

MPs throw their weight behind Better Off Out campaign

Members of the 2005 intake of MPs are among those who have given their support to a new campaign for Britain's withdrawal from the European Union

Until a few weeks ago only one member of the House of Commons - Philip Davies, the member for Shipley - was publicly committed to seeking Britain's withdrawal from the European Union. Even that situation was an improvement on the previous parliament which did not include a single MP prepared to say in public that the best interests of the United Kingdom would be served by a fundamental break with our EU partners.

Shared Objectives

On the 26th April, however, nine Conservative MPs attended the launch of the Freedom Association's Better Off Out campaign. According to the TFA, eight of these declared their support for the campaign's objective of withdrawal from the EU.

Of those attending - Douglas Carswell, the member for Harwich, Philip Hollobone (Kettering), David Davies (Monmouth) and Philip Davies himself - entered the House at the last general election and have sacrificed whatever prospects for advancement they might have possessed as a result of their involvement. Also attending were Eric Forth, Christopher Chope, Bob Spink, Sir Nicholas Winterton, and Lady Winterton.

The disparity between anti-EU sentiment as reflected in the Commons and that in the country is, of course, still vast: eight or nine out of 659

scarcely reflects the rising tide of euroscepticism. But taken in conjunction with the creation of a new eurosceptic group in the Lords (see page 5) the launch of Better Off Out is a significant development and perhaps a historic one.

The Conservative leader has responded to the development by making it clear that those involved cannot expect advances in their careers, but he has stopped short of threatening to deselect them in accordance with assurances he gave during the party leadership campaign. Were he to change his mind he would risk a civil war within party ranks and the loss of some key financial supporters.

Significant Step

Mr Davies told *eurofacts*: "*The important thing is that we have put down a marker. The issue of membership is no longer an issue that is widely spoken of outside Parliament but can't be talked about inside Parliament.. That's a significant step forward. We know of others who are sympathetic to our aims, and not just in the Conservative Party, and we hope that in time they may join us*".

Mark Wallace, the Freedom Association's Campaign Manager commented: "*We are confident that when MPs discover that nothing terrible has happened to those who lent their support and they remain free*

to speak their minds the number supporting the campaign will grow. We hope that MPs will pass on information about the EU as well as data about the rising level of support for withdrawal".

Unambiguous Commitment

Although the launch of Better Off Out is intended as a non-party group its launch was attended only by Conservative MPs. Roger Knapman, leader of UKIP, however, warmly welcomed the development. He should perhaps have gone further by making it clear that UKIP will not field candidates in constituencies where incumbent candidates have taken the pledge to support withdrawal. In the past we have argued that UKIP should refrain from fielding candidates in the relatively small number of instances where an incumbent Tory or Labour MP had proved their eurosceptic credentials; but since in all cases those credentials did not include an unambiguous commitment to back British withdrawal we also acknowledged the strength of the counter-argument. Times have changed: whatever their party allegiance there can be no credible reason for UKIP to compete against Mr Davies and the other MPs who join his banner.

In a letter to *eurofacts* (page six) Frederick Forsyth makes a number of

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: France's global rice strategy p.2 - Euro needs political integration? p.2 - Only 33% approve EU membership p.2 - No Constitution, but business as usual in the EU p.3 - Just like the old days p.3 - Gibraltar unlike UK - to keep sovereignty and have a referendum on its Constitution p.4 - Why we should support Neelie p.4 - 86% against Constitution in UK p.4 - How EP voting system makes a mockery of democracy p.5 - Peers join EU study group p.5

France's global rice strategy

Of the top ten recipients (via the CAP) of agricultural subsidies in France, no fewer than six are rice-growers in the Camargue, the region in the south where the Rhone splits up into a delta before reaching the Mediterranean. According to the May issue of the French business monthly *Capital*, those six rice-growers have huge acreages, and receive a massive subsidy of 971 per hectare, to "help them fight off competition from Siamese rice-growers".

In 2004, the biggest recipient of rice subsidies was Fermes de France, which got 872,108 (£601,454), accounting for 60 per cent of its total turnover. Fermes de France, based in Port-Saint-Louis-du-Rhone, has 14 employees.

As events last summer showed (when the French government let it be known that it would block a foreign takeover of Danone), France has a global yoghurt strategy. It looks as if, in a slightly different way, France is also pursuing a global rice strategy, this

time funded by the CAP, and thus, partly, by British taxpayers.

Were they to be aware of it, British taxpayers - who already wonder why their taxes should subsidise any French farmers at all - would no doubt find it incomprehensible that the biggest French beneficiaries of British largesse should be a handful of southern French rice-growers. It is not known what Siamese rice-growers make of this particular example of CAP lunacy.

Euro 'will collapse without political integration'

Europhiles used to argue that political integration would fail without a common currency. Now it seems they are coming around to the view that the matter is the other way around. Paul de Grauwe, a prominent Belgian economist has argued that the euro is bound to collapse in 10 to 20 years because there is no clear progress towards political union. "A political union is the logical end-point of a

currency union", he said. "The monetary union will collapse...not next year, but on a time frame of 10 to 20 years. There is not a single monetary union which survived without political union. They have all collapsed. If political union fails to materialise, then in the long term the euro area cannot continue to exist".

It seems that other European economists and bankers are having

similar nightmares. Jurgen Stark, the vice-president of the German Bundesbank and a new member of the European Central Bank told a meeting of MEPs on the 22nd April: "I am concerned about current trends because monetary union...needs a common political commitment to function smoothly". (*euobserver*, 24th April 2006).

Only one in three approve of EU membership

Only 33 per cent of the British public believe that the UK's membership of the EU is a good thing,

according to the latest EUBarometer, the EU's own survey of opinion. Other eurosceptic members include Latvia

where only 29 per cent regard it as such, followed by Austria (31 per cent) and Finland (36 per cent).

Continued from P.1

MPs support Better Off Out Campaign

practical suggestions about how readers can back Mr Davies and the TFA campaign. In similar spirit, *euofacts*, which has campaigned for British withdrawal for more than a decade, offers the following advice to the campaigners:

- Maintain links with eurosceptics in other parties - especially the Labour Party - and wherever possible remove any barriers which prevent them from joining you.
- There are a number of euro-sceptic think-tanks, pressure groups and publications which between them possess formidable knowledge of EU issues - make use of it.
- Don't allow the media to present the EU as the wave of the future; it

is your task to demonstrate that the EU is incapable of responding to the challenges of the 21st century and that its numerous defects are systemic, resting on outmoded and flawed ideas from the last century. Consequently these cannot be overcome by 'reform'.

- Make sure that briefing papers and other documents are accurate and of high intellectual standard; the case for withdrawal is very strong; there is no need to exaggerate.
- The key issues have to do with sovereignty, democracy, costs and regulation - concentrate on these and don't be side-tracked by distractions.
- Learn by heart the *Today* producer's telephone number so

that you can respond to one-sided or inaccurate BBC reports - there will be no shortage of them; field your best performers and make as much use as possible of the new parliamentary intake.

- Stagger good news about recruits and other favourable developments - so that the Better Off Out campaign acquires a sense of momentum.
- Your critics will take any opportunity to present you as inward-looking intemperate xenophobes; don't make it easy for them as the result of carelessly-worded statements or bad taste jokes (europhiles have very little in the way of a sense of humour!).

No Constitution until 2008 - but it's business as usual in the European Union

France has submitted plans for institutional reform which would secure the objectives of the Constitution by other means

EU officials have apparently come to the reluctant conclusion that the EU Constitution will remain in the intensive care unit for some years and that they will have to pursue their objectives by other means.

The admission came on the 27th April as senior Commission officials met at a two-day seminar outside Brussels to pursue the uphill task of defining a new vision for the EU against a background of rising euroscepticism.

"The debate in recent months has shown that Europe is not yet ready for a constitutional solution", a Commission spokesman told the *International Herald Tribune* (28th April). *"Some members states say the constitution is dead, some say it is alive, some say we should go ahead, so there is no consensus."*

New Narrative

According to the *IHT*, Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso favours postponing a decision on the Constitution until 2007 or 2008 while the Commission devises a new European "narrative" to sell the European project.

But, as readers of *eurofacts* will be aware, this does not of course mean that the on-going process of political integration will now grind to a halt. As during previous EU crises France has claimed the driving seat by formulating its own plans for institutional reform "on the basis of existing treaties".

On the 25th April France submitted proposals to the Austrian EU presidency which it claims will result in smoother-functioning EU machinery.

"At this stage, the aim should be to

seek improvement in the functioning of [the EU's] institutions on the basis of the framework provided by existing treaties", the French document reads.

But the improvements sought by Paris reflect ideas in the EU constitution, which was rejected by French and Dutch voters in referendums last year.

The document is in line with earlier French ideas to "cherry-pick" individual parts of the constitution, despite German and Spanish calls to revive the charter in its entirety.

Majority Voting

At the core of Paris' proposals is the use of the so-called "passerelle" or "bridging" clauses in the current EU treaty, which allow to shift policy areas from unanimous decision-making to majority voting, effectively eliminating the national veto.

For any such shift from unanimity to majority-voting, a unanimous vote by member states is necessary first.

The main area where France wants to suppress the national veto is justice and home affairs, where the EU constitution also proposed more majority-voting.

"The application of [the passerelle] clause would thus enable European action to be made more effective in the area of internal security and justice...particularly for preventing and combating terrorism, organised crime and the phenomena on which the latter feeds (drugs, trafficking in human beings, etc)", according to the proposals.

The national veto should be equally eliminated in some social policy areas, opening the door for EU measures on

workers' protection which appear to reflect France's recent mass protests against more flexible lay-off rules.

"This would mean that [EU] acts could be adopted by a qualified majority...to lay down minimum requirements for the protection of workers where their employment contract is terminated...and for the representation and collective defence of the interests of workers and employers", the French text says.

The proposals also include ways to boost the Union's capacity to act on the world stage, concentrating on an enhanced role for the EU's foreign policy chief, the ultimate Brussels insider and empire builder Javier Solana.

Reinforced Mandate

France wants Mr Solana to have a reinforced mandate for crisis management and the representation of the Union abroad, while holding regular meetings with the European commissioners for external relations, enlargement and development.

This should "ensure greater consistency between Council and Commission in conducting action and in external representation."

France also seeks "more effective coordination of economic policies in the euro zone", including in the area of taxation.

In other words, constitution or no-constitution, crisis or no crisis, it's business as usual in the European Union.

Just like the old days...

"Everyone knew that the communist dictatorship was a harmful system, yet we talked about it bringing peace and prosperity. Now we use this same double-speak when talking about the EU." Timo Soini, former Finnish presidential candidate and leader of the populist rural party True Finns, *International Herald Tribune* 24th April 2006.

Gibraltar - unlike the UK - to keep sovereignty and have a referendum on its Constitution

Twice in one day, the 27th March 2006, in separate statements in the House of Lords, the British government demonstrated (no doubt inadvertently) that, despite paying vast amounts of our taxes to Brussels to take our sovereignty away, they still understand exactly what sovereignty is.

First, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Lord Triesman, made a statement on "Gibraltar: New Constitution". The second paragraph said:-

"A joint statement by the UK and Gibraltar was made earlier today, which sets out the main provisions of the new constitution. The full text of the new constitution will be published in the coming weeks, and put to the people of Gibraltar in a referendum".

Well, at least the two thousand-odd

Gibraltarians are going to get a referendum on their constitution. How ironic, given that the self-same British government, a few days earlier, in both the Commons and the Lords, had specifically, knowingly and deliberately refused to promise a referendum to the British people if a new version of the EU Constitution (being openly discussed by Continental governments) were to be proposed. So much for democracy at home.

But it gets much odder. A few paragraphs further on, Lord Triesman states: "...Her Majesty's Government will never enter into arrangements under which the people of Gibraltar would pass under the sovereignty of another state against their freely and democratically expressed wishes. The new constitution confirms that the people of Gibraltar have the right of self-determination...". Does that mean - as

it appears to mean - that when it comes to sovereignty and self-determination Gibraltarians are to enjoy rights denied to Britons?

Later, in a debate on the Joint Strike Fighter being developed by the USA and the UK, and the refusal up to now of the US to guarantee full access to the US software and technology that enables the plane to fly, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Defence, Lord Drayson, said: "...I remain optimistic that we will achieve the operational sovereignty that we require...".

So there you have it. Sovereignty's fine so long as it's not under any circumstances to belong to the British people. Ditto with referendums on constitutions: OK for anyone except the British people. Curious, isn't it?

Why we should support our Neelie

There is something increasingly comic about the periodic attempts of the Chancellor to make the EU mend its economic ways, if only ever so slightly. One typical example occurred on the 7th April when an earnest-looking Mr Brown arrived at a meeting of Finance Ministers in Vienna with details of a plan to curb the growing tide of EU protectionism. Mr Brown's intervention followed Spanish and Polish attempts to thwart foreign takeovers of their energy and banking firms.

Mr Brown's plan was to create a new EU taskforce that would identify sectors that fail to liberalise. But while fellow Finance Ministers agreed that protectionism was responsible for high

levels of unemployment Mr Brown found almost no support. Bristling with simulated indignation, the French Finance Minister, Thierry Breton baulked at the idea of adding to the bureaucracy. "There are already enough layers of bureaucracy", he said.

The EU Monetary Affairs Minister, Jouquin Almunia said that Mr Brown's call was superfluous because Europe's best brains were already at work on the job: "The most efficient and respected experts in Europe regarding competition are in the EU Commission", maybe, but are they busy promoting competition or obstructing it?

Mr Almunia was not clear on this point, but added: "Everybody agrees

that the Commission, in enforcing the competition rules, acts with absolute independence. I think the best thing we can do is support the work of Neelie Kroes [the Commissioner for Competition]", he added.

So there we have it. The task of good Europeans is not only to support protection for inefficient manufacturers of shoes, textiles, ladies underwear and agricultural produce, not to mention uncompetitive banking and energy firms, but also to protect Neelie Kroes, the very person charged with the responsibility of promoting competition. At the risk of repeating ourselves, this is the kind of thing you cannot make up.

86 per cent against Constitution in UK

A joint survey by the Robert Schuman Foundation and Eurobarometer finds that, amongst those countries which haven't yet ratified the EU Constitution, support in

the UK is all of 14 per cent, with those against at 86 per cent. No wonder the word Constitution never passes Blair's lips.

In other countries, majorities seem to

be just about in favour, though with huge proportions of don't knows. The source of the data is an article on page six of *Figaro* on the 25th April 2006.

How the EP voting system makes a mockery of democracy

It is likely that many EU directives do not reflect the views of those who voted on them

By Graham Booth

Last October, during one of the European Parliament's monthly voting sessions, the acting president Antonios Trakatellis called for a vote on an amendment and surveyed the 600-odd arms waving like corn in the field. He declared that it was "approved". Several MEPs doubted that he had made the right decision and called for an electronic check, which showed that it had actually been rejected by a massive 502 votes to 128.

If an error of such magnitude had been made by a fledgling government in a developing third world country it would either have been greeted with howls of derision or possibly with sympathy and offers of financial aid to install proper electronic equipment.

But this is the European Union, which claims to be the largest trading bloc in the world and whose directives affect the lives of all 400 million of its citizens.

Since the EU's creation in 1957, with just 6 member states, it has always relied on voting by a show of hands. Although electronic equipment was installed some 20 years ago it is only used when specifically requested, or as a check when the "count" of hands is in doubt. Now that there are 25 member states with 20 different languages the system clearly doesn't work.

That incident in October persuaded me to compile a dossier of such errors. A significant number of wrong calls have been corrected by electronic checks since then but Mario Mauro, who was acting president on January 18th this year, hit the jackpot when he

declared a vote on an amendment to the Climate Change directive "rejected" when the electronic check that was called for showed that it had been approved by an astonishing 574 votes to 41!

Possibly more sinister have been the number of times when calls for a check have fallen on deaf ears and been ignored, so that we shall never know if those results were correct.

Frequently remarks such as "*We think it's carried*", "*Looks adopted*", "*We think it's approved*" etc are made but are never checked.

The speed at which the voting is carried out is quite ridiculous and is another contributory factor (either by accident or design) in achieving incorrect results - we sometimes get through over 600 amendments in an hour (one every 5 seconds!).

Fraction of a Second

The English interpretation of the call to vote sounds like 'those infavour-those against-abstentions' as if it were one word. MEPs voting in favour can start to raise a hand as soon as the amendment number is given but those wishing to vote against have only a fraction of a second to raise a hand and if it is not lowered immediately it is counted as an abstention. This wording clearly favours those MEPs who are voting in favour. Sure enough when I checked one recent batch of 202 votes that I had recorded, 155 were 'approved' and only 47 'rejected'.

A large proportion of amendments as

well as full directives are voted on by a show of hands, so it is very likely that many of the directives that are now ruling our lives do not correctly represent the wishes of the MEPs who voted on them.

All of these facts have been reported to the President of the European Parliament, Sr. Josep Borrell, by myself and by Vladimir Zelezny (of the Czech Republic) with a request for full electronic voting in future.

Sr. Borrell has defended the present system and has correctly pointed out that electronic voting would be slower than a show of hands but he has, nevertheless, given his permission for us to put forward a 'Proposal for Amendment of Parliament's Rules of Procedure', which my colleague and I did on April 18th, 2006.

Full electronic voting would at least ensure that every vote is correctly recorded: it will be interesting to see what the Committee on Constitutional Affairs considers to be most important - accuracy or a prompt lunch.

If the present system continues it does beg the question: What is the point of 732 MEPs making the arduous journey to Strasbourg once a month, where voting should be the key part of the proceedings, only to find that constant errors are making a mockery of their efforts?

Graham Booth is the UKIP MEP for the South West.

Peers join EU study group

More than 60 peers have joined a new all-party group to examine aspects of European political integration which have occurred since the rejection of the EU constitution but which they believe have not been adequately scrutinised by parliament

and the media. The group's convener is the Lib-Dem peer Viscount Falkland and founder members include the former Conservative Home Secretary Lord Waddington, Lord Vinson of Roddam Dene, Lord Willoughby de Broke, Baroness Detta O'Caithan and

Lord Moran. One member described the complexion of the Lords EU Study group as "broadly eurosceptic - but open to all with an interest in the subject".

LETTERS

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

I Told You So!

Dear Sir,

It may not have escaped your readers' attention that two Conservative MPs have finally spoken the dreaded words: Better Off Out (*Although Mr Forsyth may not have known at the time of writing the figure now appears to be rather higher than that - see page 1*) David Cameron has pronounced that though they would not join his front bench, they would not be sanctioned in any other way, such as deselection.

You might also note that both men, Philip Davies and Douglas Carswell, are first-timers, i.e. elected May 5th 2005. They are also the tip of the iceberg.

Last year I spent many words in your generous columns begging UKIP to give the Tories best-chance 60 candidates a clear run. This was never because I think Tory Headshed was any good (I still don't) but because the shires had done a good selection job and ninety per cent of the newcomers were rock solid on the EU.

Without UKIP 58 of the 60 would have got there. In fact it was only 33. The full 58 would have reduced Blair's majority to thirteen and probably toppled him. But no; UKIP just had to pass wind and call it Greensleeves.

The situation is not lost. More Tory MPs are joining the BOO movement; if the figure ever touches 100 call-me-Dave will have the entire party versus the payroll vote and be in a minority among the 197 MPs, causing him to reverse the career ban. Even at 50 he will feel the ground begin to move.

Your readers could help. Just write to your Tory MP or candidate saying your vote is his, only if he takes the pledge.

Another letter to Headshed in Victoria Street saying if the career ban is not removed, bang goes your membership, fees, donations and canvassing help, would also give pause for thought.

EU - appeasers dominating the party of Churchill and Thatcher must hear loud and clear that there is going to be a real price to pay - loss of office or any chance of it. But for Pete's sake, unlike UKIP make it specific. Destroying first class patriots must leave Kenneth Clarke roaring with laughter.

FREDERICK FORSYTH
Hertfordshire

Untrustworthy Tories

Dear Sir,

Following David Cameron's statement that no Eurosceptic MP would serve on his front bench I believe those who have been advocating a vote for the Conservative party as a means of saving us from the EU owe us all an apology.

As has proved the case time and again the Conservatives are not to be trusted on the matter and if future generations wish to find the main culprits for betraying this nation to the federalists they need look no further than those who have run that party in the past fifty years.

COLIN BULLEN
Kent

Deathly Hush

Dear Sir,

I am not at all surprised that the EU has increased its budget by some £20 billion. It has its own blinkered view of the future and will not be distracted. I am a member of the EU's Committee on Regional Development and, during

a recent discussion on our budget for the years 2007-13, I said this:

I have studied the budget figures for the cohesion funds from 2007 to 2013, which I refer to as 'Plan A', very closely. I see that the funds, totalling 336,212,000,000 euros have been allocated very precisely to each of the member states. If one of the major contributors, like Britain, should decide to leave the EU and thus stop its drip feed of £1 million per hour into the EU's coffers, is there a 'Plan B'?

As you can imagine there was a deathly hush.

GRAHAM BOOTH MEP
Devon

A Question for Cameron

Dear Sir,

The last issue of *eurofacts* devoted nearly three whole pages to the present weakness of the Conservative Party and to the near if not total impossibility of the party ever again winning a General Election.

What I would wish you to try to get is David Cameron's answer to the question, "What do you identify as the benefits to the UK of membership of the European Union, benefits which you see as somehow outweighing the enormous net costs?"

These net costs were, according to the Democracy Movement, £3.5 billion a year from 2000-2006. But Blair's promised defence of that figure is going to result in a near doubling to £6 billion from 2007 onwards. So what, please is David Cameron's response?

PROF ANTONY FLEW
Berkshire

Tory rebel wins public backing

Roger Helmer, the Conservative MEP who lost the Conservative whip and was sacked from the European Peoples Party (EPP) as a result of his campaign against EU cronyism and corruption, has received

more nominations in a Parliamentarian of the Year Award than David Cameron. Mr Helmer, who is currently campaigning for the restoration of the whip, also scored more highly in terms of nominations than William Hague

and Michael Howard. The award is being given by the independent Conservative on-line forum www.conservativehom.com.

MEETINGS

**United Kingdom
Independence Party**
North West Branch
01772 555975

Saturday **20th May**, 10.30 am

North West Spring Conference

“The Police State”

Speakers to include:

Gerard Batten MEP, UKIP

Phil Booth, NO2ID

**David Campbell-Bannerman, UKIP,
Chairman**

Dr Sean Gabb, Libertarian Alliance

Dr John Whittaker MEP, UKIP

**NORTH WEST
SPRING CONFERENCE**

Headway Hotel, Morecombe,
Lancashire

Admission Free

(Tickets available in advance)

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)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **30th May 2006**, 6.00 pm

“The Judges and the Constitution”

Our membership of the EU, together
with the Human Rights Act, and devolu-
tion have all increased the influence of
judges and some would argue, brought
them into the political arena

**Professor Vernon Bogdanor, CBE,
FBA, Gresham Professor of Law**

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

**United Kingdom
Independence Party**
South East

Saturday **3rd June**, 10.30 am

South East Conference

Speakers to be announced

SOUTH EAST CONFERENCE

The Emmanuel Centre, 9-23 Marsham
Street, London SW1

Admission Free

FREE

Advertising Space

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

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020 7219 3000

Monday **15th May 2006**, 4.00 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Follow-up
inquiry into the revised Draft Services
Directive* from;

a) the CBI; the Federation of Small
Business;

b) the TUC.

Tuesday **16th May 2006**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard by The Science
and Technology Committee from;

(a) Mr Neil MacGregor, Director, Mr
David Saunders, Head of Conservation,
British Museum; Mr Alex Beard, Deputy
Director, Mr Leslie Carlyle, Head of
Conservation, Tate; Dr Jim Tate, National
Museum of Scotland;

(b) Mrs Joyce Townsend, Chair, Institute
for Conservation Science; Mr Alastair
McCapra, Chief Executive; and Dr David
Leigh, Communications Manager,
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.

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.

The Truth They Won't Tell You (And Don't Want You To Know)

About the EU

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£9.99**

A further 269 useful facts you need to know about the development 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.

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 Referendum Roundabout

by *Kieron O'Hara*. **£8.95**

A lively and sharp critique of the role of referendums in modern British politics, includes the 1975 vote on Europe, devolution, and a possible Constitution.

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**

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"

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 41 3006