

Time to be bold as EU is gripped by paralysis

One of the very few things that EU foreign ministers can agree about is that the Constitution should be given a new name!

Whatever their political views most people who have taken the trouble to read the draft EU Constitution are inclined to agree that compared to other such documents the text is prolix, pompous and excessively long. Needless to say this is not the view of its author, the former French President Giscard d'Estaing who still believes that it will be adopted. In an interview with the *Financial Times* on the 23rd May Giscard made it plain that despite its rejection by the French and Dutch voters last year he remained optimistic about its future. Providing that the "modalities" were sorted out the treaty would be ratified without change, he said. The big mistake, apparently, had been allowing ordinary voters in France and Holland to have a say: "*If we had chosen to have a parliamentary vote last year the constitution would have been easily adopted. It is the method that has provoked the rejection....There are 16 out of 25 countries that have ratified the European constitution. That's to say there's a qualified majority. There is an agreed (sic) text. The concern now is the modalities of accepting it*".

Enunciating an entirely novel approach to the interpretation of referendum results Giscard continued: "*It is not France that has said no. It is 55 per cent of the French people - 45 per cent of the French people said yes. I wish that we will have a new chance, a second chance, for the constitutional project...People have the right to*

change their opinion. The people might consider that they made a mistake". Some people might, but not, it seems, the former French President.

Giscard's comments typify the arrogance of a class which has shaped the EU institutions and which is consequently responsible for its present state of paralysis as well as for many of Europe's most intractable economic and political problems. He may believe that one day every European capital will display a statue of the man who gave constitutional form to the European project, but the odds are against. The crisis which today engulfs the European Union is profound, as was apparent from the meeting of EU foreign ministers in Vienna on the 27-28th May, almost exactly one year on from the French and Dutch referendums. Eurosceptics should take greater advantage of this fact.

More palatable

Still unable to find a way out of the morass one of the few things that the ministers could agree upon was that the Germans should have the first shot at drawing up plans to resuscitate the constitution next June - in effect extending the present 'period of reflection' for a further twelve months. Press reports suggest that the only other matter on which agreement could be reached was that the term "constitution" should be dropped in favour of something more palatable to

the voters. On the big issues of whether France and Holland should be made to re-sit the exam question they failed last time around and of how to deal with the spectre of referendums in the UK, Denmark and the Czech republic (all strongly eurosceptic) if the French and Dutch subsequently answer the question correctly, there was no agreement. Nor was there agreement on whether the constitution should be preserved in its present form.

Staging second referendums in France and Holland would of course be fraught with huge risk for the europhiles since a further rejection of the treaty would surely kill it for all time. A poll conducted by Open Europe on the first anniversary of the polls in France and the Netherlands suggests a new referendum would see the no camp's lead increase in both countries compared to last year. In France, the survey showed that 55 per cent would say no compared to 54.5 per cent last year, while in Holland 65 per cent would say no compared to 61.5 per cent in 2005. Moreover, the poll also indicates that around two thirds of voters in both countries would take powers back from the EU - which flatly contradicts the claim that the referendums were not a vote against integration.

Among EU leaders there are those who want to scrap the present constitution in favour of something briefer, simpler, less ambitious. But that raises the question of deciding

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: Immigrants stream into Ireland p.2 - Iran's growing missile threat exposes weakness of EU policies p.3 - Those impossible British p.3 - Peers' debate adds to momentum for a referendum on EU withdrawal p.4 - Have we grown afraid of freedom? p.5 - How to back the Better Off Out campaign p.5

EU in the grip of paralysis

what to do about the 16 countries including three of the biggest - Germany, Italy and Spain - which have ratified the present text. There would be other problems, too. The constitutional treaty was finalised following more than two years of horse-trading. As an excellent analysis by Honor Mahoney of the *euobserver* pointed out on the 24th May, the danger of removing some parts of the treaty, for examples in areas where national sensibilities are tender, is that it could consequently lead to the unravelling of the whole package.

Recently the EU Commission has proposed that the so-called *passarelle* clause be invoked in order to reduce the number of vetoes in justice and criminal matters so that these can be dealt with at the EU level. This may still happen but the initiative has been strongly opposed by Ireland and Germany. Both are said to have agreed to stronger EU powers in these areas in the constitution, only because they got other things in return and since these are no longer on offer there is presently no basis for a deal.

As to the suggestion that prospects for getting public approval for the constitution can be improved by changing its title this smacks of desperation. There is a well-established EU tradition of trying to mislead the European electorate's by calling things by misleading or obscure

names (competencies rather than powers, rapid reaction forces rather than armies etc), but it seems most unlikely that the trick will work this time. Europe's political elites are capable of great cynicism and the voters - not least in Britain - have often shown themselves to be gullible when it comes to EU matters. But the device of changing the name of the constitution while preserving its substance in its entirety seems more likely to encourage derision than to win public support.

No legal authority

In this situation almost the only way European political integration can continue is if ministers of member states permit measures for which there is no legal authority - as in the case of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the European Defence Agency - but this can only be done at the cost of stoking up greater public antipathy towards the EU project as a whole.

The fact of the matter is that the EU project is in a deeper crisis than ever. It cannot be taken further by legal means; it cannot be put into tactical reverse, and, on the EU's own admission, it cannot remain as it is. The logical thing would be to return to the starting point and to rethink the project in ways that fully respect national sovereignties - but the philosophy which underlies the

project as well as the interests of Europe's political elites do not, for a moment, permit this.

In these circumstances, British eurosceptics should be emboldened. The EU is down, if not out. Those in public life who have hesitated to acknowledge that leaving the EU is the only sensible way forward and that the case for 'reform' is risible should follow the recent example of Lord Tebbit by announcing publicly their support for withdrawal. The number of the great and the good ready to contemplate withdrawal is plainly increasing, but further public conversions are required if the eurosceptic cause is to regain a real sense of momentum.

The recent improvement in Tory fortunes should encourage Tory boldness. It is now just possible to imagine a Tory government which is not dependent on Lib-Dem support. The party's scope for honest-speaking on the EU without damaging its prospects is correspondingly greater. Remaining silent on 'Europe' - when quite obviously 'Europe' is in a state of paralysis - in the belief that this will assist a return to power could turn out to be strategically foolish as well as unprincipled and irresponsible.

Immigrants stream into Ireland

Ireland is debating whether to introduce road signs in Polish, Lithuanian and Latvian to cut down on road accidents among migrant workers. Every third drunk driver stopped in the country now comes from central or eastern Europe.

The phenomenon of drunk drivers who speak little English but with the capacity to out-drink even the average Irishman is a new one and is one consequence of the huge numbers of Central Europeans - huge that is in relation to the size of Ireland's total population of just over four million - who have arrived since EU enlargement on the 1st May 2004.

For decades the numbers leaving Ireland in search of work greatly exceeded those coming in. That pattern changed in the late eighties and nineties as the Irish economy began to take off and significant numbers of Irishmen returned from jobs abroad. Even so, Ireland has no experience of absorbing large numbers of foreign workers. But when EU enlargement occurred Ireland was one of three countries - the others being Britain and Sweden - that opened their labour markets to citizens from the mainly ex-communist states.

As a consequence last year Irish immigration reached record levels with

40 per cent coming from the accession countries. In a study published on the 19th May the [Irish] Economic and Social Research Institute says that 186,000 personal public service numbers were issued from May 2004 to February 2006. This compares with 35,000 from January 2001 to April 2004.

A PPSN is necessary in Ireland to get a job or to access social welfare services.

Of the 112,000 PPSNs issued last year, 65,000 went to Poles, 18,700 to Lithuanians, 9,300 to Latvians, 9,200 to Slovaks and 4,500 to Czechs.

Iran's growing missile threat exposes weakness of EU policies

Jack Straw's 'sticks and carrots' approach had one major defect - it left out the sticks

The problems of the US-led coalition in Iraq have tended to distract attention from the EU failure to deal with the nuclear ambitions of Iran. This, however, is a problem which historians of the future may well conclude represented a more serious threat to the West than that posed by Saddam Hussein. According to the International Institute of Strategic Studies, which has a reputation for weighing its words with great caution, it is now *inevitable* that Iran will acquire nuclear weapons. The IISS also says it will prove almost impossible to prevent it from doing so.

At the Paris agreement with the EU-3 (Britain, France and Germany) in November 2004 Tehran promised to halt all uranium enrichment activities. Since the election of Mahmoud Ahaminejad as president the following June, however, it has been clear to most that Iran would pursue its long-standing aim of acquiring weapons with even greater determination than before - despite the diplomatic pressures applied by the EU-3. In large part these were orchestrated by the former British Foreign Jack Straw whose trips to the Iranian capital were so frequent that they earned him the soubriquet of "Tehran Jack". Prior to his cabinet demotion Mr Straw repeatedly expressed confidence that Tehran might be discouraged from its present path by a policy of "sticks and carrots"; unfortunately Mr Straw and his French and German counterparts failed to include the sticks and even the threat of them. For good measure, Mr Straw famously stated that the use of force was "inconceivable", an utterance that may well have cost him his job.

Just how serious Iran was about the talks with Mr Straw and his EU colleagues became clear in October

2005 when the British government revealed that the Iranians had supplied sophisticated bombs with charges capable of penetrating armour to clients in Iraq - who used them in a series of attacks on British forces in the south of that country. Iran has also known to have given discreet support to insurgents such as Moqtada al-Sadr, who has led two Shi'a uprisings against coalition forces and the Iraqi government.

The US is now likely to insist on a policy of sanctions, but for the time being the policy of offering carrots without sticks continues: at an International Conference in London on the 24th May Mr Straw's successor, Margaret Beckett indicated that Iran would be offered a light-water reactor in return for a guarantee that it would abandon its nuclear weapons ambitions, an offer which had already been rejected by the Iranians.

Blood-chilling

The spectre of Iran as the nuclear-armed regional hegemonist, combined with the Iranian President's blood-chilling threats to annihilate Israel ought to focus attention on some unwelcome realities. But there is little sign that this is happening in EU circles.

Until recently EU spokesmen were apt to suggest that that the age of 'hard' power was passing; the impotence of the US, the world's greatest military power to achieve its objectives in Iraq demonstrated that, "Soft" power (at which EU foreign ministers like to think they excel) had conveniently become of age. The collapse of the EU's Iran initiative exposes the emptiness of such vanities.

Most newspaper reports have concentrated on the details of Iran's

uranium enrichment programme. But the details of its missile programme are no less disturbing, especially for Europeans. Iran is believed to be producing around 10 Shahab 3 intermediate range missiles a year; these are based on Korean missile technology and with modification are capable of reaching parts of Europe. There are reports that that the Shahab 4, with a still greater range, which has been based on the Soviet SS4 is in an advanced state of development and, when deployed, would bring all of Europe into range. It is widely assumed that Iran would not have a missile capable of reaching the US for at least a decade.

Thus Iran's military ambitions present problems which are maturing more quickly for Europe than for America. Such hard power as EU countries possess, including the British and French nuclear arsenals, were designed for quite different scenarios and appear to be of little value as a means of confronting present dangers.

Meanwhile, 'Europe' (which is more dependent on oil from the Middle East than the US) continues to gaze at its military navel, producing plans and projects for which there is inadequate funding and whose underlying purpose is to promote political integration rather than to defend European interests. It appears hostile to US ideas about pre-empting rogue states like Iran from pursuing their ambitions to acquire weapons of mass destruction while displaying little or no interest in contributing to America's plans to provide protection against a limited missile threat of the kind that Iran will soon present. We may well end up paying dearly for such indifference.

Those impossible British...

"The British will not approve the constitutional treaty. We know it." Giscard d'Estaing, interviewed by the *Financial Times*, on the 23rd May 2006.

Peers' debate adds to momentum for a referendum on EU withdrawal

Lord Blackwell:...having been denied a referendum on the constitution, this continued movement towards political integration is not something to which the British people have given their consent; nor is it something that I believe is in their interests. The time is coming when we must ask the British Government to declare their hand and we must then give the British people a chance to say yes or no. For there is an alternative which better reflects our nation's future interests and prosperity. It does not mean turning our backs on Europe but it means opening our eyes and arms to the opportunities in the rest of the globe.

Our initial objective in Europe was the opportunity to develop and expand free trade with our neighbours - free movement of goods and capital without barriers and protectionism - and, through trade, to learn to live together better in peace. Over time, even that economic benefit has been offset by the burdens of regulations, social costs and even import quotas that have been imposed on our economy under the mantra of the single market. I believe that those regulations and costs reflect an outdated 20th century European social model - the concept of somehow protecting European Union workers from the need to compete with the world...

European trade represents less than 10 to 12 per cent of our economy in total, depending on how it is measured, but the regulations and costs it prescribes are imposed on our entire economy. Yet we risk being dragged back, losing our competitiveness, in order to maintain our position inside the European project. If we care about employment and prosperity, we should be focused on aligning our economy with the exciting growth economies of the future, not the outdated economies

of the past...

With our commitment to the EU project comes the imposition of a top-down centralist model of laws and governments in place of our ancient, democratic and legal conventions, sweeping away our ancient common-law rights and freedoms under English law, to be replaced by Roman-law rights that exist only where they are granted by the state. We should say to our neighbours, "You go down the route to political integration if you want to, but we will not join you. We will opt to maintain a free trade relationship with Europe. We seek to engage co-operatively on common programmes across Europe which are in our interests, whether they be on environmental protection, transport policy or security; but we will engage in those programmes on an Inter-governmental basis where we retain control, not on the basis of handing over decision-making to an executive able to override our Parliament. We will opt out of all the institutional and legal trappings of the political integration project".

Lord Waddington: On the 23rd April the *Sunday Times* ran a detailed account of how the Commission has been busy setting up in all but name the External Action Service, which is provided for in the constitution. It has been acquiring grand mansions in Moscow, Washington and throughout the world, and some are already housing people on the EU payroll who are, to all intents and purposes, ambassadors. One such is John Bruton, the former Irish Prime Minister. John Bruton, we read, is occupying as his residence a mansion in the Sheridan-Kalorama neighbourhood of Washington. Apparently it was built for a steel and railway tycoon in 1923 and has just been renovated at a cost of £1.4 million. We are told that it has 16

bedrooms, a grand dining room and a hall of polished marble - all equipped to entertain 150 guests. It has an Italianate garden complete with classical statues in bronze and a swimming pool.

It is ridiculous to suggest that all this magnificence is for a trade mission like those that have been set up by the Commission over the years under its general powers. It is absurd to pretend that Mr Bruton is just the humble head of a trade mission, doing his best to persuade Americans to buy more champagne, cuckoo clocks and pasta machines...

As only the constitution makes provision for the External Action Service - and the constitution is not law - where, I ask, is the legal cover for this expenditure?

Lord Pearson of Rannoch: The heart of our democracy is the right of the British people to elect and dismiss those who make their laws, and so it has been betrayed by our membership of the European Union. Our party politics and general elections have become largely charades. The House of Commons and your Lordships' House have become largely redundant.

It is worth remembering, too, that once an area of our national life has been ceded to Brussels, the treaties ordain that it cannot be returned to the authority of this Parliament. Furthermore, no changes can be made to the treaties unless they are unanimously agreed by all 25 member states in the Council of Ministers. That is why many of us fear that renegotiation of the treaties is not realistic, and why we believe that the only way out is the door.

Source:

HANSARD - House of Lords
Parliamentary Copyright 18th May 2006.

Have we grown afraid of freedom?

It will soon be a criminal offence to display imperial measures alongside metric ones - but public reaction suggests that the notion of choice is no longer understood

By Vivian Linacre

I experienced a sense of euphoria when on the 21st April *The Times* published a letter from twenty one of the patrons and honorary members of the British Weights and Measures Association protesting at the prohibition of the last permitted use of imperial measures. Never before, I was informed, had a letter to *The Times* carried so many signatures. But my euphoria was quickly dispelled by the correspondence that followed.

Our sole purpose had been to rally opposition to the prohibition (under S.I. 55 and 85/ 2001) of the last permitted use of customary measures. From the 1st January 2010 - only 3 1/2 years hence - it will become a criminal offence merely to show the imperial equivalent alongside but subordinate to the primary metric marking, even though the purpose is purely to provide additional information to assist the customer. Without any criticism of the metric system, we were simply pleading for continuation of the right to display the corresponding traditional measures for the sake of clarification.

But the ensuing correspondence (such as the editor selected) immediately degenerated into a futile, ignorant argument about the superior merits of metric versus imperial. This was so depressing, not only because it entirely missed the point of our letter, but more especially because it revealed in readers' minds a presumption that the two systems are necessarily rivals between which we have to choose. The very notion of freedom of choice - of its practicality or even its value - seems to have faded away within a generation. When I tell my younger friends (i.e. anyone under sixty!) that I learned metric alongside imperial

measures in primary school, my arithmetic paper in the 11-plus exams containing questions in both, they are incredulous.

People are just as incredulous when I point out that an Act of Parliament in 1897 made the optional use of metric units in Britain legal for all trade purposes, so that for almost a century the two systems co-existed in perfect harmony. Indeed, the very reason why that has been generally forgotten is precisely because there was never any difficulty! Even when persuaded that all the conflict and confusion is caused by this attempt within the last few years to impose a metric monopoly, people still seem to feel that life would be easier and safer if we all used the same system. Are we losing the habit of liberty?

Blind Assurance

I try to explain, for instance, that surveyors will always use imperial for the simple fact that a calculation of area to the nearest whole square foot is accurate enough whereas to the nearest square metre it is not - so it has to go into decimals - and that in many other occupations the ease of factorising in imperial measurements is preferred to wrestling with huge numbers of 'mm', 'ml', 'mg', etc. The blind assurance is still maintained that after a few years everybody will get used to dealing exclusively in metric, so long as in the meanwhile we are all compelled to do so.

If I finally remind the metrically-inclined that modern technology is entirely based on computer mathematics which derives from binary arithmetic which is compatible

with duo-decimal but incompatible with decimal, or that music is based on timings in threes or fours but never fives or tens - and that, for those two reasons alone, customary measures can never be eliminated....all that's too remote to think about!

Does this need for uniformity reflect a sense of insecurity resulting from sixty years of post-war socialism? Has the ever-expanding State succeeded in subjugating the masses? Is wide-spread susceptibility to the EU not so much acquiescence in its propaganda as rather a hankering after continental comfort, arising from a collapse in national confidence - the fear of 'isolation' that Euro-fans are forever playing on - the same 'isolation' shared by hundreds of other independent countries? So we hear that "The UK is alone in an imperial desert. The rest of the world has gone metric, except for Liberia - oh yes, and the USA, but they'll convert soon". The fact that the new Far Eastern super-powers and most of the Third World happily trade in both systems, according to the dictates of the market-place, is regarded as an irritating distraction.

Whether prohibition of imperial measures merely for display as extra information would be enforceable is not the immediate issue. Beyond the protection of imperial measures, our growing worry is that freedom of choice is no longer considered worth fighting for. Without wanting to defend tyranny - of course not - people will just let their freedoms slip away.

Vivian Linacre is President of the British Weights and Measures Association.

How to back the Better Off Out campaign

Better Off Out campaign: Those wishing to support the CIB campaign for Parliament to legislate for the UK to leave the European Union can obtain petition forms from the CIB office, 81 Ashmole Street, London SW8 1NF .

LETTERS

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

UKIP will not step aside

Dear Sir,

In your front page article of the 12th May you again make the periodic plea for UKIP not to stand against some Tory MPs. You cite Philip Davies because he, and apparently eight other Tory MPs, have said Britain should leave the European Union. Mr Davies won his seat on a Tory manifesto saying that Britain should stay a committed member of the EU. If he fights next time around we can assume he will fight under a similar manifesto pledge, unless of course Mr Cameron dramatically changes tack, which is unlikely. Mr Davies and his colleagues hold their seats on a false premise, and are likely to fight again dishonestly under similar conditions; whereas no UKIP candidate would, or will be, selected if they thought that EU membership was a good idea. Anyone voting UKIP will know exactly what they are getting, which is sadly never the case with the Tories. Mr Philips and his colleagues are just lobby-fodder, and their anti-EU stand will be tolerated by Mr Cameron as a useful safety-valve and a cynical means of retaining the votes of some Tory eurosceptics.

UKIP is a proper political party with a full range of policies. We have no intention of standing down against anyone. If Mr Davies and his anti-EU colleagues can reconcile their consciences with representing a party whose most fundamental policy they disagree with then that is a matter for them, not UKIP. You would not expect the Labour or Liberal Democratic parties to stand down against a Tory because some aspect of their candidates views seem to coincide, so don't expect UKIP to do so either.

GERARD BATTEN MEP

London

Immigration Concerns

Dear Sir,

You are quite right to worry about the new wave of migration that will come as a result of Bulgaria and Romania

joining the EU (lead article 26th May). When the European Parliament voted on the accession of ten new member states in 2003 the then three UKIP MEPs were the only ones from the UK to oppose. With 300,000 Poles having since arrived we feel that we made the right decision.

In a recent debate on Bulgaria and Romania I provided the same opposition to an open border immigration policy to the whole of Eastern Europe. For the first time I was openly jeered and heckled by Conservative MEPs. Indeed Geoffrey Van Orden MEP, a supposed eurosceptic, has said that there are 'no limits' to EU expansion.

I wonder whether Frederick Forsyth might offer an explanation?

NIGEL FARAGE MEP

Kent

Literary Contortions?

Dear Sir,

Frederick Forsyth (letters, 12th May) seems not to have thought through the consequences of his scenario of 58 'rock-solid-on-the-EU MPs' possibly bringing down Blair (though not necessarily Labour).

David Cameron is the Tories' fifth stab in less than ten years at finding an 'appealing' leader so they can expect to be stuck with him for some while to come. Yet a large contingent of EU-sceptic MPs would make the Tories as divided and hence ineffective as never before. Except it wouldn't, for they are as desperate for power now as Labour was ten years ago. Once in government, ranks would close and 'Europe' would cease to be an issue; at the following general election BOO candidates would be lucky to make any list in the top half of the alphabet.

Also, there is no evidence to suggest that big business, the Tories' principal paymaster, countenances Britain leaving the EU. Why should it, when it can sup at the top table in Brussels and calmly pass on the cost of the rules it helps draft? Even the FSB, whose members may suffer most from these rules, seems uninterested in a life

outside the EU.

The dismal non-achievements of cross-party and pressure groups suggest that we will only get out of the EU when enough people vote for a party that is crystal clear on the issue. Similarly, the idea that the demise of UKIP, the inevitable consequence of giving Tory candidates a clear run, will hasten our exit from the EU by even one day, is pure self-delusion.

Sadly the Tories still show no inclination to put country before party as the literary contortions of their best-seller writing champion show only too clearly.

TONY STONE

Surrey

Don't overlook the DUP

Dear Sir,

In your otherwise excellent journal, you state that eight MPs support Better Off Out.

Surely this ignores the quiet yet consistent support given by the Democratic Unionist Party to the territorial integrity and independence of the UK and against foreign erosion of our sovereignty. Given the very small beginnings of Better Off Out, such an accession of strength and numbers would surely be welcome?

G. F. MAIN

Sussex

The Pantomime Continues

Dear Sir,

Despite allowing me to emphasise the key failings in the present voting system to one of the members of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs before they went into secret session (see *eurofacts* for the 26th May) I was issued, the next day, with the following result:

"Proposal by Mr Booth and Mr Zelezny: no follow up."

So, as I guessed, a prompt lunch takes priority over accuracy.

GRAHAM BOOTH MEP

Devon

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **21st June 2006**, 6.00 pm

“The Decline and Fall of the British Empire”

In 1945, the imperial possessions of Great Britain circled the globe; in 2005, there was virtually nothing left.

Was Great Britain forced out by the colonial peoples, was she encouraged to leave by the US or the United Nations, did economic decline make withdrawal almost inevitable, or did the British people lose the ‘will to empire’?

Professor Kathleen Burk, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **28th June**, 7.00 pm

Frederick Forsyth, *Author and political commentator*

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)

United Kingdom Independence Party
South Manchester Branch
0161 485 3818

Tuesday **11th July**, 8.00 pm

“Honesty in Politics”

Delroy Young, *National Executive Committee Member, UKIP*

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

Swinton Circle
0208 691 7495

Tuesday **18th July**, 7.00 pm

Meeting and Summer Buffet

Douglas Carswell MP, *Conservative*

PUBLIC MEETING & SUMMER BUFFET
Parliament Room, The Clarence, 53 Whitehall, London SW1
Admission by ticket £15
(includes buffet and wine)

Campaign for an Independent Britain
Dorset Branch
01300 341788

Friday **8th September**, 7.30 pm

“Does membership of the EU benefit the United Kingdom”

Roger Helmer MEP, *Conservative, East Midlands*

Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP, *Conservative, West Dorset*

PUBLIC MEETING
Town Hall Corn Exchange, High East Street, Dorchester DT1 1HF
Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

2006

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

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

2007

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

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

2008

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

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020 7219 3000

Tuesday **13th June 2006**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Management and Audit of EC Expenditure and Accounts* from Mr Ashley Mote MEP.

Tuesday **13th June 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Further Enlargement of the EU* from Lord Ashdown of Norton-sub-Hamdon.

Wednesday **14th June 2006**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *The meeting of the Ministers of the Interior of the G6* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **14th June 2006**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *EU Strategy on Biofuels* from;

a) Mrs Clare Wenner, Head of Transport Biofuels, Mr Graham Meeks, Head of Fuels and Heat, UK Renewable Energy Association;
b) Mr Chris Hunt, Director-General, Mr Richard Wheatley, BPOil UK Ltd; and Mr John Lynn, Chevron Texaco Ltd Environment - UK Petroleum Industry Association.

afternoon session, 2.40 pm
a) witnesses to be confirmed.
b) Mr Thomas Gameson, Abengoa; and further witnesses to be confirmed..

Wednesday **14th June 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The Criminal Law Competence of the European Community* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **15th June 2006**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *Current Developments in European Defence* from Dr Sarah Beaver, Mr Andrew Mathewson, Ministry of Defence.

Tuesday **20th June 2006**, 14.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The 2007 EC Budget* from Mr Ed Balls, Economic Secretary to HM Treasury.

Wednesday **21st June 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The Criminal Law Competence of the European Community* from Mr Gerry Sutcliffe MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Home Office.

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

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 usefull 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 413006