote for Brussels. The exact opposite of what you want. So vote for the new Tory intake.

Blair is going to try and rig the election with 'bent' postal votes. Then he will try to rig the referendum with hugely asymmetric funding. Why help

him? Those who love this country should stick together, not split the vote and lose all.

FREDERICK FORSYTH
Herts

What is a Eurosceptic?

Dear Sir,

Your correspondent George West says that eurosceptics contesting elections against each other is a gift to our enemies. But what is a eurosceptic?

I have led a campaign in UKIP for us not to oppose any sitting Labour or Conservative MP who advocates withdrawal. However I have been wasting my breath as not a single MP has made this statement.

There will be 500 UKIP candidates on May 5th 2005 advocating withdrawal. Let us hope that real EU opponents gain a voice in Westminster. It is about time.

NIGEL FARAGE MEP
UKIP

The Danger of Crystal Balls

Dear Sir,

eurofacts has gazed into the crystal ball (15th April) and determined that in 50 years time India will account for 25 per cent of the world's output. May I suggest that it is unwise to look at today's situation and make such sweeping conclusions about the future? I started working in India in 1982. India was, at that time, the world's 10th most industrialised country and a nuclear power. It had a population of around 740 million, today its population exceeds 1.2 billion with a birth rate of over two per cent. It is not simply headcount that determines GDP and there are many cultural and other reasons why India may not, and I suggest will not, make the progress you suggest. I agree though that our destiny must lie in our own hands and that cannot happen whilst we remain within the expanding, insatiable and increasingly inefficient and bureaucratic EU.

PAUL RHODES
London

No need for 'New Relationship'

Dear Sir,

So far from refuting the biggest myth about leaving the EU, your leading article of 1st April suggests that you have swallowed it hook, line and sinker. That myth is the claim invented by the government in 1975 that if we left, "we would have to negotiate some special free-trade arrangement with the EEC, because otherwise our exports to the Common Market would be seriously handicapped" (Britain's New Deal in Europe), while our imports would presumably remain unaffected.

We didn't have such an arrangement before we joined the EEC, neither Britain nor the EU has had one with the US, and, by your figures, we now have a deficit of over £110 billion a year in our trade in goods (including oil) with the eurozone. Reducing our trade there would also reduce the deficit. Isn't that what we want?

Your 'irrefutable evidence' that Britain would have 'enormous leverage' in negotiating 'a new relationship' with the EU is flawed in at least two ways. First, because that deficit results from the burden which CAP, VAT and the regulations you keep telling us about impose on British producers. Getting rid of that burden would in itself reduce the deficit, and therefore reduce the economic incentive for the eurozone countries to establish 'a new relationship' with us. Second, you are assuming that the EU is motivated by rational economic considerations. In reality the EU has repeatedly shown itself willing to sacrifice the economic welfare of its peoples in pursuit of its own political agenda.

Please don't help the eurofanatic divert the debate from the economic case for a straight withdrawal to discussion of the feasibility of negotiating a 'new relationship' with the EU. Negotiating such a relationship may well be impossible and is certainly pointless.

JOHN KISSIN
London

MEETINGS

London Swinton Circle and the Springbook Club

Tuesday **26th April 2005**, 7.00 pm

“How Conservatives and Labour are prepared to dismantle the Monarchy and the British Constitution”

Philip Benwell MBE, *Chairman, Australian Constitutional Monarchy League*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Crypt, Orange Street
Congregational Church, Orange Street,
London WC1

Admission Free

United Kingdom Independence Party 0208 607 9254

Tuesday **26th April 2005** 7.30 pm

“Is the European Union the New Soviet Union”

Vladimir Bukovsky, *Former political prisoner in the USSR and author*

Peter Dul, *UKIP, Parliamentary candidate*

Douglas Orchard, *UKIP, Parliamentary candidate*

PUBLIC MEETING

Old Town Hall, Whittaker Avenue,
Richmond, Surrey TW9 1TP

Admission Free

London Swinton Circle

Wednesday **18th May 2005**, 7.00 pm

“The tactics being used to undermine Gibraltar”

Peter Pepper, *Chairman, Falkland Islands Association*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Clarence, 53 Whitehall,
Westminster, London SW1

Admission Free

Gresham College 020 7831 0575

Wednesday **25th May 2005** 6.00 pm

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

[During the immediate post-war period, the United States used the promise of Marshall aid to force the countries of Western Europe to take the first steps towards integration. Britain opted out, then spent the subsequent twenty years trying to get in. Once in, she toyed with various plans and made various attempts to be both in and out. This may be a play with a long run.]

Professor Kathleen Burk, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

Right Now

08456 01 32 43

Saturday **28th May 2005**,
10.30 am to 4.00 pm

ALL DAY CONFERENCE

Philip Claeys MEP

Christopher Gill, *Chairman, Freedom Association*

Ashley Mote MEP

Further details to be announced

ALL DAY CONFERENCE

The Mark Masons Hall, 86 St James's Street, London SW1

Admission by Ticket £45

(Includes refreshments and buffet luncheon)

Tickets from Right Now, PO Box 361,
78 Marylebone High Street, London
W1U 5AP

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020 7219 3000

Wednesday **4th May 2005**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard by the
Constitution Committee from witnesses to
be confirmed.

Wednesday **18th May 2005**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard by the
Constitution Committee from witnesses to
be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005

UK General Election **5th May**

French referendum **29th May**
on European Constitution

Dutch referendum **1st June**
on European Constitution

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

ECOFIN meeting **12-13th July**

GAERC meeting **18-19th July**

Danish referendum **27th September**
on European Constitution

ECOFIN meeting **11th October**

GAERC meeting **14-15th October**

ECOFIN meeting **8th November**

GAERC meeting **21-22nd November**

2006

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

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

**Britain and the European Union:
Alternative Futures**

by Mark Baimbridge, Brian Burkitt and Philip Whyman. **£7.50**

A critical analysis of UK membership, with credible alternative options.

Germany's Four Reichs

by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**
Idiosyncratic history of Germany by Englishman, El Alamein, Burma, Bletchley (codebreaker).

**The Great Deception:
The Secret History of the
European Union**

by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£12.99**
A comprehensive history of the European Union project. In paperback.

**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.

The Freedom Audit

by The Freedom Association. **£3.00**
Details the extent of the Government's assault on fundamental freedoms and the democratic system.

**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.

**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.

**EUROPE A Concise
Encyclopedia of the European Union**

by Rodney Leach. **£14.99**
The fourth update of this highly informative and necessary directory.

The New Case for Europe:

The Crisis in British pro-Europeanism and How to Overcome it
by Roger Liddle. **£6.95**
The strap line tells it all.

A Cost Too Far?
by Ian Milne. **£8.50**

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

**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: 08456 120175
Fax: 08456 120176
Email: info@juneypress.com
www.juneypress.com

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)
20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

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	
Veritas	020-7631 3757
Robert Kilroy-Silk MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006