

The Charter of Fundamental Rights is being imposed illegally

The Charter was an integral part of the draft Constitution rejected by French and Dutch voters last year, but it's being imposed anyway - in flagrant contradiction of EU law

The refusal of EU political leaders to accept the results of referendums is well known. The Danes voted against the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and were promptly told by the then French President, François Mitterrand, and the British Foreign Secretary, Douglas Hurd, to vote again - which they did. The Irish voted against the Nice Treaty in 2001 and were told to vote again. They did. In 2005, the French and Dutch voted against the draft EU Constitution, and were told, by former French President, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing amongst others, that they'd better vote again, and they'd better vote yes the next time.

Storm of Controversy

Imagine the storm of controversy in the UK if a losing Prime Minister refused to accept the result of a general election and said that the British people had "really" meant to vote for him and would have to vote again until they got it "right". Imagine the row in France if the losing candidate refused to accept the result of a presidential election. Yet, when it comes to "Europe", no-one seems particularly bothered, no doubt because the one-eyed media take the eurocrats' contemptuous disdain for the democratically-expressed will of the electorates as par for the EU course.

So it wasn't surprising that, following the French and Dutch votes against the

Constitution last year, the EU "elite" decided they'd go ahead with the main bits of it anyway, without bothering what the French and Dutch electorates, or anyone else, said or thought about it.

Democracy is about far more than votes in referendums or general elections. Democracy also means - or should mean, in the UK at least - that no law or regulation can come into force without due process, including a majority vote, in a parliament composed of democratically-elected MPs. The EU has now decided to ignore this principle, compounding its felony of ignoring the results of referendums. The EU position is: to hell with due parliamentary process: even in its own poodle, the so-called "European Parliament".

Unlawful Behaviour

The unlawful behaviour of the EU is based on its illegal and improper misuse of an already pretty dodgy article in the Treaty of Rome (technically known as the TEC: the Treaty establishing the European Community). This article, number 308 (formerly number 235) is a "catch-all" or "sweep-up" article. This is what it says:-

Article 308

If action by the Community should prove necessary to attain, in the course of the operation of the common market [our emphasis], one of the objectives of the Community and

this treaty has not provided the necessary powers, the Council shall, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, take the appropriate measures.

Light of Day

Note that this article is only supposed to be used "in the course of operation of the common market". The EU's illegal behaviour consists of ignoring that quite specific restriction, and using Article 308 to give itself powers which have absolutely nothing to do with the "common market".

Part II of the draft EU Constitution rejected by French and Dutch voters in 2005 consisted of the 54 articles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the Union. Readers may remember that the Charter first saw the light of day as a non-legally-binding annex to the Treaty of Nice, and was airily dismissed by poor Keith Vaz MP, then minister for "Europe", as of "*no more significance than the Beano*". Since the Charter was an integral part of the now-moribund draft Constitution, most people would judge the Charter to be dead as well. But a little thing like mortality won't stop the eurocrats.

On 6th July 2005, Lord Triesman, for the British Government, confirmed in a written answer that the Commission had adopted "*.....a proposal for a Council regulation establishing a*

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: Journalists also on EU gravy train p.2 - The Tories are the careless party p.3 - Confirmed: Britain will face a hidden tax bill p.4 - Observations of a fruitcake p.5 - Letters p.6

Charter is being illegally imposed

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, based on Article 308 of the TEC (which, as we saw above, is only for matters to do with the common market). A further written question asked Lord Triesman to explain the misuse of Article 308.

The Noble Lord (a Foreign Office minister), in his written answer of 13th December 2005, gave no explanation. All he could say was that Article 308 had already been used in 1997 to set up the Vienna-based "EU Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia". That body is now changing its name to become the "EU Agency for Fundamental Rights" and its job is to ensure that - notwithstanding the rejection of the draft Constitution - all EU legislation complies with the provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

On the 11th January 2006, Lord Triesman confirmed that the legal basis of the Fundamental Rights Agency "has not yet been agreed".

On the 12th January 2006, in

response to a further written question, Lord Triesman confirmed that Article 308 does indeed restrict the power to act to matters to do with the common market, but - in desperation - pulled another moth-eaten legal rabbit out of the FCO's increasingly threadbare hat: what one might call a variation on the Mandy Rice-Davis defence:

".....the European Court of Justice has found that ensuring respect for fundamental rights is a condition for the lawfulness of Community acts and that respect for fundamental rights thus forms an underlying **or implied** [our emphasis] objective of the Community."

Note that even the ECJ hadn't the gall to claim any connection with "the operation of the common market".

It is crystal clear therefore that the use of Article 308 to bring in the Charter by the back door is illegal. Why does it matter?

It matters because the Charter is so widely-drawn that its implementation will have the effect of concreting-in,

across all 25 members of the EU, including the UK, the EU "social model" which has so spectacularly failed in France, Germany and Italy. That doesn't seem to bother the British government, but it should certainly bother the British people.

The House of Lords Written Questions were asked by Lord Pearson of Rannoch and answered by Lord Triesman on the 6th July 2005 (Hansard Col WA 109), 13th December 2005 (Col WA 148), 11th January 2006 (Col WA 58) and 12th January 2006 (Col WA 83) www.publications.parliament.uk

In the European Parliament, on 20th March 2006, President Barroso, in a written answer (ref E-0429/06EN) to Daniel Hannan MEP, confirmed that the legal base for the setting up of the "European External Action Service" - the EU diplomatic service - is Article III-296(3) of the draft EU Constitution. Since the Constitution is not in force, the setting-up of the EU diplomatic service is also illegal.

Journalists also on EU gravy train

In order to compensate for the extreme tedium of covering sessions of the European Parliament (*see eurofacts for the 24th March*) journalists are being offered an array of lavish sweeteners, a practice which dates from the 1980s.

These include travel and entertainment subsidies to encourage them to follow when the EP shuttles once a month to Strasbourg from Brussels.

The funding for journalists can include payment of a first-class round trip train ticket, or an economy plane ticket from any of the 25 countries and a daily stipend of 100 to cover hotel, food and entertainment over two days.

Around 60 journalists are invited to Strasbourg each month under the programme. Media organs that have benefited from the subsidies are RTVF of Belgium, RTE of Ireland, ERT of

Greece and ORF of Austria, among dozens of others according to *The International Herald Tribune* on the 5th April in a lengthy account of the inducements currently being offered to journalists.

The Parliament also provided television broadcasters with unlimited use of free state-of-the-art television studios, free sound and camera equipment and even free two-person camera crews that can be borrowed for the day. One journalist told the *IHT*: "The Parliamentary sessions are stultifying dull, so the Parliament does whatever it can to make it easier for us to work here, including paying for our journeys and providing plush facilities. I would never get my Parliament reports on the air, if the Parliament was not paying for it".

A broadcaster who requested anonymity said the perks had prompted

journalists to refuse requests by editors to write stories on the controversial issue of members' privileges and expenses. "How can I expose such perks when I myself am benefiting from them?" the journalist asked.

Other EU perks for journalists include free meals and unlimited phone calls during EU summit meetings and free television studios at the EU Commission. At the beginning of every six month EU presidency the presiding country invites journalists to a free junket to the capital. In February Austria, the current holder of the EU presidency, invited 62 Brussels-based journalists to Vienna, paying for their lodgings at a Hilton Hotel and hosting a complementary dinner in an 18th century baroque castle where a soprano sang Strauss operettas. Media organs had an option of paying for the trip. Only 8 did so.

The Tories are the careless party

Anthony Scholefield argues that the Tory leadership's public disdain for UKIP is part of a political strategy that is deeply flawed. Failure to secure its base and to find favourable electoral ground on which to fight means that the party faces a near impossible task

'To lose one parent, Mr. Worthing, may be regarded as a mistake, to lose both looks like carelessness.' Lady Brackenbury in Oscar Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest*.

Since 1970 the Conservative Party has been careless about its core vote. It has allowed no fewer than four parties to take bites out of its core electoral strength. These are the Ulster Unionists, the UKIP/Referendum Party, the BNP and Veritas. Most of the damage was done in the Heath era, one that was characterised by the high tide of liberal managerial conservatism and disdain for the core Conservative interests and ideals. The breakaway new parties were grounded on formerly traditional Conservative beliefs of democracy, patriotism and the protection of the interests of the British people, especially its working population.

Core Policies

Once a new party rises and establishes itself, it can prove remarkably resilient so long as its core policies are relevant and have a small but solid support. It is quite clear that UKIP and the BNP plug into separate but vital core areas of politics and offer a distinctive policy from the three main parties. It is hard to see them going away.

Heath directly lost the 10/12 Unionist MPs who were incorporated in the Conservative ranks up to 1970. Once a certain period of independence had passed, it was inconceivable that the Ulster Unionists would rejoin the Conservatives. The parties drifted further and further apart.

Heath's enthusiasm for Europe did not do immediate damage to the Conservatives' ability to win elections but the European issue eventually exploded in the 1990s with the

formation of the Referendum and UK Independence Parties. Once again, what was a substantial opinion in the Conservative Party was so estranged that it split off. Moreover, its policy stance was continually vindicated by the collapse of support for the EU by Conservative voters and the chronic evasiveness of Conservative politicians on the EU.

Finally, the ruling liberal conservative elite showed little interest in the impact of mass third-world immigration on British working class areas. This enabled the BNP, despite the unsavoury past of some of its leadership, to gain a foothold. In fact, the impact of the BNP is probably underestimated since it presents a real obstacle to Conservatives recovering in the metropolitan areas outside London where they now hold only 5 out of 124 seats. In most of the West Midlands and urban Yorkshire and Lancashire, the Conservative vote dropped in 2005 while the BNP saved deposits all over both regions. In effect, the Tory working class vote cultivated by Conservative leaders so assiduously in the nineteenth century has been ignored and has now collapsed in most of the Midlands and the North of England.

Electoral Bias

At the same time the Conservatives became careless about the state of the electoral system. The massive electoral bias in favour of Labour is, to a large extent, the product of decisions about the electoral system taken when the Conservatives were in office. In 1987, following a House of Commons' Committee study of the electoral system, the decision was taken to retain the over-representation of Scotland and Wales. The Tory leadership also failed to set principles

for the Boundary Commission which would reduce bias in the electoral system, particularly to reduce the gap between the size of the average Labour seat and the average Conservative seat which in 1997 still amounted to 6,500 votes. The more efficient distribution of the Conservative vote in the 1980s masked the other biases in the system in Labour's favour.

On the basis of the current bias in the Westminster electoral system the Conservatives would have only won one post-War election (1983), according to Kavanagh's *'The British General Election of 2001'*.

In 2005 the result in England alone was 286 seats for Labour against 193 seats for the Conservatives despite the Conservatives being slightly ahead in the number of votes.

Anti-Democratic

Even now this staggeringly anti-democratic state of affairs is being treated as a second order issue by Conservative politicians who make no serious attempt to address it. It also has another effect. The poorest regions, which are massively over-represented, supply most of the governing party which inevitably colours policy.

The next election

According to the Electoral Reform Society's Report on the General Election of 2005, the Conservative Party needs a swing of about 7 per cent and a lead of about 11 per cent to win an absolute majority at the next election. This allows for the Conservatives achieving a net gain of about seven seats after the Boundary Commission Report. The changes are estimated to be Tories +7, Labour -5

Continued on P.4

The Tories are the careless party

and Liberal Democrats +2. In elections since 1945, such a swing was only attained once, by Tony Blair in 1997.

Given these self-inflicted handicaps, where are the Conservative votes to come from?

If we add up the votes for Labour, the Liberal Democrats and the Scottish and Welsh nationalists we find that they totalled the following in the last nine general elections (*% of the electorate*):

1974	59.0%
1974	61.0%
1979	52.8%
1983	54.5%
1987	55.1%
1992	54.5%
1997	62.5%
2001	61.5%
2005	59.4%

The bedrock of this Left Bloc is thus about 55 per cent. In addition there is Northern Ireland which is a further 2.5 per cent of the total electorate. So the Conservative ceiling would seem to be about 42.5 per cent of the vote.

The best Conservative performances were in 1979, 1983, 1987 and 1992 when they won 42-43 per cent. Their success in numbers of seats in 1979, 1983 and 1987 was due to the split in the Left Bloc with a great deal of the LibDem vote wasted. This is no longer the case.

But the crucial point is that up to 1992, the Conservatives did not face any political party attacking from the Right. In the last three elections they did. In 1997 these parties attracted 2.9 per cent in 2001 1.7 per cent and in 2005 3 per cent of the electorate.

Moreover, in England only, the

parties of the Right attracted just under 4 per cent of the votes in 2005 - votes that, in the past, would normally have mainly gone to the Conservatives.

No wonder that the UKIP vote alone was in excess of the Labour's winning margin of the vote in 25 constituencies and the BNP/UKIP vote combined exceeded that vote in a further 5 constituencies, despite the BNP concentrating on Labour heartlands and not standing in many marginals.

With the Cameron Policy of targeting Left bloc parties, the Conservatives might cut back the vote for the Left Bloc from about 60 per cent in the last three elections to, say, 55 per cent - the bedrock Left Bloc vote - and, from this process, they could gain 5 per cent of the national vote. Their possible electoral total might be:

Conservative vote 2005	32.4%
From Left Bloc	<u>5.0%</u>
	37.4%

If we assume that 50 per cent of the votes came from Labour and 50 per cent from the LibDems, this would mean the Labour vote would total 32.7 per cent, giving a Tory lead of 4.7 per cent. This would produce a hung Parliament but the Tories would still be about 25 seats behind Labour.

So, relying on taking votes only from the Left Bloc leaves the Conservatives with an inadequate result; a hung Parliament at best.

To actually win with this strategy the voting figure would have to look like

this:

Conservative	42.6%
Labour	30.1%
LibDems	16.9%
Scots/Welsh	2.2%

This would give the Conservatives a lead over Labour of 12.5 per cent, just enough to form a government. In this scenario the total of the Left Bloc is 49.2 per cent. In other words, the Tories would have to push the Left Bloc into a lower percentage of the vote than in 1979 when the Left Bloc totalled 52.8 per cent - lower than in any election since the 1950s. Is this really a possibility?

To emphasise, there are two reasons for the scale of the challenge the Tories face. The existence of the new Right Parties compresses the total available vote for the Conservatives. Second, the LibDem vote is much more successful in turning votes into seats than it was in the 1980s.

Conservatives have ignored the two basic canons of electoral warfare. They have failed to fight on favourable electoral ground and they have failed to secure their base. The Left Bloc may shrink from 60 per cent to 55 per cent of the electorate if the Tories detach some of it with their current strategy but, historically, it is unlikely to go lower. Remember that Mrs. Thatcher was neither handicapped by the bias in the electoral system nor by the existence of small but crucially important Right Wing parties.

Confirmed: Britain will face a hidden tax bill

On the 17th April readers of the *Daily Telegraph* discovered what our readers had already learned from our 27th January issue - that the cost of Tony Blair's European Union budget deal is far more than he let on when giving up a large chunk of Britain's

rebate. The *Telegraph* quoted an article by Mrs Dalia Graubauskaite, the European Union Budget Commissioner in which she says that figures used by Mr Blair take no account of an extra 36 billion (£24 billion) in "financial institutions" on

top of the deal negotiated by the Prime Minister in December. The total spending will exceed 900 billion (£600 billion). This is £24 billion above the deal announced by Mr Blair and means that British taxpayers' will have to find an extra £2 billion.

Observations of a fruitcake

Helen Szamuely says that the three main parties now have more in common with one another than with the electorate

How strange that a man all of whose jobs have been in politics or political PR should be so bad at understanding what does and what does not work politically. I speak, of course, of the leader of the Conservative Party, David Cameron and, in particular, of his unnecessary attack on UKIP and, by implication, all those people who might support UKIP's central policy of withdrawal from the European Union.

By now all our readers must know what happened when David Cameron (or, as we like to call him, the Boy-King of the Conservative Party) was taking part in a phone-in on Radio 5 Live. Somebody asked him about UKIP's stated intention to use the Freedom of Information Act to find out about Conservative donors and lenders with relation to subsequent recommendations for peerages. Cameron replied that it was all just mischief-making, which it undoubtedly was. Not content to stop there, he giggled a bit and told his incredulous audience that UKIP was full of loons, fruitcakes and "closet racists", whatever that last description might mean.

As the row broke, with everyone from the *Daily Telegraph* leader to Melanie Phillips in the *Daily Mail* to Yasmin Alibhai Brown in the *Evening Standard* demanding that he apologised, not so much to UKIP itself but to the nearly 3 million people who voted for them in the last election, Cameron turned peevish.

He insisted that he was absolutely right, trotted out the old story of Alan Sked leaving (ten years ago!) because of infiltration by extremists and, apparently, instructed his correspondence secretary (who happens to be his sister-in-law) to reply to the many outraged letters and e-mails that he had consulted the very suspect organisation called Operation Black Vote and was assured that yes,

indeed, UKIP was racist. There is at least one problem with OBV: they get the bulk of their funding from various EU funds, the rest coming from the government, quangos and the Mayor of London. The notion that they are likely to be unbiased about UKIP is laughable.

Why did Cameron do this? The most obvious explanation is that he is incapable of consistent rational thought. As I said above, it is astonishing how little somebody who has done nothing but politics one way or another all his adult life understands political forces and motivations. Possibly the problem lies in the fact that his rise has been smooth, without difficulties and, one must add, without trace. In this he mirrors the Blair of 1997 with somewhat less substance.

Near Hysterical Outburst

On the other hand, the abuse of UKIP may have been a calculated move. The Conservative leadership has never understood or wanted to understand the phenomenon of UKIP and the growing support among the electorate for it. We have seen near-hysterical outbursts of accusation against people who dared to vote UKIP or Veritas, thus losing Conservative seats. It did not seem to occur to the accusers that the electorate owes the politicians nothing. It is the candidates who owe us an explanation of why we should vote for them.

Nor has the Conservative leadership noticed that UKIP is trying to move into areas less traditional to them: education, taxation, the effects of devolution and so on. These, together with the thorny question of Europe and Britain's relationship with it, are subjects that matter to the electorate. Norwegian glaciers do not.

It would appear that Cameron and his cohorts do really believe that UKIP and all those who vote for it are a bunch of fruitcakes and closet racists, people

from whom the "modern compassionate Conservative Party" must distance itself. The people they must target and hope to bring over are supporters of the Lib-Dems, who are in tune with the "modern etc etc". Apart from the basic dishonesty and lack of principles behind that thinking, the mathematics is wrong. In order to attract a minuscule number of potential defectors or returnees from the Lib-Dems, Cameron is deliberately discarding his own core supporters and another very important group of people: the disaffected Labour voters, who would, in the days of the "nasty" Tory party, have gone over to supporting it. Now they seem to be drifting to the BNP or, again, UKIP. Between them these two groups, which are growing, will outnumber by far the few centre-ground Lib-Dems that might find Cameron's vacuousness attractive.

We are reaching a political stage in this country that, in the past, we have seen only on the Continent: the three main parties now feel that they have more in common with each other than with any part of the electorate. Their main aim at any election is to keep out any smaller party or independent candidate in order to divide the spoils, based on ever-smaller proportions of actual votes. When and if state funding for parties (so warmly supported by Cameron and his acolytes) is introduced, the process will be completed. And then what?

Dr Helen Szamuely was one of the founding members of both the Anti-Federalist League and UKIP. She left after a disagreement with the Leader over representation in the European Parliament.

LETTERS

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

Missing the Point?

Dear Sir,

I fear Mr Clements misses the point (*letters, 24th March*). I won my seat as a Euro MP in Yorkshire and North Lincolnshire from a Labour incumbent with a massive share of the old Labour vote. Also a huge amount of people who had stopped voting returned, at least in the Euro elections, to the ballot box.

Mr Clements would do much better to save his criticism for a party which retains in its ranks such high profile Europhiles as Kenneth Clarke. Perhaps, also an apology from the Conservative Party for abandoning middle England on almost everything, not just Europe, would be a start.

GODFREY BLOOM MEP

Selby

Intriguing Anglosphere

Dear Sir,

In my view *eurofacts* is admirably concise and exemplary in its fusion of the main EU realist ideas, issues and concerns - the recent article on ID cards was definitive, confirming my worst suspicions regarding the dangers inherent in such a scheme though I would have been interested to know the identity of its author* and to have had more indication of sources. In addition the EU is so clearly irredeemable and essentially inimical to British interests that I would like to see more detailed examination of how the process of withdrawal would be executed, how long it is likely to take and what options exist as alternatives to the Union. The Anglosphere concept is especially intriguing as perhaps the optimal model for Britain to pursue and it would be fascinating to see what Messrs Frost, Milne *et al* make of its potential in terms of maximising withdrawal and international security, prosperity, democracy and harmony.

N.J. BATTEN.

Warwickshire

*[*Lord Willoughby de Broke, an*

assiduous participant in the the very thorough ID debate in the House of Lords - Ed.)

Upping the Ante

Dear Sir,

"Time to up the ante!" (*your headline 21st October 2005*). Yes, indeed. I appreciated your detailed account years ago of the steps which need to be taken in order to disentangle ourselves from the EU. Now we need a less detailed but positive outline of what Europe could look like tradewise if sovereignty were to be returned to the individual countries.

Incidentally, in 2004 Civitas published a book "The Need for Nations" by Roger Scruton (available from The June Press £8.50 plus 10% P&P) which is a help to political theory at this time.

ANN WHITAKER

Cornwall

The Right Question

Dear Sir,

In the recent budget the Chancellor, Gordon Brown, withdrew the £200 council tax assistance, which undoubtedly was a political sweetener before the last general election for pensioners.

The government tells us that it cannot afford to give pensioners a larger pension increase which would provide many pensioners with a decent standard of living.

However, in Brussels last December Mr Blair agreed the budget for the EU for the period 2007-2013. Contributions from UK tax-payers to the EU are complicated and no one can really put an exact figure on the cost of our membership, but it is estimated to be between £40-55 billion, but could be as much as £70 billion.

In the UK we have so far been denied a referendum on the EU Constitution and millions of people in other EU countries, who are dissatisfied with the EU have also been denied their say.

The EU imposes rules and

regulations, mergers and regionalisation which affect everyone's daily lives. Opposition is usually ineffective. We as a country are dictated to by a group of unelected bureaucrats in Brussels. Surely, our taxpayers' money could be better spent in the UK. There is so much that could be done to improve the lives of people here in the UK, particularly pensions. The pensioners of today sacrificed so much for this country's freedom during the Second World War and how do we repay them? They have to worry about heating, council tax and selling their homes if they need long-term care. It's a national disgrace! If we are ever allowed a referendum on the future of the EU, then surely the question should be, do we need to continue our membership, or withdraw.

JOSEPHINE ALLEN

Norwich

Scope for Humour

Dear Sir,

The proposed legislation on identity cards sounds, on the face of it, terrifying but it seems to me that there is scope for a great deal of free entertainment here.

"You claim to be a policeman? Show us your identity card."

"You would have us believe that you are an income tax inspector? Show us your identity card."

"You think that you are a Member of Parliament? Some people think that they are Napoleon: show us your identity card."

"A state banquet, your Majesty? Are you over eighteen? Show us your identity card."

In the great and glorious days to come when Parliament, the Monarchy and all the offices of state have been swept away, there will arise one magnificent position known, perhaps, as 'The Keeper of the People's Identity'. It might even become hereditary though this would, of course, involve DNA testing.

PETER HOWELL

Wiltshire

MEETINGS

**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)

**British Weights
and
Measures Association**
020 8922 0089

Saturday **6th May**, 2.00 pm

Speakers to include:

John Gardner, *Director, BWMA*
Guy Herbert, *General Secretary,
No2ID*
Vivian Linacre, *President, BWMA*
Ashley Mote MEP

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Victory Services Club, Trafalgar Room,
63 Seymour Street, London W2
Admission £5.00
(Lunch facilities available at the club)

Democracy Movement
01443-205753

Saturday **6th May**, 2.00 pm

Guest speaker Christopher Gill,
Chairman, Freedom Association

FREE EUROPE DINNER

‘The Discovery’, Celyn Avenue,
Lakeside, Cardiff

Admission £15.00 by ticket

(Tickets in advance please contact Ian
Phillips 01443 205753 for details of full
menu etc.)

Freedom Association
07979 695611

Tuesday **23rd May 2006**, 12.30 pm

Rev. Dr Peter Mullen

PUBLIC MEETING

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **23rd May 2006**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and change: Prime
Ministers in the post-war world - Blair”

Professor the Lord Giddens
Professor Vernon Bogdanor, CBE,
FBA

PUBLIC MEETING

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **24th May**, 7.00 pm

Dr Irwin Stelzer, *Senior Fellow at the
Hudson Institute*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Oak Room, Kettners, 29 Romilly
Street, Soho, London W1D 5HP
Admission £10
Payable on the door or in advance
(Includes, wine, juice, water and nibbles)

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020 7219 3000

Wednesday **3rd May 2006**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *The
Consequences of the European Court of
Justice’s judgement in Case C 176/03-*
from Mr Richard Plender QC.

Tuesday **9th May 2006**, 11.15 am

Evidence will be heard by The Science
and Technology Committee from Sir Neil
Cossons, Chairman, Mr John Fidler,
Conservation Director, English Heritage
and Mr Chris Batt, Chief Executive, the
Museums, Libraries and Archives
Council.

Tuesday **16th May 2006**, 11.15 am

Evidence will be heard by The Science
and Technology Committee from;
(a) Mr David Saunders, British Museum;
Tate Gallery; Mr Jim Tate, National
Museums Scotland;
(b) Mrs Joyce Townsend, Chair, Institute
for Conservation Science; Mr David Leigh
and Mr Alistair McCapra, Institute for
Conservation.

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

2008

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

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.

Sleepwalking into an EU Legal System: How the Charter of Fundamental Rights is being incorporated into British law

by *Lord Blackwell*. **£9.99**

The title explains the story.

The Great Deception:

Can the European Union survive

by *Christopher Booker*. **£9.99**

This is the latest version (Nov 2005) of this comprehensive history of the EU.

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 EU.

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 European Union

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.

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.

The Benefits of Tax Competition

by *Richard Teather*. **£12.50**

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

Video

Britain On The Brink

by *Sanity*. *DVD or VHS Video* **£5.00**

Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

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
CIB	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	
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
David Cameron MP	
Democratic Party	01684 891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Labour	08705 900 200
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell 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