

Democracy in action: Let the people decide

In or out of the European Union?

The campaign to secure a referendum on the question

It now seems a long time ago that the late Sir James Goldsmith launched his Referendum Party using the slogan, 'let the people decide'. Whilst the party failed to win any seats at Westminster the campaign was a huge success. Fear of Goldsmith and his war chest forced all of the major party leaders to promise a referendum before the UK joined the Single European Currency. If it hadn't been for the 'let the people decide' campaign, the UK would now be in the euro: the battle to secure a referendum pledge won those of us who believe in self-government valuable time.

When the EU Constitution first appeared on the horizon, there was concern that the large Labour majority in the House of Commons would result in an easy victory for Mr Blair. Despite that, in early 2003 my colleague Jeffrey Titford MEP and I discussed the possibility of trying to score a referendum promise. We launched a petition, one of many initiatives at the time, which resulted in a broad coalition of cross-party support for a referendum, in both Westminster and Brussels.

Pressure began to build with the *Daily Mail* and the *Sun* mounting huge campaigns, promoting the same message and demanding a referendum. Fearing an electoral disaster in the European and subsequent General Elections, Mr Blair caved in and

promised the people a referendum. Now, with the French and Dutch NO votes, there is almost no prospect of that referendum being held. Once again, securing a referendum pledge has given us more time, but time which is limited due to the creeping introduction of elements of the document through the back door.

Without the Euro and the EU Constitution there is now a view in the media and much of Westminster that 'Europe' is no longer an issue. This is one of the reasons cited for Ken Clarke's growing campaign for the leadership of the Conservative Party. Yet, as published in a previous edition of *eurofacts*, there is a strong public appetite for a referendum to decide this issue. Two thirds of respondents to the recent *yougov* poll want a vote on whether we stay in or get out of the EU. Remarkably there is now, for the first time in 30 years, a clear majority that would vote to leave the EU in favour of a free trade agreement.

Do not listen to these politicians who say we must not entertain the idea of leaving the EU or we would lose. As ever, the public is miles ahead of the Westminster political class. It is time to give them a voice. It is time to trust the people, not our politicians.

The 2005 version of the 'let the people decide' campaign is based on securing as many verified signatures as possible for a petition demanding a

referendum on our future in the EU. The campaign is backed and initially funded by the Independence and Democracy group in the European Parliament, the only group opposed to the EU Constitution and to which UKIP is delighted to belong. It is high time that taxpayers' money was used to tell people the truth about the EU. We have produced millions of A5 leaflets, petition forms and placards and are collecting signatures now. A running total will be displayed on our website: www.letthepeopledecide.co.uk, where people can sign up online. To gain momentum, this campaign needs help from all readers to spread the petition via their e-mail list, or by collecting signatures in their local area.

It has now been thirty years since the British had a vote on the European Question and those of us under 50 have never even been asked whether or not we want our country to be independent or governed elsewhere. There are also millions of people over 50 who feel they were conned in 1975 and would like another opportunity to express their opinion. We cannot, and must not, trust our established political classes to sort this out: they do not possess courage. It is up to the people.

Nigel Farage MEP (UKIP) is co-leader of the Independence and Democracy group in the European Parliament.

Economics: the French carry on being French

French politicians from all sides of the spectrum have excelled themselves recently doing what they do best: thinking up barriers to free trade and thinking up new taxes.

First of all there's the French government itself, whose newish prime minister, Dominique de Villepin, promised economic reforms following the French "No" on 29th May 2005 and is now busy putting in place fresh barriers against take-over bids from non-French companies. This was triggered off in July when it was rumoured that Pepsi Cola was thinking of bidding for the French yoghurt maker Danone. De Villepin and others called on the French to behave with "economic patriotism". In September the government drew up a list of "sensitive sectors" – industries in which it proposed that government permission would be needed before take-overs by foreigners, hostile or friendly, were allowed. The industries concerned include not just defence equipment but also biotechnology, cryptology and – believe it or not – casinos.

In addition, the French government is hoping to water down the effects of the EU Take-Over Directive (which only took the member states 14 years to negotiate) by inserting (French) amendments into it during the process of transposing it into national French law. Meanwhile, the government will

continue to encourage French companies to make bids for foreign competitors like BPB (British Plasterboard Industries), for which Saint-Gobain has made a hostile bid, and Allied-Domecq, recently acquired via a friendly bid by Pernod-Ricard.

To be fair to the French, other EU countries are just as bad – Italy, for example, where Antonio Fazio, governor of the central bank, improperly scuppered the take-overs of two Italian banks by, respectively, a Spanish and a Dutch bank. Germany is bringing in measures similar to the French ones for blocking foreign takeovers of "sensitive" companies, especially in defence equipment.

Back in France, President Chirac is still pushing the idea of a tax on airline tickets, the proceeds of which would be used to subsidise developing countries. Quite how those proceeds would be prevented from ending up in dictators' Swiss bank accounts hasn't been explained. It seems that Mr Blair is backing the idea.

Not to be outdone, two of the presumed future candidates to succeed Chirac as President in 2007, both former finance ministers in socialist governments, have come out in favour of raising taxes. Dominique Strauss-Kahn wants to increase VAT above its current eye-watering standard French rate of 19.6 per cent. Laurent Fabius wants to bring in a capital gains tax on owners' principal residences (such a

tax already exists on second homes). He also wants to levy a tax on oil companies in order to fund energy-saving measures.

Fabius is proudly reminding the electorate that it was he who invented the wealth tax when he was prime minister under Mitterrand – the very thing that over the last couple of decades has driven thousands of French entrepreneurs into tax exile in Belgium, the USA and the UK, and is forcing smallholding farmers on the Ile de Ré now caught by the wealth tax to sell off plots just to pay the tax. As if all this weren't depressing enough, Madame Martine Aubry, deputy prime minister under Jospin, the inventor of the 35-hour week, presently mayor of Lille, daughter of Jacques Delors, has let it be known that she's considering running for president in 2007.

Could it just be that all these leading Continental politicians have totally ignored Tony's and Gordon's calls for "economic reform" in the EU? Perish the thought. In under three months' time the British prime minister and his Chancellor will no doubt claim that the British presidency of the EU has been a resounding success. Long-suffering British businesses, not for the first time, will ask themselves if that's "success" what must "failure" be like, and wonder why their country's in the EU at all.

Flag waving

Wear Valley District Council has been long flying the EU flag outside its council offices. Its Leader, Olive Brown is a representative on the EU's Committee of the Regions. Neil Herron and Bishop Auckland and Wear Valley District Council resident, Jim Tague, decided action needed to be taken against this blatant attempt to promote the EU.

The Regulations for the flying of flags is controlled by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. The flying of flags other than the Union flag is

regulated by the Town and Country Planning Act 1992 Regulations on the display of Advertisements.

As the European Union is a political project a Local Authority will also be in contravention of Section 19 of the Local Authority Guidelines on Publicity...ie. you cannot use public money to attempt to persuade the public to hold a particular view on a political matter.

So, any Local Authority flying an EU flag must be asked politely to remove it as they will not have planning permis-

sion and are in breach of the Section 19 guidelines.

The request for an explanation as to whether WVDC had planning permission to fly the EU flag was made by Jim Tague a couple of weeks ago and WVDC confirmed that they had no authority or permission to fly the flag.

The Cross of St. George has now been hoisted on the flagpole in place of the EU flag.

Every other Council across the country should obey the law and remove any EU flags from public buildings.

Under Half of British Exports Go to the EU

UK deficit with EU is huge and growing

British governments, including the present one, keep telling us that “sixty per cent or more” of our exports go to the EU. They imply, or say, that this “proves” that we couldn’t afford to leave the EU. Such assertions are – let us be charitable – mere “spin”, having nothing to do with the government’s own statistics. The 2005 edition of *The Pink Book**, as usual, tells a different story.

The new *Pink Book* contains for the first time data for “EU-25”, the old EU-15 plus the ten countries which joined on 1st May 2004. Even with the addition of UK exports to those ten new members, total UK exports to EU-24 in 2004 (unadjusted) were barely

above 50 per cent of UK exports worldwide. If those figures were adjusted downwards to take account of the Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect and the separate Netherlands Distortion, both of which over-state the official figures, the real proportion of UK exports going to EU-24 would drop well below

the 50 per cent mark. And even the official unadjusted proportion has been steadily sinking over the last three years.

As the table shows, the UK continues to have a sizeable and growing surplus on its trade with the USA, and an even more sizeable and growing deficit on its trade with EU-24. One wonders why. There is also a big deficit on UK trade with the rest of the world. As a

the deficit was £12.3 billion. Within the overall deficit with Germany, the main culprit was trade-in-goods, in which the UK deficit was £13.4 billion. This was offset, a bit, by a small surplus in trade-in-services. “Income” was roughly in balance. In 2004, for every £100 of goods the UK sold to Germany, she imported £161 of goods from Germany.

The other big component of the 2004 UK deficit with EU-24 was, as usual, our net contribution to “EU Institutions”, of £5.0 billion. UK gross payments to EU Institutions hit a new record of £13.1 billion, equivalent to a mere quarter of a billion pounds a week of UK taxpayers’ money handed over to Brussels.

UK Trade* Balance (£bn)	2002	2003	2004
Surplus with US	11.8	13.4	17.1
Deficit with EU	(9.8)	(20.9)	(22.1)
Deficit with Rest of World	(18.5)	(9.3)	(18.0)
Deficit with whole World	(16.5)	(16.8)	(23.0)

* “Trade” defined as Goods, Services, Income and Transfers

result, our deficit on trade with the whole world is also sizeable and growing. Another triumph for the economic management of Gordon Brown.

In 2004, within our £22.1 billion deficit with EU-24, over half was accounted for by Germany, with which

**United Kingdom Balance of Payments: The Pink Book 2005, Office for National Statistics, www.statistics.gov.uk ISBN 1-4039-9235-5*

Post-Soviet Customs Union in trouble

As the Soviet Union, an artificial federation, collapsed in 1991, Russia cobbled together a customs union, the “Commonwealth of Independent States” (“CEE”) to try to preserve its sphere of influence in the former Soviet peripheral states.

This is now pretty much an empty shell. Turkmenistan has semi-disengaged itself, becoming an “associate member”. The new apparently pro-western governments of Georgia and Ukraine have announced their intention of applying

to join that other customs union, the EU – knowing very well that a country can’t belong to two customs unions at the same time. Ukraine, for its part, has said that it has no intention of signing up to the supranational body which supervises the CEE. Russia itself, disillusioned with its creation, is now trying to assemble a free trade area called the “united economic space” with Belarus and Kazakhstan.

All a bit of a fiasco, but that’s the way it usually is when you surrender your trade policy to a multi-country customs

union – like, for example, the EU customs union, now in the midst of a super-fiasco of its own making over the quotas on Chinese exports of bras and pullovers.

How pleased the Swiss, Norwegians and Icelanders must be that they’ve shunned customs unions and stuck to their user-friendly free trade agreement, EFTA, whose average GDP per capita is 81 per cent higher than that of the EU-25 customs union.

Correction

In our breakdown of the 2005 election results in the 29th July 2005 issue of *eurofacts*, the number of votes

achieved by the Liberal Democrats in 2001 was wrongly stated as 5.8 million. The correct figure is 4.8

million.

Our apologies to readers for this error.

Canadians sore at US over NAFTA

Canada, with a population of 32 million (fewer than California's) trades with the USA (population 294 million) via NAFTA. Strains are beginning to appear in this unequal relationship.

Canadians are presently seething with the Americans over what is seen as a US refusal to abide by the NAFTA rules.

NAFTA is the North American Free Trade Agreement, a three-country arrangement involving Canada, the USA and Mexico. In such FTAs (free trade agreements) participating countries specify the goods and services they wish to trade between each other tariff- and quota-free, retaining their freedom to apply whatever trade policies they choose to trade with countries outside the FTA. Thus, in NAFTA, one of its members, Mexico, has an FTA with the EU while Canada and the USA do not.

FTAs are unlike customs unions (such as the EU's) in which the entirety of a member-country's trade policy is decided by the customs union, not by the member-country, which has to apply the common tariff (and other measures) decided by the union on imports into the union from outside. Thus it is that the UK, the third-biggest trading nation and fourth-biggest

economy in the world, is quite unable to choose its own trade policies, but is obliged by EU law, like it or not, to apply whatever the EU – by qualified majority vote – decides. (Thus it was – is – that the UK finds itself held hostage by southern European EU countries in the current fiasco over imports of clothing from China – but that's another story.)

Bone of Contention

Canada and the US signed a bilateral FTA in the mid-1980s. This was subsumed into NAFTA in 1993. The current bone of contention concerns US imports of Canadian softwood lumber. Washington asserts that low "stumpage" fees charged to Canadian companies cutting timber from Crown (i.e. Canadian government) land constitutes a government subsidy, and applies a compensating import duty on such timber. Canada invoked the NAFTA dispute settlement mechanism, which has delivered several rulings in its favour, the most recent on 10th August 2005. The Americans have refused to comply, arguing that a recent ruling of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) has complicated Canada's position and that more negotiations (with Canada) are

needed. The Americans have also refused to return \$5 billion collected from Canadian lumber companies, despite being ordered to do so by the relevant NAFTA dispute settlement committee.

Opposition Wades In

On 7th September 2005 Stephen Harper, leader of the Conservative opposition in Canada, said that a Conservative government would "revisit" NAFTA and explore expanded trade with China and India if the US is unwilling to toughen the NAFTA rules and stick by them. He argued that the dispute is not just about softwood timber, but about "where we're headed on NAFTA..... it's about the future of our entire trading relationship". The Canadian government dismissed Harper's suggestion, pointing out that the US-Canada trading relationship is the biggest in the world; that over 95 per cent of that trade is uncontentious; that Canadian exports to the US have tripled since NAFTA began; and that Canada has a surplus on its trade-in-goods with the US of CAN\$139 billion.

What Bush should do

It may not come to Canadian withdrawal from NAFTA of course. Tongue-in-cheek, Canada's *Globe and Mail* (on 17th September), referring to George Bush's announcement of huge

federal spending on rebuilding New Orleans, notes that lots of cheap lumber will be needed. Bush, says the paper, should rescind the tariffs on imports of Canadian lumber, thus at a

stroke reducing the cost of rebuilding New Orleans, resolving the trade dispute, saving NAFTA, and lowering the level of whining from north of the border.

Turkish accession: Ankara jumps the gun?

An article in *La Lettre Gaulliste* points out the quite remarkable similarity between Turkey's new (since 1st January 2005) one lire coin and the two euro coin. Same dimensions, same appearance, (a nickel outer ring round

a copper disc), same (almost) font for the numbers on one side, similar heads (Ataturk's for the Turkish coin, various heads of state on the euro coin) on the reverse side.

One Turkish lire is worth a lot less

than two euros, so – if the report in the French publication is accurate – the one lire coin could be used in millions of slot machines throughout the eurozone to get goods and services at less than half price.

Should Canada withdraw from NAFTA?

The case for Canada to leave NAFTA and rely on the treaty-based rules of the World Trade Organisation for its trade with the USA

An article entitled "Let's get out of NAFTA" in the September issue of the Canadian monthly *Common Ground* argues that the solution to the problem is simple. "Lost in the cacophony of bluster [about the lumber dispute] is the fact that Canada is already part of a coherent rules-based trade agreement with the US. It is called the WTO, formerly the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and it has the mechanisms already in place to enable Canada to emerge a clear winner from the current situation.

"Founded in the late 1940s, the GATT/WTO was for almost 40 years the primary trade contract between Canada and the US. In all of that time, the US was never able to levy a countervailing or anti-dumping duty on our exports of lumber. During those four decades, Canada traded profitably, our standard of living rose, we won almost all our trade disputes with the US – and Washington abided by the rulings. By the mid-1980s, 90 per cent of Canadian lumber entered the US tariff-free and duties on the remaining 10 per cent were negligible.

WTO better for Canada than NAFTA

"It was only when Canada decided to turn away from the multilateral framework of trade rules with the US and enter into a bilateral one-on-one FTA in the mid-1980s that US industry saw its opportunity and used it. It has been using it ever since.

"Under the FTA and NAFTA, it is US law which now applies in countervailing, anti-dumping and related disputes with the US. The dispute panels are limited to deciding if the US has applied its own law correctly. Furthermore, the US can at any time amend its trade laws without Canada's agreement, and on lumber alone it has done so three times to Canada's great disadvantage. In other

words, the FTA and NAFTA, instead of giving us more secure US market access, unleashed the full force of US protectionism to be used against Canada in a way that was not possible under GATT/WTO.

"As for the dispute settlement mechanism, touted repeatedly as the crown jewel of the FTA, all agreements end when the negotiated means of resolution are discarded by either player.

"The answer is not to shake our fists or shout meaningless threats against the US. The answer is to simply return to the safer, more effective, already existing multilateral WTO framework. Under the WTO we have all the levers to get back the \$5 billion the US has taken in lumber tariffs and to make sure it doesn't happen again.

"When the USA not long ago threatened hefty steel duties against Europe, Japan and a number of other steel exporters, Europe triggered the WTO retaliatory process and the Bush administration backed down. The same defences are available to Canada under the WTO.

Wheat and lumber threatened by NAFTA

"Since signing the FTA and NAFTA, the US has taken 10 trade actions against the Canadian Wheat Board, Canada's largest net earner of foreign currency, and we now have US tariffs against our wheat exports. In all the years of trading with the US under GATT the Americans never launched a single formal action against the Wheat Board because they knew they could not win.

"The essence of the FTA and NAFTA is that they cede vital government powers to the US and the private sector that were used to build an independent Canada. What the US wants out of the repeated challenges against Canadian lumber exports is to wear Canada down until it agrees to privatise its

crown-owned forests, opening them up to direct US ownership. In grain, the US wants an end to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mechanics of Withdrawal

"There is a simple way out, without bluster or insults. Canada does not have to give up ownership of its forests, its industries and its institutions. With a simple letter to the US, under FTA Article 2106, NAFTA Article 2205, Canada can, with six months' notice, withdraw from these agreements without penalty and without conditions. Our trading relations with the US will then automatically revert back to the GATT/WTO framework of international law, which will enable us to both maintain our institutions and trade profitably with the US.

"All of the intolerable NAFTA rights US companies now have over Canada – to sue the Canadian government, to overturn Canadian laws, to control our exports and energy prices – would disappear. Chasing the dreams of a 'special relationship' and some kind of shortcut to 'secure access' to the US market is a dangerous delusion which has cost Canada dearly."

One of the authors, Mel Clark, was deputy chief negotiator for Canada at the Tokyo Round of GATT and chief negotiator for the International Grains Agreement. Retired and living in Ottawa, he is currently writing a book on NAFTA's impact on Canada. His co-author, David Orchard, is the author of The Fight for Canada - Four Centuries of Resistance to American Expansionism. He ran for the leadership of the federal Progressive Conservative Party in 1998 and 2003 and farms at Borden SK.

LETTERS

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

Off the Rails

Dear Sir,

A friend who works for Arriva Trains Northern tells me that British train operating companies now change from summer to winter timetables on the second weekend in December, rather than in September as they used to do, because Brussels says that they must.

A small matter perhaps but it shows how the bureaucrats of the EU interfere with virtually every part of our lives.

RICHARD CLEMENTS

Essex

What Justice?

Dear Sir,

What a surprise, the European Court of Justice throws out the challenge against state-funded European-wide political parties.

If as MEPs of various countries, the court decided they had no proper status, perhaps its time the whole of the EU Parliament packed its bags and went home?

A pity such an event won't happen. At least then, as the EU machinery ground on, no one would be left with any doubts as to its democratic deficit, if one were needed!

JOSE O'WARE

Middlesex

Eurobarometer

Dear Sir,

Eurobarometer No.62 published in May this year provides interesting statistics and should be read and carefully considered by those calling for signatories to a petition calling for a Referendum in the UK on the European Union. The question likely to be offered would be "Do you want the United Kingdom to remain a member of the European Union?" A simple YES or NO response required.

Fieldwork interviews of 1310 people in the UK carried out in October/November last year, showed

that 38 per cent thought that our membership of the EU had been a good thing and 33 per cent thought membership to be neither good nor bad. Only 22 per cent thought our membership is a bad thing. Of further significance, is the 6 per cent who are in the "I don't know" category. Pre-supposing that the call for a referendum is acceded to by our Government, then the propaganda will begin with ferocity, and fear will be instilled into the "I don't know", and some of those in the "neither good nor bad" category.

A mere 13 per cent is all that would be required to swing the vote not to leave the EU and Mr Blair would 'wrongly' see this as a mandate for further integration. To those encouraged by the *yougov* poll showing 50 per cent in favour of leaving the EU, I would advise caution. Looking at the *yougov* figures in relation to the Eurobarometer figures, you could be playing into the hands of Europhiles which is precisely the intended objective of "a call for a referendum". If you believe in the conspiracy theory where EU issues are concerned, spook, may be at work on the honest Eurorealists. How we should proceed to our release from the chains that bind us must be the subject for further consideration.

HARRY M. RANDALL

Dorset

Metric Games

Dear Sir,

In the *eurofacts*' article, headed, "UK Under Pressure to go Fully Metric", in the 23rd September issue, it was stated that a spokesman for the United Kingdom Metric Association, (UKMA), denied that it was "strongly lobbying the European Commission to ensure that the Government stands by a 25-year-old commitment to go fully metric, preferring, he said, to rely on persuasion. On 31st August 2005 a UKMA press release stated, "The UKMA has had no contact with the European Commission in the last 12 months. The EC has no power to

require the UK to name an early date for phasing out pints of beer, or miles on road signs, and UKMA has therefore not lobbied the Commission on this point.

The UKMA's assertions are false, the UKMA has been lobbying the EC. The truth of the matter is revealed on the Department for Transport's website. The document is a DfT letter responding to an enquiry into the British government policy on setting an end-date for the mile. The DfT's letter is dated 17th June 2005 and is in reply to a letter from Robin Paice, Chairman of UKMA. The document has 19 responses to Mr Paice's plea for action to make the UK fully metric, but the answer to question number 11 relating to the EU's metrication Directive, 80/181/EEC is revealing. This is reported below.

"As the complaint by the UKMA Director to the European Commission relates to the implementation of EU legislation, and could lead to formal legal proceedings, it would not be in the public interest to disclose the legal advice we have received on the merits of the complaint. I am therefore refusing your request, under section 42 of the Act relating to legal professional privilege and the provision of legal advice." The document is signed off "050617PAICEUKMA3.DOC". The first six digits refer to the date of the letter and PAICE would appear to be UKMA's Chairman, Robin Paice. UKMA3 implies that it is the third letter that the DfT has written to UKMA."

So there you have it. The denial by UKMA that it has not lobbied the EU is seen to be the usual package of lies and deception that one has come to expect from Europhile metric fanatics.

If you would like to see all the evidence, go to the British Weights and Measures Association website, <<http://www.bwmaonline/>> and look for; *UK Metric Association falsehood exposed*.

DEREK NORMAN

Committee Member, British Weights and Measures Association.

MEETINGS

No2ID

(Kensington and Chelsea Branch)
0207 373 4431

Monday **10th October 2005**, 7.00 pm

“ID Cards - how will they affect you?”

Speakers include:

Gerard Batten MEP, UKIP
Jonathan Fryer

PUBLIC MEETING

St Mary Abbot's Church Hall, Vicarage
Gate, London W8

Admission Free

The Freedom Association

(City of London Branch)
0207 488 4533

Tuesday **11th October 2005**, 12.30 pm

Ruth Lea, Economist and author

PUBLIC MEETING

The Counting House pub, 50 Cornhill,
London EC3V 3PD

Admission Free

Tough Talking From The Right

0208 691 7495

Saturday **15th October 2005**, 1.00 pm

“EU fraud and corruption”

Ashley Mote MEP, Author

MEETING & BUFFET

The Parliament Room, The Clarence, 53
Whitehall, London SW1

Admission £15.00

(Tickets from Allan Robertson TTFTR,
PO Box 29208, London SE8 3ZU)

No2ID

0121 442 4514

Saturday **15th Oct. 2005**, 2.30 pm

Speakers include:

Ron Dorman, Campaign Against Euro-Federalism
Christopher Gill, Freedom Association Chairman
Richard Shepherd MP
Chairman, **Michael Clark**

PUBLIC MEETING

Old Royal Public House, Church,
B'ham (close to Snow Hill Station)

Admission Free

United Kingdom Independence Party

01503 230055

Saturday **22nd October 2005**

7.00 for 7.30 pm

“EU fraud and corruption”

Roger Knapman, Leader, UKIP
Malcolm Wood, SW Organiser, UKIP

MEETING & BUFFET

The Snooty Fox, Morval, Looe,
Cornwall

Admission Free

(Tickets for Buffet £7 from UKIP, 5
Battery Park, Polruan-by-Fowey,
Cornwall PL23 1PT)

London Swinton Circle

0208 691 7495

Tuesday **25th October 2005**, 7.00 pm

“EU, Identity cards, a discussion on the
racial and religious hatred bill and
reform of the House of Lords”

Lord Stoddart of Swindon

PUBLIC MEETING

The House of Lords, Westminster,
London SW1

Democracy Movement

(Louth Branch)
01507-601699

Friday **28th October 2005**, 7.30 pm

“Vision Europe”

The Alternative to the EU
Marc Glendening, Campaign Director, Democracy Movement
Ashley Mote MEP, Journalist and author
Cllr. Steve Radford, President of the Liberal Party

PUBLIC MEETING

Conoco Room, (Above Louth Library),
Northgate, Louth, Lincolnshire

Admission Free

UK Independence Party

(Salisbury Branch)
01507-601699

Monday **7th November 2005**, 7.30 pm

“Let the People Decide”

Christopher Gill, Freedom Association
Nigel Farage MEP, UKIP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Guildhall, Market Square, Salisbury

Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Wednesday **12th October** 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on *Reform of the Sugar Regime* from the Lord Bach, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

Thursday **13th October 2005**, 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on *Pandemic Influenza* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **18th October 2005**, 10.35 am

Evidence will be heard on *A European Strategy for Jobs and Growth - The Lisbon Agenda* from Mr Ivan Lewis MP, Economic Secretary to the Treasury.

Wednesday **19th October** 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on *Reform of the Sugar Regime* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **19th October** 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *A European Small Claims Procedure* from witnesses to be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005

UK Parliamentary Recess Ends **10th October**

ECOFIN meeting **11th October**

GAERC meeting **14-15th October**

ECOFIN meeting **8th November**

**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 Area.

The Great Abdication

by Alexander Deane. **£8.95**

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

Britain and the EU: Time to Move On

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

The EU malaise and the cure.

The ECB and the Euro:

The First Five Years

by Otmar Issing. **£10.00**

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 book by a member of the European Convention on the Future of Europe and former MEP describes the nature and purpose of the European Convention.

Should Britain Leave The EU?

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

An economic analysis of the relationship.

Alarming Drum

Britain's European Dilemma

by Peter Morgan. *Hdbk* **£19.95**

An analysis of Britain's relationship with the EU, Director-General of the IoD (1989-1994) proposes alternatives to current failing EU.

Plan B For Europe - Lost Opportunities in the EU Constitution

Edited by Lee Rotherham **£7.00**

A collection of key Eurocritical papers and speeches, which mark the path to an alternative Treaty for Europe.

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**

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. Free Educational CD (charge is for handling).

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"

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

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



9 771 361 413006