

## Is the British taxpayer funding the French deficit?

*A leading accountant speculates as to why some EU governments refuse to cooperate with the European Court of Auditors*

Imagine an international bank with a head office in London and branches all over the world. As one might expect, the shareholders of this particular bank wish to ensure that its accounts are properly audited. Its auditors consequently audit the funds that pass through the London HQ to an acceptable professional standard. But supposing that the rules under which it operates are such that they are powerless to audit the accounts relating to its world-wide activities. Instead, they are forced to rely on certificates issued and controlled by the bank's local management - even when, for example, they know for certain that a particular regional manager has run off with all the assets. How long would the bank's shareholders and customers retain confidence in the bank? Not long, one imagines. But, this analogy accurately demonstrates the nature of the audit system in place in the EU. It also explains why the European Court of Auditors has refused to sign off on the EU accounts for ten years in succession - and why, as matters stand, it will *never* be able to do so.

### Leading Expert

The analogy was suggested by Christopher Arkell, a leading international accountancy expert following a meeting with senior members of the European Court of Auditors and MEPs on 30th May this year.

After the meeting, Mr Arkell said that he believed that the ECA and its directors seemed to be labouring as honestly as possible in difficult circumstances. But the reality was that the Court would never be able to give the accounts of the EU Commission a clean audit - no matter how much money was spent on the latest computers, new accounting systems and the introduction of conventional accounting rules that businesses have been obliged to follow for years. This is because the ECA is powerless to audit the funds paid under the Common Agricultural Policy, Structural Funds, Regional Funds and other expenditures run by the member states themselves.

### Detriment of the Poor

According to Mr Arkell: "While some Member States' National Audit Offices (or their equivalents) are cooperative, others are the very reverse".

The funds which are unauditible comprise some 80 per cent of the Commission's budget - over 70bn (approximately £48bn). The remarkable truth is that no one knows for sure where this money goes. The thought that the bulk of this is intended to support EU farmers - to the detriment of the consumers and of poor Third World food producers - understandably arouses indignation, but in fact no one can be sure that governments hand on all of the money

for such purposes.

Said Mr Arkell: "*The conclusion is inescapable: the member states which absorb the greatest level of subsidy do not want their books looked at for fear of it being publicly demonstrated that the European Commission is simply baling out general government deficits around the EU under the guise of assisting farmers, former industrial regions or the bakers of apple pie*".

### Invitation to Fraud

The present demands for an increase in the EU budget could have been used as the occasion to insist on the dismantling of the present EU structure. A British government which was seriously interested in reform could have tabled detailed proposals to ensure honesty and transparency. For as Mr Arkell has pointed out, the present arrangements do not merely invite fraud and corruption but are themselves part of a structure of fraud and deceit. The Court of Auditors exists to provide assurance that public money is not being misused but it is forced to operate in a way that prevents it from carrying out its task.

The British government is unlikely to be in ignorance of these matters. Could it be that it doesn't raise them because it does not want British taxpayers to discover the extraordinary fact that not only are they funding a system which is wide open to fraud but which also means that they are funding the huge French national deficit?

# EU sugar reform will increase world poverty

*Changes to the EU sugar subsidy regime will help big EU producers but damage poor Third World farmers*

The EU Commission has finally and reluctantly announced changes to its much criticised sugar subsidy regime. However, the revised system will impact even more brutally on Third World producers than the system it replaces. It will consequently make a mockery of the EU's commitment to the millennium goals as well as Tony Blair's mission to save the African continent.

The Commission's proposal, which will cut guaranteed prices to European producers by 39 per cent and beet prices by 42 per cent over two years, follows a successful challenge at the WTO by Australia, Brazil and Thailand. The aim of the reforms is to get rid of 5.2m tons of subsidised exports and to close down uncompetitive production.

EU sugar prices are more than four times higher than the global market

rate and are protected by substantial tariffs. Brussels also pays out export subsidies to get millions of tons of sugar a year off the market, helping to keep prices high. However, the EU also grants preferential treatment to producers in poor nations in the Caribbean and Africa who fear that their industries will be devastated by the changes which will slash guaranteed prices and open up competition from major world producers.

The EU is preparing to set up to 6bn aside to fund a buy-out programme to pay small European farmers to give up their quotas.

Writing in the *Financial Times* on 22nd June Mrs Mariann Fischer Boel, the EU Agriculture Commissioner acknowledged that the changes were made to protect European sugar producers at the expense of poor farmers. They would, she said, incite

"noisy protests" but were "crucial to guarantee the survival of European sugar production".

Fischer Boel said she could no longer offer Third World producers guaranteed high prices because that would "draw in more imports than we could absorb and our market would be in danger of imploding".

A spokesman for the Jamaican government saw things differently. The changes would decimate sugar industries which contributed up to 70 per cent of some developing countries' GDP while increasing poverty and crime, he said. Clement Rhee, Guyana's minister of foreign trade said it was hypocrisy for the EU to adhere to millennium goals while 'presiding over such collateral damage'. And Luis Morago, for Oxfam, said: "This proposal in its current form will hurt some of the poorest countries in the world".

## Anglo-Saxons do wealth creation better

We have made the following points in *eurofacts* many times, but they have seldom been made as well as they were by Mark Steyn, the brilliant *Daily Telegraph* columnist on 28th June:

*For Britain and Ireland, two relatively dynamic provinces of a moribund continent, there are only two options: share the pain and expense of societal upheaval, or decide that you are not that "European" after all and begin the process of detachment or at*

*least semi-detachment. When Continentals bemoan "Anglo-Saxon" Capitalism, they have a point. Of the 20 economies with the biggest GDP per capita, no fewer than 11 are current or former realms of Her Britannic Majesty. Admittedly, some of the wealthiest turf is the pinprick colonial tax havens - Bermuda, Guernsey, the Caymans. But if you eliminate populations under 10 million, the GDP per capita five are, in order, America, Canada, Australia,*

*Belgium and the United Kingdom. And if you make it territories with over 20 million, the Top Four is an Anglosphere sweep. In other words, the ability to generate wealth among large populations does indeed seem to be an Anglo-Saxon thing. That being so, which is more likely? That Blair will transform a Europe antipathetic to Anglo-Saxon ways? Or that Europe will drag its Anglo-Saxons down with it?*

## The Tories: Can there be hope?

*"For too long - dare we say, since the days Mr Howard sat in Sir John's cabinet - the Conservatives have wavered on Europe. Now, with a new leader imminent and the EU project in chaos, they have a chance to articulate and benefit from the intense desire among the British people for national self-government." (Daily Telegraph leader, 28th June).*

## Blair still backs Constitution

*"I continue to think that the Constitution is a set of rules perfectly apt for Europe to function better. We will have to reflect on it again." Tony Blair, interviewed by *Le Monde*, 24th June, 2005.*

# Contributions to Brussels

Many readers have asked us to publish an up-to-date table showing EU countries' gross and net contributions to and receipts from Brussels.

As soon as HM Treasury publishes its annual paper, *European Community Finances: Statement on the [year] EC Budget*, we will analyse the figures and publish the results. This Treasury paper (it should be available at [www.hm-treasury.gov.uk](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk)) is usually published in April, but at the time of writing it hadn't appeared. Possibly the Government wished to avoid anything controversial coming out just ahead of the General Election?

Commission figures are unreliable because they tend to understate the amounts sloshing in and sloshing out (don't ask us why). However, it is probably still the case that the biggest net contributors in absolute terms are, in descending order, Germany, the UK, Holland and France. Per capita, Holland and Sweden are probably the biggest net contributors.

The biggest net recipients in absolute terms are probably still Spain and Portugal, though, per capita, Ireland is probably the biggest.

The current "row" between France and the UK about the rebate is of course purely synthetic, started by Chirac to distract attention from the humiliation of the French Non. Blair willingly let himself be suckered into this nonsense so that he can bang on about "reform" and "modernisation" of the EU. How touching. Blair has signed up to every "policy" the EU's come up with during his time in office; why didn't he complain then that they

behind which the eurocrats will continue to steal our sovereignty. As Blair keeps on saying, he's a "passionate pro-European". On that at least we can believe him.

Just for the record: Gordon Brown's 16th March 2005 Budget Statement contained the following data for net payments to the EU budget, tucked away in an obscure footnote to Table C11 on page 257 (**see table**).

These net amounts include the rebate. Three months ago, compared to the current financial year, 2005/6, the Treasury was therefore forecasting that in only two years the UK net contribution to Brussels would be going up by almost a third. Now that Mr Blair has committed this country to paying even more to Brussels in return for some as yet unspecified "reform", the internal Treasury projections from 2007/8 and beyond are presumably even worse than the ones they shyly slipped into the Budget Statement three months ago.

**Net payments to EU Budget in £ bn**

2004/5	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8
4.3	3.8	3.4	5.2

were in need of "reform"? He knows, we know and the rest of the EU knows that there just ain't gonna be any EU "reform". It's all a smokescreen

## Inward investment plunges in Eurozone

The almost constant flow of black economic news about the Eurozone has continued with the publication of figures for foreign direct investment from the OECD. These show that investment in France and Germany, the two largest economies of the European continent, fell sharply in 2004.

In France, inward investment almost halved last year, falling from \$43bn to \$24 bn.

In the case of Germany, foreign investors actually withdrew about

\$39bn from the country, reversing the inflow of \$27bn recorded in 2003, the OECD said in the report "Trends and recent developments in foreign direct investment" published on 23rd June.

Investment also fell sharply in seven other Eurozone countries: Austria, Portugal, the Netherlands, Ireland, Sweden, Luxembourg and Spain.

On the other side of the Channel, foreign direct inflows into the UK more than tripled, reaching \$78.5bn in 2004, according to the report.

The US has regained the role as the

world's principal destination for direct investment, rising from \$67.1bn in 2003 to \$106.8bn in 2004, it said. And at the same time, foreign direct investment outflows from the United States hit an all-time record of \$252bn in 2004.

The other major 'anglosphere' nations - Australia, New Zealand and Canada - also recorded significant increases in the volume of inward investment flows, as did China, India, and Russia.

## De Villepin urges protectionist path for EU

*"No one can understand why Europe doesn't give itself greater means to defend its economy, wealth and jobs. No one can understand why it doesn't benefit more from the tools it has put in place, like the euro. We have a strong*

*currency. Let's also give ourselves a strong economic policy. Let's give ourselves the means to defend a European preference, as do all the other major economic blocs. Let's open up new prospects such as tax*

*harmonisation and union with Germany in areas chosen together."*

Dominique de Villepin, the French Prime Minister in his address to the French National Assembly on 8th June.

# “Empire” by integration

By Ian Milne

**G**eir Lundestad is a Norwegian historian who worked for the Norwegian Nobel Committee at the time this excellent book was published. A serious rather academic account of US support for European integration, it is mercifully short, packed with references to original sources and containing an extensive bibliography of published and unpublished works and interviews.

The “Empire” - in inverted commas - is of course the USA, which definitely is an empire despite its reluctance to be so described. Lundestad begins thus:

“This study presents two basic arguments. First, it argues that the United States promoted the integration of Western Europe, rather strongly until the mid-1960s, less strongly after that.....Second, while the American attitude was in some ways unique, the United States still wanted to exercise some form of control over Western Europe.”

And he concludes:

“The present study has demonstrated Washington’s general support for European integration, but this support has always been conditioned on Europe being fitted into a wider Atlantic framework.....once the Atlantic framework is seriously

---

## “Empire” by Integration

**The United States and European Integration 1945-1997**

*By Geir Lundestad*

Oxford University Press, 1998  
Hdbk 200 pp £45

ISBN 1-9878212-8

---

questioned, it seems likely that US support for European integration will falter rather quickly. The end of the Cold War may have widened the perimeters of the Atlantic framework, but there are still limits to how far Washington will permit a ‘friendly’ EU to move.”

Lundestad identifies five broad motives for US support of European integration between 1945 and 1997:

- The containment of Germany.
- The containment of the Soviet Union.
- A reduced American burden.
- The creation of a more rational and efficient Europe (than the pre-World War 2 one).
- A sincerely American-held belief

that the American model, particularly “federalism”, is good for other countries.

Lundestad discusses, develops and illustrates US policy in the light of these five motives for the whole period from the Truman to the Clinton administrations.

A decade and a half after the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is possible to see a US “containment of Russia” policy in operation in recent official US statements in support of last year’s accession of ten mainly east European states and, more recently, in support of Ukraine’s joining the EU. Iraq may have lessened US support for the EU; how the US administration will view the French “Non” remains to be seen. If American support for the EU does diminish, it will probably be because in Washington’s world-view Europe is of fading importance, partly as a result of Europe’s economic and demographic decline, partly because of the rise of China in particular and of Asia-Pacific in general.

{The Hardback version is no longer in print, but a paperback version will be available shortly £22.99, please contact the June Press, see rear page.}

## What a difference a week makes!

**I**t would be naive to look for inconsistency in the comments of the Prime Minister, but his recent remarks on the British budget rebate suggest that the U-turns are becoming more pronounced and the time which he takes to contradict ‘unequivocal’ statements of policy and principle is

shortening.

“The UK rebate will remain and we will not negotiate it away”, the Prime Minister told the House of Commons on 9th June. But following discussions with Goran Persson, the Swedish Prime Minister at 10 Downing Street on 21st June, he

declared:

“We have made it clear that we are prepared not just to discuss and negotiate, but to recognise that the rebate is an anomaly that has to go, but it has to go in the context of the other anomaly [the CAP] being changed away”.

## Doomsday for the euro

“We’re not looking at the doomsday scenario quite yet: but it is a question of when, not if.”  
Peter Wandersford, HSBC’s chief economist commenting on the future of the euro.

*The summer double issue of eurofacts (Vol 10 No 20/21)  
will appear on 29th July 2005.*

# Future enlargement: the French voters' new veto

*The revised French constitution has destroyed Turkey's prospects of being admitted*

Turkey may still insist that its political destiny lies in the EU but the reality is that the French non has finished of its prospects of being admitted. Earlier this year, hoping to neutralise the Turkish question ahead of the French referendum, Chirac solemnly promised to insert a clause in the French Constitution (which was being revised to make it compatible with the draft EU Constitution) subjecting every future potential admission of a country to the EU to the agreement via referendum of the French electorate. The revised French Constitution, unlike that of the EU, is now in place: it came into effect on 28th February, three months ahead of the referendum. Chirac, in his short final televised appeal to the French immediately before the EU referendum, beseeching them to vote "Yes", reminded viewers that they had the right to vote on future accessions. The French electorate, if it so chooses, now has the unilateral and unconditional right to reject any enlargement beyond a 28-member EU (EU-25 plus Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia, whose entry negotiations were already in the pipeline).

The relevant article in the revised French Constitution is no 88-5. This is what it says:

*Any Bill authorising the ratification of a treaty concerning the accession of a State to the European Union and to the European Communities shall be submitted to a referendum [of the French people] by the President of the Republic.*

A further paragraph states that accessions decided by IGCs convened before 1st July 2004 are excluded from

Article 88-5 (those of Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia, though their names are not spelt out). If the EU Constitution were ever to come in to force, Article 88-5 of the French Constitution would be re-numbered as 88-7.

The prospect of any future French Head of State and his or her government risking a referendum on Turkish entry is minimal. Even if Bulgaria and Romania join the EU (scheduled for 2007), plus Croatia - and that is no longer certain, following the French and Dutch No - enlargement is effectively stopped dead.

## Colossal Shock

The French non not only destroyed Chirac's presidency, it delivered a colossal shock to the French elite in general. Its effects will be felt in France for a generation. **It seems inconceivable that any future French Head of State and his or her government would risk a referendum on any accession candidate, let alone Turkey, in, say, the next 20 years.** Ukraine? More Polish-like "plumbers" - 50 million of them. Morocco? Worse than Turkey. Kosovo? Albania? More Moslems. Belarus and Moldavia? French people will never have heard of those places, so why risk losing a referendum on them? As for Turkey, EU negotiations with the Turkish government may not now begin (as they had been scheduled to) on 3rd October next.

Any move by the rest of the EU (led for example by the UK) to promote the accession of Turkey or of any other

country will almost certainly be blocked by France at an early stage, to avoid the risk of having to ask the French electorate their permission. Even if the whole of the EU ganged up on the French and told them to activate Article 88-5 in respect of Turkish accession, or else remove the referendum requirement from the French Constitution, or to re-run the referendum on the EU Constitution, it would backfire badly. Revising the French Constitution is a complicated, cumbersome and visible process. Any attempt to delete the offending clause could not be "smuggled through" without the electorate noticing. Deleting or emasculating the referendum requirement would reinforce the electorate's already massive distrust of their leaders. It just couldn't be done. Similarly, no one in France believes that the electorate could be asked to vote again on the EU Constitution.

If the EU really does want to admit Turkey, the only way of doing so in the foreseeable future is to expel France from the EU. She might in any case have decided to leave by then, once the CAP finally collapses.

It looks therefore as if "enlargement", one of the few policies on which europhiles and eurosceptics alike agreed, is dead. With enlargement gone, little momentum remains in the European project. Not just the EU Constitution, but the European project itself is terminally damaged.

## America 'worse than China'

Eighty five per cent of the French believe it would be good if the EU or another country emerged as a military rival to the US, a survey of attitudes in 16 nations has shown. In

most of Europe, China - a country that lacks democratic elections and personal freedoms - had a better image than the United States. The only Western countries in which positive

attitudes to the US outnumbered those with negative attitudes were Britain and Poland, according to the Pew Global Attitudes Survey carried out in April and May this year.

# LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## Thinking the unthinkable

Dear Sir,

The Conservative Party needs radical policies if it is ever to be elected as a Government. It should therefore 'think the unthinkable'. Above all, it needs to convince the electorate that it is possible to have lower taxes whilst simultaneously increasing expenditure on public services.

One means of achieving this would be through the introduction of a Flat Tax system. This leaves individuals and businesses with more of their own money to spend as they wish which would also have the effect of increasing government revenue. Both individuals and businesses might be given an allowance of £12,000 before paying the single rate of tax at 22 per cent. Such a system exempts the poor from paying tax, reduces avoidance and evasion, eliminates tax on savings and investments and reduces costs for government revenue departments.

Another revenue raising policy which involves 'thinking the unthinkable' would be withdrawal from the EU. The UK's gross contribution to the EU budget amounts to £11bn and rising. The Institute of Directors in its research, estimates that the EU costs to the UK are 1.75 per cent of Gross Domestic Product which at 2003 levels would be £19bn. Businesses would be freed from red tape including the 101,811 EU regulations, leaving them better placed to expand and raise employment levels, again producing increased government revenue.

As a consequence, the cry for EU reform would be forced upon European institutions and politicians by the loss of the UK contribution.

I fear these policies are too radical for the Conservative Party which appears to lack the courage to 'think the unthinkable' preferring to rely on the belief that it is governments that lose elections rather than oppositions who win them.

HARRY M RANDALL  
Dorchester

## Blair's perfidy

Dear Sir,

Addressing the European Parliament a few days before assuming the rotating Presidency of the European Union on 1st July 2005, Tony Blair claimed that he had always been a committed supporter of the European Union.

A few titters were heard when this claim was made as in 1983 he promised the Labour Conference, "When the Labour Party comes to power it will negotiate Britain's withdrawal from the European Community which has drained our resources and destroyed our jobs".

The truth is that the Prime Minister has not been straight with the British people as far as his aspiration for our role in Europe is concerned. He very much wanted to adopt the euro and ditch the pound, in spite of all the evidence that the single currency was never likely to succeed. He subscribed to the view that the proposed EU constitution was merely a "tidying-up" exercise, happily signing up to it in advance of the referendum that he promised us - now abandoned following the votes of the French and Dutch peoples.

A substantial number of Labour MPs will have no truck with the euro or the Constitution but that simple truth was suppressed during the recent General Election Campaign.

DAVID OWEN  
Devon

## On the way up

Dear Sir,

Jeffrey Titford, UKIP's MEP for the Eastern Counties wrote the following in his recent newsletter to members: "Almost everywhere we increased our share of the vote and we did this in spite of media blackout". While George Curtis, our Regional Committee Chairman wrote: "Our coverage in the media left something to be desired, which is to be expected. The BBC have rules of engagement, and air time is based on votes collected in the previous elections".

In 1997, UKIP fought 194 seats, in 2001 434 and in 2005 497 seats. Our

national share of the vote was 0.34 per cent, 1.47 and 2.38 per cent respectively. Total votes cast were 106,001 in 1997, 390,910 in 2001 and 610,000 this year.

We are happy and proud to give the electorate the opportunity to vote for us. Therefore, my question to Anthony Hoyle (*eurofacts* letters 10th June) is why should UKIP members (and supporters) use tactical voting to appease the Tory party when as 'a rising star' UKIP has its own growth and ranking to consider.

IAN SMITH  
Suffolk

## Where are Freddy's warriors?

Dear Sir,

As never before, the European Union is in a shambolic phase, but where are the Tory eurosceptics so beloved by Freddie Forsyth? The answer is simple. They are tucked away, nice and cosy, in their newly won constituencies laughing like drains at having once again conned the electorate into voting for them.

They should be up on their hindlegs shouting their heads off for the repatriation of powers to Westminster.

Eurosceptics - my grandmother's unmentionables!

JACK BARNWELL  
Hants

## Little words that mean a lot

Dear Sirs,

There are two words which make the difference between the Conservative and UK Independence Parties: 'must' and 'can't'.

The Conservatives say we in the UK 'can't' leave the EU but 'must' reform it from within by amending the treaties, whereas the UK Independence Party says we 'must' leave the EU because it 'can't' be reformed.

If the Conservatives continue to say we 'can't' leave then the UK Independence Party 'must' continue to campaign against EU membership.

DEREK BENNETT  
Walsall

# MEETINGS

**The Bruges Group**  
020 7287 4414

Thursday **21st July 2005**, 7.00 pm

**Simon Wolfson**, *CEO of Next*

## PUBLIC MEETING

The Abbey Centre, 34 Great Smith Street, Westminster, London

**Admission £10**

**(Includes wine and refreshments)**

**FREE**

## Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

## Contact Details

**eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65**  
**or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com**

## SELECT COMMITTEES

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Wednesday **11th July 2005**, 4.20 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *European Union documents and other matters related to the European Union* from Mr Douglas Alexander MP, Minister for Europe, Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

Wednesday **13th July 2005**, 10.45 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Economic Migration to the EU* from Professor Andrew Geddes, Department of Politics, Sheffield University; and representatives from the CBI.

Wednesday **20th July 2005**, 10.45 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Economic Migration to the EU* from the TUC; and the International Labour Organisations (ILO).

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

## USEFUL WEB SITES

### British Declaration of Independence

[www.bdicampaign.org](http://www.bdicampaign.org)

### British Democracy Campaign

[www.britishdemocracycampaign.co.uk](http://www.britishdemocracycampaign.co.uk)

### British Weights & Measures Assoc.

[www.bwmaOnline.com](http://www.bwmaOnline.com)

### Bruges Group

[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

### Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

[www.poptel.org.uk/against-eurofederalism](http://www.poptel.org.uk/against-eurofederalism)

### Campaign for an Independent Britain

[www.cibhq.co.uk](http://www.cibhq.co.uk)

### Congress for Democracy

[congressfordemocracy.org](http://congressfordemocracy.org)

### Democracy Movement

[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)

### Democratic Nations in Danger

[freenations.freeuk.com](http://freenations.freeuk.com)

### EU Observer

[www.euobserver.com](http://www.euobserver.com)

### EU Referendum

<http://euroreferendum.blogspot.com>

### European Commission (London)

[www.ccc.org.uk](http://www.ccc.org.uk)

### European Foundation

[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)

### European No Campaign

[www.europeannocampaign.com](http://www.europeannocampaign.com)

### Facts, Figures & Phantasies

[www.eufactsfigures.com](http://www.eufactsfigures.com)

### Foreign Affairs

[www.foreignaffairs.org](http://www.foreignaffairs.org)

### Freedom Association

[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)

### Freedom UK

[www.taylor.co.uk/eu/](http://www.taylor.co.uk/eu/)

### Global Britain

[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

### June Press (Publications)

[www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)

### Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)

### New Alliance

[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)

### Regional Assemblies

[www.regionalassemblies.co.uk](http://www.regionalassemblies.co.uk)

### Save Britain's Fish

[www.savebritfish.org.uk](http://www.savebritfish.org.uk)

### Sovereignty

[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)

### Statewatch

[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)

### The People's "No" Campaign

[www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk](http://www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk)

### United Kingdom Independence Party

[www.ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org)

### Vote No

[www.vote-no.com](http://www.vote-no.com)

## DIARY OF EVENTS

### 2005

Luxembourg referendum on European Constitution **10th July**

ECOFIN meeting **12-13th July**

GAERC meeting (General Affairs and External Relations Council) **18-19th July**

German Parliamentary Elections (to be confirmed) **Mid-September**

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

ECOFIN meeting **11th October**

GAERC meeting **14-15th October**

European Constitution (Final date for ratification) **31st October**

ECOFIN meeting **8th November**

GAERC meeting **21-22nd November**

ECOFIN meeting **24th November**

ECOFIN meeting **6th December**

GAERC meeting **12-13th December**

Portugal referendum on the European Constitution (to be confirmed) **December**

### 2006

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

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

### 2007

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

Accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union **1st January**

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

### 2008

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

**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.

**A Throne in Brussels**

by Paul Belien. **Hdbk £25.00**

A penetrating historical analysis which warns that the EU is heading the way of Belgium.

**The Case for Commonwealth Free Trade**

by Brent Cameron. **£11.26**

The Canadian author explores at length the pros, cons and practicalities of a Commonwealth Free Trade.

**The Great Abdication**

by Alexander Deane. **£8.95**

The strap line explains all. "Why Britain's decline is the fault of the middle class".

**Guide To The European Union**

by Revd. Philip Foster. **£1.50**

The EU and the Constitution in detail.

**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 European Central Bank.

**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 New Case for Europe:**

The Crisis in British pro-Europeanism and How to Overcome it

by Roger Liddle. **£6.95**

Roger Liddle was the Prime Minister's policy adviser on Europe 1997-2004.

**Who's Afraid of a European Constitution?**

by Neil MacCormick. **£8.95**

This authoritative book explains the Constitution's nature and purpose, by someone involved in its preparation.

**Should Britain Leave The EU**

by Patrick Minford, Vidya Mahambare and Eric Nowell **£15.95**

An economic analysis of a troubled relationship.

**Alarming Drum**

**Britain's European Dilemma**

by Peter Morgan. **Hdbk £19.95**

An analysis of Britain's relationship with the EU, by a former Director-General of the Institute of Directors.

**A Guide to the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe**

by Stuart Sexton. **£5.00**

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

**CD**

**EEC Entry Campaign 1970-72**

by Independent compiler **£2.00**

Free Educational CD (charge is for handling). Uses startling new source material showing how Parliament and the people were deceived into supporting entry. You will need a pdf reader such as adobe acrobat.

**Send Payment to**

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD**

**PO BOX 119**

**TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@junepress.com

**WEB SALES www.junepress.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"**

<b>European Commission</b>	<b>020-7973 1992</b>
European Movement	020-7940 5252
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020-7735 4000</b>

**AGAINST "EU"**

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403-741736</b>
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
<b>British Weights &amp; Measures Assoc.</b>	<b>020-8922 0089</b>
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071-663876
<b>Campaign for an Independent Britain</b>	<b>020-8340 0314</b>
Democracy Movement	020-7491 3072
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>01746-861267</b>
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020-7691 3800
<b>New Alliance</b>	<b>020-7386 1837</b>
Save Britain's Fish	01224-313473

**CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS**

**Congress for Democracy 01372-453678**

**CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS**

<b>Bruges Group</b>	<b>020-7287 4414</b>
Global Britain	
Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org	
<b>New Frontiers</b>	<b>020-7808 7772</b>

## POLITICAL PARTIES

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>020-7222 9000</b>
Rt Hon Michael Howard MP	
<b>Democratic Party</b>	<b>01684-891700</b>
Mr Geoff Southall	
<b>Labour</b>	<b>020-7802 1000</b>
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
<b>Liberal</b>	<b>01562-68361</b>
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	<b>020-7222 7999</b>
Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP	
<b>New Britain Party</b>	<b>020-7247 2524</b>
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
<b>UK Independence Party</b>	<b>0121 333 7737</b>
Roger Knapman MEP	
<b>Veritas</b>	<b>020-7631 3757</b>
Robert Kilroy-Silk MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

