

## A pernicious bill that by-passes democracy

*The little-known Legislative and Regulatory Bill will enable ministers to enact or repeal laws without consulting Parliament*

Even when judged by the normal standards of parliamentary draftsmanship the 22 pages of the Legislative and Regulatory Bill make turgid reading and the eight pages of explanatory notes are almost as impenetrable. Yet the Bill, now heading for its third reading is surely one of the most extraordinary to have been proposed by the present Government. It is one which, following the Bill to introduce ID Cards (see page 3) is likely to confirm the impression that this administration is the most illiberal British government of recent times.

The aim of the legislation, which has attracted curiously little publicity, is to enhance the ability of Ministers to by-pass Parliament when seeking to enact new legislation or to repeal or amend existing law.

Ministers already possess significant powers in this regard. Particularly helpful to them are the powers granted by the Regulatory Reform Act 2001. In the view of ministers, and, it seems, the Better Regulation Task Force, this Act contains far too many safeguards. Following a government review these are now to be swept away. The notes accompanying the new Bill state: "*The review concluded that the 2001 Act presented a number of hurdles which inhibited the production of RROs, [Regulatory Reform Orders]; in particular that the powers of the 2001 Acts were too technical and limited, that the scope of RROs should be extended to deliver non-controversial proposals for simplification and that*

*the whole process for delivering an RRO and subsequent scrutiny should be made more proportionate*".

Accordingly, under clause two of the new Bill "**orders can amend, appeal or replace any legislation**" (our emphasis).

In effect, the Government has decided the way to get 'better laws' is to ensure that Parliament has no part in making a significant number of them. Since at least as many as 50 per cent and perhaps as much as 80 per cent of UK legislation originates in Brussels it is a safe assumption that many EU laws will be transposed into British law in this way, and the public will not even know that this is going on. This suspicion is strengthened by provisions in the Bill allowing for the incorporation of EU law into British law in this way.

### Few Safeguards

There are very few safeguards in the Bill. True, orders cannot be used to bring in new taxes. It is also true that the new powers are supposed to apply to non-controversial issues and that an order can impose a burden "only proportionate to the benefit to be gained". But, the latter requirement is vague to the point of meaninglessness and it will be for ministers to decide what is likely to be controversial and what is or is not "proportionate". Experience suggests that they are not very good in deciding either.

Among the few expressing concerns about the Bill have been the members

of the House of Lords Constitution Committee which has described it as being of "first-class constitutional significance" and expressed the fear that it will "markedly alter the respective and long standing roles of ministers and Parliament in the legislative process".

John Spencer, a Cambridge law professor says that the Bill would enable the government to create without debate new offences punishable for up to two years.

Daniel Finklestein, Associate Editor of *The Times*, and about the only journalist to recognise the Bill's significance has described it as "*the Bill to end all Bills*".

The Legislative and Regulatory Bill is indeed a pernicious piece of legislation, something which the constant use of management-speak in the language of the Bill - 'better regulation', 'risk-based enforcement' etc does not conceal. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that one purpose of the legislation is to enable ministers to avoid controversy over unpopular legislation originating in Brussels - and what other kind of EU legislation is there?

"Gold-plating" is bad enough; "gold-plating" which takes place without even the possibility of parliamentary scrutiny in circumstances in which the public may be wholly unaware of what is proposed is still more serious. Such a step would represent a significant further erosion British sovereignty and parliamentary democracy.

# Why's no one copying the EU model?

*"Outside the EU, with the ...exception of three Latin-American arrangements (CAN, CACM and CARICOM\*) institution-building has NOT led to the development of supranational bodies and laws" - European Central Bank, Bulletin, October 2004, page 80.*

The architects of the EU model have not only repeatedly claimed its superiority over the nation-state but have suggested that this extraordinary experiment in statecraft would be widely copied. Like Soviet Communism before it the trans-national European State was the Future. Well, how many political copy-cats are there?

The answer seems to be none. The last thing large and small self-governing nations in the developed world are doing is moving towards EU-type structures. The mighty USA is proud to be a self-governing nation-

state. So is Japan. So is Australia. So is South Korea. So is Singapore. And so on.

In the developing world a few customs unions do exist, but more on paper than in practice. Mercosur, comprising Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, is often cited as an EU-emulator, but its "customs union" doesn't even have a common external tariff, one of the basic defining features of a customs union. Elsewhere in the developing world examples do exist, sort-of, of customs unions: in the Gulf principalities, Latin America, the former Soviet Union and sub-Saharan Africa, but they're pretty feeble and none, as the ECB helpfully points out in the quote above, with the exceptions mentioned, has supranational institutions and laws. In Asia, the last thing China and India (and also Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam and others) intend to do is to set up or join

an EU-type structure. The Central Asian states talk about the need for economic integration, but do little about it.

As for CAN, CACM and CARICOM, with all due respect to the individual member-countries, it would be rather difficult to argue that any is a significant player geo-politically or otherwise.

The reason that there are no political copy-cats might just be that having glimpsed "the Future" the world has decided that it doesn't work.

*\*CAN comprises Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela - but doesn't even have a common external tariff. CACM comprises Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. CARICOM comprises sixteen Caribbean territories including Jamaica, Haiti, Surinam and Guyana.*

## If you're bored by the European Parliament just think how those poor MEPs must feel!

Members of the European Parliament are so bored with its proceedings it seems that they will do almost anything or go anywhere in order to avoid attending debates. According to a recent edition of the Brussels weekly publication *European Voice* European Parliament President Josep Borrell, is "really embarrassed" by the MEPs' attendance record and blames parliamentary sessions that are "out of step with events". He is consequently trying to find ways of improving matters.

There are 732 Members of the European Parliament but when the EU Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso presented his 2006 work programme to the EP - one of the major events in the parliamentary calendar - earlier this year MEPs were outnumbered by Commissioners and officials. This dismal turn-out led to an official complaint to Mr Borrell from the EU Commission President.

A discussion paper prepared by Mr

Borrell and others says that part of the problem is that plenary sessions do not correspond to events in Europe and that agendas can be "documents for the technocratically initiated". The title of debates can be "opaque" and their structure "not conducive to interest, liveliness or attendance". (*If speakers employ the same kind of vocabulary as Mr Borrell that too could be a factor-Ed*).

Mr Borrell's paper also questions the value of the activities in which MEPs engage when he believes they should be in the EP chamber. These include observer missions to far-away elections and attendance at international events - all of course at the taxpayers' expense. The growth of these activities carries the "risk of transmitting an unfocussed, incoherent and cacophonous message to the outside world", it says.

Mr Barroso may have described one symptom of the EU malaise, but he plainly hasn't got to the roots of the

disorder. So what is the reason for low turn-outs and the boring debates? Well, it just might have something to do with the lack of a European *demos*, the little problem of language, and the fact that the European Parliament remains largely a talking shop. European democracy is the political equivalent of a Potemkin village, a sterile, artificial construct that is incapable of generating real excitement. Mr Borrell who wants to boost attendance by staging more debates on 'big issues' is powerless to change such fundamental design defects. Making the payment of the attendance allowance conditional on actual attendance might reduce the number of MEPs wishing to observe elections in the icy wastes of Central Asia instead of listening to their parliamentary colleagues. But finding a formula that will guarantee interesting EP debates is a challenge that is likely to defy the world's best political brains.

# ID cards will provide total surveillance over every British citizen

*euofacts believes that the article below provides the clearest and most comprehensive account to date of how the Government's ID scheme will impact on the lives of citizens*

You may have heard that legislation creating compulsory ID Cards passed a crucial stage in the House of Commons. You may feel that ID cards are not something to worry about, since we already have Photo IDs for our Passport and Driving Licence and an ID Card will be no different to that. What you have not been told is the full scope of this proposed ID Card, and what it will mean to you personally.

The proposed ID Card will be different from any card you now hold. It will be connected to a database called the NIR, (National Identity Register) where all of your personal details will be stored. This will include the unique number that will be issued to you, your fingerprints, a scan of the back of your eye, and your photograph. Your name, address and date of birth will also obviously be stored there. There will be spaces on this database for your religion, residence status, and many other private and personal facts about you. There is unlimited space for every other detail of your life on the NIR database, which can be expanded by the Government with or without further Acts of Parliament.

## Wrong Conclusion

By itself, you might think that this register is harmless, but you would be wrong to come to this conclusion. This new card will be used to check your identity against your entry in the register in real time, whenever you present it to 'prove who you are'.

Every place that sells alcohol or cigarettes, every post office, every pharmacy, and every bank will have an NIR Card Terminal, (very much like the Chip and Pin Readers that are everywhere now) into which your card can be 'swiped' to check your identity. Each time this happens, a record is

made at the NIR of the time and place that the Card was presented. This means for example, that there will be a government record of every time you withdraw more than £99 at your branch of Nat West, who now demand ID for these transactions. Every time you have to prove that you are over 18, your card will be swiped, and a record made at the NIR. Restaurants and off licenses will demand that your card is swiped so that each receipt shows that they sold alcohol to someone over 18, and that this was proved by access to the NIR, indemnifying them from prosecution.

Private businesses are going to be given access to the NIR Database. If you want to apply for a job, you will have to present your card for a swipe. If you want to apply for a London Underground Oyster Card, or a supermarket loyalty card, or a driving licence you will have to present your ID Card for a swipe. The same goes for getting a telephone line or a mobile phone or an internet account.

## Shopping Habits

Oyster, DVLA, BT and Nectar (for example) all run very detailed databases of their own. They will be allowed access to the NIR, just as every other business will be. This means that each of these entities will be able to store your unique number in their database, and place all your travel, phone records, driving activities and detailed shopping habits under your unique NIR number.

These databases, which can easily fit on a storage device the size of your hand, will be sold to third parties either legally or illegally. It will then be possible for a non-governmental entity to create a detailed dossier of all your activities. Certainly, the government

will have clandestine access to all of them, meaning that they will have a complete record of all your movements, from how much and when you withdraw from your bank account to what medications you are taking, down to the level of what sort of bread you eat - all accessible via a single unique number in a central database.

This is quite a significant leap from a simple ID Card that shows your name and face.

Most people do not know that this is the true character and scope of the proposed ID Card. Whenever the details of how it will work are explained to them, they quickly change from being ambivalent towards it.

## A Matter of Compulsion

The Government is going to compel you to enter your details into the NIR and to carry this card. If you and your children want to obtain or renew your passports, you will be forced to have your fingerprints taken and your eyes scanned for the NIR, and an ID Card will be issued to you whether you want one or not. If you refuse to be fingerprinted and eye scanned, you will not be able to get a passport. Your ID Card will, just like your passport, not be your property. The Home Secretary will have the right to revoke or suspend your ID at any time, meaning that you will not be able to withdraw money from your bank account, for example, or do anything that requires you to present your government-issued ID Card.

The arguments that have been put forward in favour of ID Cards can be easily disproved. ID Cards will not stop terrorists; every Spaniard has a compulsory ID Card as did the Madrid Bombers. ID Cards will not 'eliminate

**Continued on P.4**

# Remarkable Stability of Pound/Euro Exchange Rate

The average exchange rates between the pound, dollar and euro during the seven-year lifetime of the euro are shown in the table.

During the last three years 2003, 2004 and 2005 the pound/euro rate has been remarkably - but “accidentally” - stable. The volumes traded each day worldwide in the global pound/euro foreign-exchange markets are much smaller than the volumes traded in the

dollar/pound and the dollar/euro markets. The stability in the pound/euro rate is a “residual” of the dollar/pound and dollar/euro rates, since at any instant in time, cross-rates must balance. (Thus, barring rounding errors, multiplying the figures in the bottom “buys \$” row of the table by the figures in the middle “£ buys ” row gives the figures in the top “£ buys \$” row.)

The reason why cross-rates balance is

that the three currencies concerned (and many more) float freely, without any intervention from central banks or governments (except at the very margin, for technical reasons). The normal activity of the global markets works to eliminate any persistent or significant tendency of cross-rates to diverge from “neutral”. The stability in the pound/euro rate reflects the stability of the two other currency pairs, especially in 2004 and 2005.

Pound, Dollar & Euro Exchange Rates							
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
£ buys \$	1.62	1.52	1.44	1.50	1.63	1.83	1.82
£ buys	1.52	1.64	1.61	1.59	1.45	1.47	1.46
buys \$	1.07	0.92	0.90	0.95	1.13	1.24	1.24

Source: ECB Monthly Bulletins, January 2003, 2004, 2005 & 2006

## A burning issue that could cost you £5,000

Thanks to The EU Directive on Waste, next time you burn a plastic wrapper or carrier bag you could find yourself fined up to £5,000 as the following exchange in the House of Lords on the 2nd March made clear.

**Lord Vinson asked Her Majesty's Government:** Further to the Written Answer by the Lord Bach on the 10th February (WA 128), whether it will be an offence under proposed regulations for a householder to burn any plastic waste on an open fire; and if so, what the maximum punishment will be for this offence [HL 4091]

**The Parliamentary Secretary, Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (The Lord Bach):** The Waste Management Licensing (England and Wales ) Regulations 2006 (‘the Regulations’) will amend section 33 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 so that, in particular, it will be an offence for any person (including a householder) to dispose of household waste from a domestic property within the curtilage of that property in a manner likely to cause pollution of the environment or harm to human health. After the

coming into force of the Regulations, if a householder were to burn plastic waste on an open fire within the curtilage of their dwelling they may (depending on the circumstances) be committing a criminal offence. The maximum penalty would be, on summary conviction, a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (currently £5000), or on conviction on indictment, a fine.

Parliamentary copyright ©, Hansard 2006.

Continued from P.3

## ID Card scheme will provide ‘total surveillance’

benefit fraud’, which in any case is small compared to the astronomical cost of this proposal, which will be measured in billions according to the LSE. This scheme exists solely to exert total surveillance and control over the ordinary free British Citizen, and it will line the pockets of the companies

that will create the computer systems at the expense of your freedom, privacy and money.

If you were not previously aware of the full scope of the proposed ID Card Scheme and you are as unsettled as I am at what it really means to you, to this country and its way of life, I urge

you to photocopy this article and give it to your friends and colleagues. The Bill has proceeded to this stage due to the lack of accurate and complete information on this proposal being made public. If everyone who reads this passes it on we can inform the nation.

# Paroles de Belette\*

## *A europhile "A Team" sings the same old songs*

The motion at the Royal Geographical Society in London on the 1st March was "The European Union is now dying before our eyes: long live Europe". Speaking against it was a positively stellar trio of europhiles, an "A" team if ever there was one: former President of France, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, Ken Clarke MP and Robert Cooper, now Director-General for External and Politico-Military Affairs at the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, which apparently means that he advises the EU's would-be Foreign Secretary, Javier Solana. Mr Cooper, who is British, spent 22 years in the Foreign Office and is well-known for being a favourite theoretician (on foreign affairs) of Tony Blair's.

Giscard's supercilious arrogance, even in French and in front of French audiences, is legendary. Here, in English, he rapidly provoked incredulity in the 750-strong mainly British paying audience, by no means initially ill-disposed to him. The French electorate, he said, "had made a mistake in voting No and would be made to vote again". They hadn't voted No last time - in fact they'd "really" voted for "Europe".

He also claimed that that the Constitution "for the first time brought clarity to the question of the division of competences between the member states and Brussels". No doubt he was thinking of the so-called "shared competence" clauses, through which member states can carry on legislating until Brussels decides - unilaterally - that it, Brussels, will legislate in their place. To cap it all, he asserted that the Constitution was "more democratic" than present arrangements because it "returns powers to national parliaments". Ho ho ho.

For his part, Cooper repeatedly asserted that the EU "means peace" and nation-states "mean war". He started off with an account of a bicycle ride he'd made from Brussels through

Waterloo, Mons, Malplaquet (site of one of Marlborough's battles), Ypres, Passchendale, Dunkirk, even - for Pete's sake! - Agincourt. That, he intoned, is what you get with self-governing nation-states, unlike what you get with the EU. He went on, outrageously, to imply that the EU had brought democracy to Spain, Portugal, Greece and all of eastern Europe. Mr Kremer (one of the team arguing in favour of the motion) gently pointed out that democracy had come to those countries years before they joined the EU, and that if anything had liberated eastern Europe from Communist rule it was Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher. Cooper also implied that without the EU all those former east European states would have collapsed into "chaos" (in fact their first priority was joining NATO, not the EU, and there was no reason for expecting they would descend into chaos anyway). He also credited the EU with "stabilising" former Yugoslavia, forgetting that it was the EU's actions (remember the Luxembourg minister Jacques Poos' "the hour of Europe has come"?) which helped to precipitate the breakdown of order in the first place.

### **Comical Assertion**

Cooper also claimed that the EU was "the most open and transparent system of government in the entire world" - provoking another wave of mirth and incredulity from the audience.

Mr Clarke gave his usual rumbustious performance. EU fraud? No worse than fraud in the Department of Work and Pensions. So that's all right then. British eurosceptics? All mad, completely barmy. The idea that the Constitution creates a single European state? Nonsense: it's just a treaty like dozens of others. (Echos there of Jack Straw's comical assertion that "golf clubs have constitutions so it's OK for Europe to have one".) Did Heath and Co lie through their teeth to the British people when they took Britain in?

Balderdash - everything was spelt out and debated in the Commons - "I was there!" said Clarke. (Never mind the White Paper and the "no essential loss of sovereignty" claim.) Loss of sovereignty? Of course, said Clarke, it's pooled and anyway it just doesn't matter!

Summing up, Giscard inadvertently contradicted Clarke by confirming that a single European state and power was indeed the objective. "The USA and China and India are all Continental powers, therefore we 'need' a European Continental power to 'stand up to them'". Did somebody mention Orwell?

The team proposing the motion consisted of Thomas Kremer, inventor, businessman, author of "The Missing Heart of Europe"; Anatole Kaletsky of *The Times* and Larry Siedentop, an Oxford academic, author of "Democracy in Europe". As Kaletsky pointed out, all of them were born outside the UK (respectively in Romania, Russia and the USA) and their families "hadn't exactly arrived with the Normans". This reporter has never asked them, but doubts whether any of the three would feel comfortable with being described as "eurosceptics". Their observations of the sad current state of the EU were all the more telling.

Before the debate began, 38 per cent of the audience were for the motion, 20 per cent against, with 42 per cent don't know. After the debate, 49 per cent were for, 39 per cent against, with 12 per cent don't know. The debate was one of a series organised by [www.intelligencesquared.com](http://www.intelligencesquared.com). Forthcoming debates are on Iran and feminism.

\*English translation: "Weasel Words".

# LETTERS

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

## What Lord Tebbit Said-1

Dear Sir,

In his letter (*eurofacts* 24th February) Mr David Owen says that in my contribution to the Radio 4 "Who Runs Britain?" discussion I told listeners that I thought the country was run by Brussels.

In fact I said that "I do not say that those who say that are wrong and certainly if we continue to be led up the garden path by the Euro-fanatics there would soon be a day when they would be right".

"But" I added, "not yet. The British people have not spoken yet".

"When a leader arises who does speak for them, the Mr and Mrs Smiths, they will assert their right to decide how their country is governed. Speed the day".

LORD TEBBIT  
Westminster

## What Lord Tebbit Said-2

Dear Sir,

It is reassuring to know that Lord Tebbit is getting a good postbag and that his profile is growing as a formidable spokesman for those who are convinced we should leave the EU. David Owen (letter, *eurofacts* February 24th issue) and your readers may be interested to know that last November Lord Tebbit told an Oxford conference organised by Rodney Atkinson that he believed that the future of Conservatism and the Conservative Party "does not look good".

When asked why he did not offer the *Daily Telegraph* the reasons he gave to help the party decide its new leader, he replied that the paper had refused to publish an article he offered it.

Next day I wrote a letter to protest to Martin Newland, the Editor - on the

day he left the post.

I got a reply from John Bryant, the Editor in Chief, who denied any bias or imbalance or suppression of valid opinions by the newspaper, but said he had drawn my complaint to every head of department in editorial.

I sent copies to Lord Tebbit. In replying, he remarked that the "policy of destruction" [of Britain] was "a velvet version of Pol Pot or Mao" and it was being "pursued across the board, which is even more alarming".

DON BRIGGS  
Cheshire

## Political Arithmetic

Dear Sir,

In the review of Jeremy Black's new book, "The European Question and the National Interest" (*eurofacts* 24th February, page 3), it was said that the author pointed to the fact that, but for the intervention of UKIP and Veritas, the Conservative Party would have won an additional 27 seats at the last election and restricted the Labour majority to fourty nine.

A seat gained by one party is a seat lost by another. If all the presumed Conservative gains had been at the expense of Labour, the Labour majority would have been down to 22. UKIP and Veritas have a lot to answer for.

RICHARD CLEMENTS  
Essex

## No Need for Renegotiation

Dear Sir,

Even though you don't think that a reduction in our trade deficit with the EU is an objective of withdrawal, others may think it is.

On the 22nd September 2000 you reported on a recent USITC study

which said that "leaving the EU completely, with the Continentals having to export to the UK over a tariff wall equivalent to the present Common External Tariff, and vice-versa, cuts the UK deficit with the EU, stimulating UK domestic output....".

On the 17th March 200 you reported on an NIESR study which found that in the medium term, between five and fifteen years after withdrawal, there would actually be more jobs in the economy than if Britain stayed in. The authors reached this conclusion in spite of (or more probably because of) their assumption that tariffs would be reintroduced, and even though they did not allow for whatever burden the "social chapter" imposes on our economy.

On page 34 of his 2004 book, "Singing the Blues", John Redwood tells us that in 1975 he concluded that Britain economically would be better off outside the EEC partly because membership was bound to lead to very large balance of payments deficits with our European partners. The data you gave on the 27th January show he was right.

The point that the USITC in particular was making was that getting rid of the preferential trading relationships which EU membership entails would in itself benefit our economy by reducing the deficit.

Talking about "re-negotiating" seems to imply the opposite - that we should try to get another preferential relationship with the EU to replace our membership. We certainly don't need to pay for the "privilege" of leaving the EU. Nor do we need any "renegotiation" to say so.

JOHN KISSIN  
London

## A completely unsubstantiated rumour....

"I have heard here or there, notably in the foreign press of France being accused of being in some way protectionist. I would simply like to underline the completely absurd character of this statement."

President Chirac speaking in Paris on the 14th March 2006.

# MEETINGS

**UK Independence Party**  
01722 744814

Saturday **25th March 2006**  
Commencing 11.00 am

**Sir Richard Body**  
**Graham Booth MEP**  
**David Campbell-Bannerman**  
**Trevor Coleman**  
**Nigel Farage MEP**  
**Marc Glendening, Democracy Movement**  
**Lindsay Jenkins, Author**  
**Mungenova Jolans, Czech Republic**  
**Roger Knapman MEP**  
**Robert McCartney**

ALL DAY CONFERENCE  
Great Hall, Exeter University, Devon  
**Admission Free**

---

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **28th March 2006**, 6.00 pm

“The Civil Service and the Constitution”  
**Professor Vernon Bogdanor, CBE, FBA, Gresham Professor of Law**

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

---

**Marlborough Group**  
01672 515 275

Sunday **9th April 2006**, 2.00 pm

**Harry Beckhough**

PUBLIC MEETING  
The Bear, High Street, Marlborough,  
Wiltshire  
**Admission Free**

---

**Freedom Association**  
07979 695611

Tuesday **11th April 2006**, 12.30 pm

**Nigel Farage MEP**

PUBLIC MEETING  
The Function Suite of the The Counting  
House Pub, 50 Cornhill, near Bank,  
London EX3V 3PD  
**Admission Free**

**UK Independence Party**  
(South Manchester Branch)  
0161 485 3818

Tuesday **11th April**, 8.00 pm

“The Myth of Europe”  
**Lynn Riley**

PUBLIC MEETING  
The County Hotel, Dairyground Road,  
Bramhall, Cheshire  
**Admission Free**

---

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **25th April 2006**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and change: Prime  
Ministers in the post-war world -  
Thatcher”  
**Professor Keith Middlemas**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London  
**Admission Free**

---

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**  
020 8340 0314

Saturday **29th April 2006**, 2.30 pm

“Better Off Out”  
**Roger Helmer MEP, Conservative**  
**John Midgley, Co-founder of the**  
**Campaign Against Political Correctness**  
**Doug Nicholls, Secretary of Trade**  
**Unionists Against the European**  
**Constitution and General Secretary of**  
**Community and Youth Workers Union**  
Chairman, **Lord Stoddart of Swindon**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Upper Hall, The Emmanuel Centre, 9-  
23 Marsham Street, London SW1  
**Admission Free**

---

**Tough Talking From The Right**  
0208 691 7495

Friday **5th May**, 7.00 pm

“Defending our liberties and freedoms”  
**Roger Helmer MEP**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Upstairs Function Room, The Clarence,  
4 Dover Street, Mayfair, London  
**Admission £17.50 by ticket**  
(Includes glass of wine)

---

## SELECT COMMITTEES

---

**House of Lords**  
020 7219 3000

Tuesday **28th March 2006**, 11.15 am  
Evidence will be heard by The  
Science and Technology Committee from  
witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **28th March 2006**, 3.40 pm  
Evidence will be heard by The Science  
and Technology Committee from Mr  
Elliot Morley MP, Minister for Climate  
Change and Environment, Department for  
Environment Food and Rural Affairs; and  
Ms Yvette Cooper MP, Minister for  
Housing and Planning, Office of the  
Deputy Prime Minister.

Wednesday **29th March 2006**, 11.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on *The Nuclear  
Package* from the representatives of the  
Government of the Czech Republic.

Wednesday **29th March 2006**, 3.30 pm  
Evidence will be heard by The Science  
and Technology Committee from Mr  
Malcolm Wicks MP, Minister for Energy.

Thursday **30th March 2006**, 10.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on *EU Proposal on  
Consumer Credit Harmonisation* from  
Mr Gerry Sutcliffe MP, Minister for  
Employment Relations, Consumers and  
Postal Services, DTI.

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

---

## DIARY OF EVENTS

---

**2006**

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

UK Independence Party **7-8th October**  
Annual Conference  
Telford

**2007**

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

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

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

**A Throne in Brussels**

by Paul Belien. *Hdbk.* £25.00

Historical analysis which warns that the EU is heading the way of Belgium.

**The European Question and the National Interest**

by Jeremy Black. £16.99

A leading historian's interpretation of Britain's relations with EU/EC/EEC.

**The Great Deception:**

**Can the European Union survive**

by Christopher Booker. £9.99

This is the latest version (November 2005) of this comprehensive history of the European Union.

**Britain and the EU: Time to Move On**

by Christopher Hoskin. £3.95

The EU malaise and the cure.

**The Future is a Foreign Country**

by Matthew Illsley. £10.00

Full of useful detail and quotes on how and why we got into the EU mess. It leads to the conclusion that withdrawal from the EU is the only way forward.

**Disappearing Britain**

The EU and the death of Local Government

by Lindsay Jenkins. £14.99

The detailed Brussels agenda for the break-up of the United Kingdom.

**Resolving the European Crisis**

Perspectives on the future of the European Union

Edited by Paul Jervis. £9.99

Authors include; Daniel Hannan MEP, Ruth Lea, Lord Pearson, John Redwood MP and Gisela Stuart MP.

**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? A European businessman's view of the impact of divergent national cultures.

**The 2006 Essential Guide to the EU**

by Ruth Lea. £15.00

A detailed yet accessible analysis of how the EU works now and in the future.

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

by Neil MacCormick. £8.95

A member of the European Convention on the Future of Europe and former MEP describes its nature and purpose.

**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.

**The Wrong Side of the Hill**

The Secret Realignment of UK Defence Policy with the EU

by Richard North. £10.00

The author argues that Britain has embarked on a course that will divide it from its traditional American ally.

**The Benefits of Tax Competition**

by Richard Teather £12.50

Teather argues that EU attempts to harmonise taxes will damage the world economy.

**EU: Papacy Reincarnated?**

by Mark Stout £9.99

This book explores the origins and functioning of both the EU and the Medieval Papacy from a legal/political/historical perspective and unearths a startling number of parallels.

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

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

## euofacts

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 *euofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....  
to *euofacts*: 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>CIB</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

<b>Congress for Democracy</b>	<b>01372 453678</b>
-------------------------------	---------------------

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

<b>Bruges Group</b>	<b>020 7287 4414</b>
Global Britain	
Email: <a href="mailto:globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org">globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org</a>	
<b>Open Europe</b>	<b>0207 197 2333</b>

## POLITICAL PARTIES

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>020 7222 9000</b>
David Cameron MP	
<b>Democratic Party</b>	<b>01684 891700</b>
Mr Geoff Southall	
<b>Labour</b>	<b>08705 900 200</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 Sir Menzies Campbell 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	

ISSN 1361-4134

