

## Temperature is rising in the EU justice debate

*The proposed abolition of qualified majority voting in Home and Justice Affairs represents a major erosion of national sovereignty*

Political crises have a way of coming out of the blue, but there can be no doubt about the development most likely to bring about the next EU crisis: it is the attempt by the Commission to get member states to scrap their vetoes in the field of justice and home affairs. For many months the Commission has been ramping up pressure on national governments to switch key policing and crime fighting powers to EU decision-making procedures, cynically exploiting last July's terror attacks in London and paedophile murders in Belgium in order to achieve its goal.

### Dynamic Action

*"The case for deeper and more dynamic European action is clear", José Manuel Barroso, the Commission President recently told the European Parliament. "We should not wait for the next tragedy in order to advance European integration in these areas; we must act now to prevent it."*

It is now clear that the Finnish presidency, which began on the 1st July has succumbed to the pressures from Brussels. On the 5th July the Finnish prime minister, Matti Vanhanen announced that "citizens expect efficient action from the EU in combating terrorism... We can make things more efficient if member states are prepared to move to qualified majority voting and to communitarisation."

A package of integrationist measures

in the area of home affairs and justice including a proposal that these may be resolved through the use of QMV will be put to a meeting of justice ministers in September and the EU Council will be asked to make a decision in December.

This development follows directly from a decision taken by the European Council in the Finnish city of Tampere in 1999. On that occasion ministers agreed to adopt a five year action programme with the aim of creating an "area of freedom, security and justice" covering civil and criminal justice, visas, asylum and immigration, and police and customs cooperation. Even when measured against the British Government's own stated intentions this should have been a step too far. An "area of freedom, security and justice" may sound unexceptional, but it inevitably confers the notion of a unitary state separate and distinct from its members, and this, one suspects, is its underlying purpose.

### Further Integration

In a recent EU "Communication" the Commission claims that substantial progress has been made under the Tampere programme since 1999 and says that further integration must now occur in the area of Justice and Home Affairs in the interests of "efficiency". Extraordinarily, however, the Commission's document offers no evaluation of the practical benefits achieved so far as the result of the

programme. Nor does it describe the practical benefits of the measures which it now proposes to introduce over the next five years - all of which is pointed out by the House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee in a report\* published on the 22nd July of this year. So we have no way of knowing whether the measures so far adopted have improved or reduced efficiency, and no means of assessing the impact of the proposed measures since we are not told, except in the vaguest possible terms, what this is intended to be.

The EU Scrutiny Committee urges member states not to sign up to the programme, which, it rightly says, concerns policies which lie at the core of national sovereignty, at least until these omissions have been repaired.

### Reliance on QMV

"We believe it bodes ill for the future if, on such matters, the Commission envisage reliance on qualified majority voting to impose on Member states legislation to which they are opposed", it states.

The Committee also criticises the Commission for:

- Encouraging the notion that the area of freedom, security and justice is a unitary state and also for leading new members to suppose that this is the only way to achieve the level of security to which they aspire.

**Continued on P.2**

**INSIDE: Britain most distrustful of EU p.2 - Bill Cash outwits the Tory whips p.3 - Chance to re-brand the EU p.3 - Constitution that will not die p.3 - Selling the (non-EU) dream p.4 - Defence budget p.5 - EP to have television channel p.6 - BBC accepts £100 million loan from EU bank p.6 - Football can't help build the EU p.7 - Lost in translation? p.8 - Ministers can't find example of subsidiarity working p.8**

# Britain more distrustful of the EU than any other country

The British have far less trust in the institutions of the European Union than any other member state, according to the Eurobarometer, the EU's own survey of opinion published earlier this month. Only 31 per cent trust the European Parliament, 28 per cent trust the European Commission and 26 per cent trust the European Council. In France exactly half the population trust the European Parliament while 44 per cent trust the Commission and 38 per cent trust the European Council. Overall the European Council is the least trusted EU institution with 43 per cent of those in the EU '25' expressing trust in it.

Generally speaking those countries with governments that are widely regarded as weak and corrupt have the highest opinion of EU institutions - perhaps because their citizens take the

view that any government must be more trustworthy than their own. For example, 65 per cent of Italians trust the EP, 60 per cent trust the Commission and 56 per cent trust the European Council. Very similar figures were recorded by voters in Belgium and Greece. A relatively high level of trust in the institutions was also recorded in Ireland, perhaps because of the perception that it has done well out of the CAP and because the Irish economic miracle has broadly coincided with EU membership.

The survey also suggests that less than half the population supports the EU Constitution in seven countries: Estonia (47 per cent), Malta (46), Denmark (45), Finland (45), Austria (44), UK (42), and Sweden (39).

Asked whether EU membership was a good thing 55 per cent of those polled

in the EU '25' said it was. The highest level of support was to be found in Ireland (77 per cent), The Netherlands (74) and Spain (72). The lowest level of support was to be found in Austria (34), Latvia (37), Finland (39) and the UK (42).

On the issue of future enlargement it is clear that support for admitting new members is shrinking. Less than half of the citizens in the EU now support enlargement, the least enthusiastic being Austria (27 per cent), Luxembourg (27), Germany (28) and France (31). In Britain only 44 per cent back enlargement - despite the fact that the three biggest UK parties are all in favour.

Field research for the survey was carried out in April and May of this year.

## What makes them so sure?

*"The British...will have to be confronted in the end with the alternative of approving the Constitution or leaving the EU. And there are very few people on the Eurosceptic island who want the latter."* Editorial in the German newspaper *Handesblatt* quoted in *Open Europe Bulletin*, 16th June 2006.

Continued from P.1

## Temperature rises in EU justice debate

- Seeking to harmonise asylum policy beyond the establishment of reasonable common standards.
- Proposing the creation of a public prosecutor and a European Corps of Border Guards without reasonable justification.
- Seeking to expand Europol's powers so that it constitutes a European police force.
- Extending the Community's activities into crime prevention.

Despite the Committee's misgivings resistance to the Commission's proposals appears to come primarily from the German and Irish governments rather than the British government. The UK supports the extension of the Tampere programme for a further five years while maintaining the fiction that it consists purely of a set of practical measures

that must be judged on their merit. The German government believes that greater EU justice powers will clash with the prerogatives of its Länder, while Ireland has expressed concern about the legal basis for new EU data surveillance measures. It is true, of course, that the Irish and Germans were prepared to swallow these measures as part of the Constitution, but they are evidently not willing to do so now.

In the immediate aftermath of the French and Dutch rejections of the Constitution we feared that EU governments would introduce the measures contained in the Treaty furtively. The list of measures from the Treaty now being introduced is increasing, but all attempt at furtiveness has been abandoned; there is now an up-front in your face quality to the attempts to ram these measures

down our throats. None is likely to be more far-reaching than the JHA legislation that is likely to be introduced if the national veto is scrapped in this area.

Given a range of domestic political developments it is difficult to be sure how this issue will impact on the British debate, or how Gordon Brown, the Prime Minister-in-waiting will deal with it. But unless the Conservative Party raises its game on 'Europe' by finding ways to point out what is at stake it will surely destroy whatever residual loyalty eurosceptic members feel towards it.

*House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee, The EU's Justice and Home Affairs work programme for the next five years HC42-xxviii.*

# Bill Cash outwits the Tory whips - to the delight of eurosceptics

A small but possibly significant step in the struggle to regain Britain's national sovereignty occurred on the 15th May when Bill Cash succeeded in winning Tory support for an amendment to the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Bill. The impact of his suggested change would be to give Parliament the right to amend or reject EU legislation.

The amendment was predictably defeated in the House, but was supported by 136 Tory MPs and had the backing of the party whips.

Cash's amendment would have ensured that the supremacy of Parliament would override all EU legislation and would have required UK courts to comply with laws made at Westminster *even if inconsistent with EU law made under the European Communities Act of 1972*.

John Redwood MP, who supported Cash when the Bill was discussed in

the House, is quoted as saying: "*The significance of this amendment is that, for the first time, the opposition party stated we should be able to amend and choose which parts of European law to obey. In the past, we have done this by prior agreement and opt out*".

It also means that a Tory government is not committed to Blair's 1997 decision to sign the EU social chapter, Redwood added.

Does the backing of the Tory whips mean that Cash's amendment is now official party policy and that the Party will commit itself to amending the Bill in this way in its manifesto?

Alas, no. According to Fraser Nelson (*Spectator*, 8th July) the Conservative whips were out-manoeuvred by Cash and did not realise the implications of what he was proposing until it was too late. Cash and Redwood may regard their colleagues' support for their amendment as an historic moment, but

the whips, it seems, regard it as an historic cock-up.

As we go to press there is an attempt to achieve Tory support for the Cash amendment in the Lords.

If this is forthcoming, and is followed by further steps to press Cameron to support the amendment - or at the very least, to adopt a more robust and coherent European policy - Bill's coup could turn out to be more than a small step in the right direction.

Tory eurosceptics may also have been given heart by the Shadow Europe minister Graham Brady who is reported to have said that Britain could not remain a member if the EU continued to block free trade with other countries.

He told a seminar at the Social Market Foundation on the 6th June: "*Can Britain afford to remain in an EU that is pulling up the drawbridge? No we can't.*"

## Your chance to re-brand the EU

The EU Commission has launched a competition to find a new EU slogan and logo. The present slogan is "United in Diversity" and its now familiar logo, consisting of a ring of gold stars on a blue background, is supposed to represent "perfection, completeness and unity".

If you think that's amusing then you would also be amused by the advice being given to young designers who wish to enter the competition. These are to focus on the future and to concentrate on the EU's "pulling points" which according to Francis Gutman, head of the European

Parliament's public events department include "democracy" and "liberty".

The winning entries will be rolled out next year when the EU plans to spend 3.5 millions of taxpayers' money on celebrations to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome. The EU intends to use the occasion to 're-brand' the European project.

According to the *Sunday Telegraph* on the 2nd July Lord Tebbit has suggested the slogan is should be "Bigger but no Better" and the logo should be "a tall tower block with people being squashed out under it". Nigel Farage has suggested "Not

Forever" and urged that the logo should be the Hammer and Sickle to draw attention to the similarities between the EU and the Soviet Union.

*eurofacts* own preferred slogan is "Regulate and Die" and its suggested logo comprises a whistle-blower being attacked by angry commissioners. Readers are invited to submit their own suggestions to *eurofacts*. Since it seems unlikely that any of these will qualify for the cash prizes being offered by the EU we will reward the best combination of slogan and logo with a bottle of champagne.

## The Constitution that will not die

"It is likely that the Constitution will die less quickly than those who are now announcing its death.... A text ratified as such [a reference to the fact that the Constitution has been ratified by 15

members] is not dead. It is interesting that in a year we haven't seen any alternative proposal. One would have imagined that those hostile to this treaty ... would have proposed to

replace it with another. Nothing like that has happened."

Former French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing. *AFP* 10th July 2006.

# Selling the (non-EU) dream

*eurofacts* invited Mark Wallace of the Better Off Out Campaign to describe the campaign's goals and strategy

Many *eurofacts* readers will have heard of the new Better Off Out campaign, launched in Westminster just over two months ago. Since our launch, which featured an unprecedented nine Conservative MPs, we have brought a wide range of people together on an unequivocal platform of campaigning for British independence from the EU.

As a non-party campaign, we seek to provide a platform which is acceptable to people from across the political spectrum. A platform that one can join to express one's wish to leave the EU without reference to one's party credentials. The original nine MPs have since been joined by their first Labour counterpart to commit to leaving the EU, Austin Mitchell MP, as well as Conservative and UKIP MEPs and the English Democrats.

The campaign centres on a new, positive approach. Due to the flood of regulation and centralisation from Brussels, those of us opposed to the EU have for years had to fight negative campaigns, blocking new initiatives. As necessary as this has been, it has allowed our opponents to cast us in a negative light, as Little England villains trying to spoil someone else's dream. This is a powerful weapon for the pro-EU lobby, and is one we seek to overcome.

In addition to the many millions around Britain who already agree publicly that we ought to leave the EU, there are many more who sympathise but feel too afraid to speak out. Some of them fear that to do so would be to join a "fruitcake" fringe, whilst others are concerned that leaving might damage the economy, especially given the oft-repeated lie about 3 million jobs supposedly at risk. These people need reassurance, information and good examples to follow. As much as our

opponents might pretend otherwise, we have our own dream to sell.

This is why the campaign is committed to communicating the positive benefits of leaving the European Union. The waste and inefficiency of the EU have been extremely well-known in Britain for quite some time now. To dispel the fears I have mentioned we must also promote the real opportunities available to us as an independent nation, not just the negative factors we would escape from.

One such benefit lies in the trading opportunities that would become available. In a world where China and India are soon to dominate the global economy, EU protectionism is clearly not the way forward. The best way to survive future challenges is to meet them with enthusiasm, trading freely to our best advantage. This can only be done outside the European Union, which is committed to protection of her outdated industries at all costs.

## Lack of Free Trade

The recent prominence of the trade justice movement is accessible to us, too. There is a strong moral case for freeing our trade from EU restrictions. Not only would it enrich us, but it would provide much-needed, unsubsidised income to many millions in poor countries who currently suffer from the lack of free trade.

As well as fighting the battle of ideas, we must fight the battle of examples. The stereotyping of anti-EU views as extreme is another giant that must be slain. People need to be shown that they are not alone in thinking this way, and in fact that they are in the mainstream majority. This is why we have gained the support of prominent figures such as Ruth Lea, Tom Utley and former Speaker of the Commons

Lord Weatherill. The more we can demonstrate that the sky does not fall in on one's head by saying it, the more people will feel comfortable in agreeing that we are "Better Off Out".

To achieve our objectives, of course, we also need the support of ordinary people. The simplest thing they can do to help is to pledge their support at our web site [www.betteroffout.co.uk](http://www.betteroffout.co.uk)

Pledging your support does not mean leaving any organisation they may already belong to. Nor does it mean forgoing the political independence that so many in modern society enjoy, or compromising one's views: it is simply an unequivocal statement that one wishes to leave the EU, provided in their own words. We are keen to work together with as many organisations and people as possible—for example, the Campaign for an Independent Britain is kindly organising a Better Off Out petition.

If you have more time to give, then we are more than happy to provide you with leaflets, support and literature. Since the end of April activists have distributed almost a quarter of a million of our leaflets nationally, with an enthusiasm far outstripping even our expectations. Whether you would like to deliver some individually, or with a group of like-minded people, we will be more than happy to help. You can either get in touch with us through the web site, or write to Better Off Out, PO Box 2820, Bridgnorth, Shropshire, WV16 6YR.

Our nation has a lot to gain from leaving the EU. If we can persuade Britain to overcome her fears, and the scare stories of the Little Europeans, then we can take our place as a truly outward-looking trading nation.

*Mark Wallace is the Campaign Manager of Better Off Out*  
[www.betteroffout.co.uk](http://www.betteroffout.co.uk)

*The next issue of eurofacts will be published on the 8th September 2006.*

*We wish our readers a restful summer break.*

# Defence budget: all the money has gone on Blair's EU fantasy army

*Richard North outlines the sorry tale of New Labour's experiment in European defence integration*

It is no exaggeration to say that "Europe" is costing the lives of British troops, leading more or less directly to them being killed by improvised roadside bombs in Iraq while patrolling in lightly armoured "Snatch" Land Rovers.

More specifically, it was Tony Blair's decision to offer further European defence integration to Jacques Chirac during the now infamous St. Malo Summit in December 1998 - some say as compensation for not being able to bring Britain into the euro.

In order to see how this chain of events is linked, however, we have to explore key aspects of the sorry tale of the New Labour experiment in European defence integration.

## Leading Role

The next major step after St. Malo was Blair's agreement at the Helsinki European Council in December 1999 to put into effect his pact with Chirac and create a European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF). This was to be an EU-led force able to deploy in 60 days and sustain for one year up to 60,000 personnel.

This was to be an air-mobile "expeditionary" force, complete with air assets and naval support and, with logistic and support personnel, would require many more times that number of personnel. With Britain taking a leading role, it would absorb much of the total strength of her shrinking armed forces, leaving only the rump of the Army and minimal air and sea assets outside this European framework. Even the proposed new aircraft carriers were pencilled in to form part of the ERRF.

Crucially, to fit the structure of the ERRF, Britain's armed forces - and especially the Army - would need to be almost completely restructured and equipped - a process that has led to the destruction of our traditional regiments so that the infantry units could be

harmonised with continental structures as air-mobile, medium all-arms brigades.

As to the equipment, the heavy tanks and tracked infantry combat vehicles which had been designed to fend off Warsaw Pact armour flooding across the German plains, would have to give way to medium-weight, multi-purpose wheeled armoured vehicles, which were to form the spearhead of the ERRF.

It was here, however, that things started to go badly wrong. Imbued with Mr Blair's enthusiasm for European defence integration, the Ministry of Defence (MoD) set about looking for a European solution for its armoured vehicle needs. This led to Germany and then the Netherlands in a tri-nation venture called the Multi-Role Armoured Vehicle (MRAV), later named "Boxer".

However, by June 2003, it had become apparent that the vehicle produced, at 31 tons weight, would be too heavy for the RAF's fleet of C-130 transport aircraft. The UK thus pulled out of the project, losing at least £48 million.

## Ambitious Plans

By this time, the MoD had more ambitious plans for its ERRF component and was working on a high-tech way of integrating the latest in communications and sensor technology into fighting vehicles to produce what it dubbed the Future Rapid Effects System (FRES).

Now partnered with Sweden, the MoD sought to develop an innovative new platform for the system which was initially costed at £6 billion but very rapidly escalated to £14 billion. It has become the largest single re-equipment programme ever undertaken for the Army - a programme which still has not got off the ground.

Meanwhile, of course, Blair had committed troops to the Balkans, to

Sierra Leone, to Afghanistan and to Iraq, where fighting was of the low-tech variety. Campaigns had degenerated into low-grade counter-insurgency operations, where the enemy weapons of choice were the improvised bomb, the RPG-7 hand-held anti-tank weapon and the Kalashnikov assault rifle.

But this did not stop or even slow down the mad Blairite experiment in European integration. Working to a "shopping list" of requirements for the ERRF, known as the European Capacities Action Plan (ECAP), the MoD poured billions into equipment, most of it European-made or designed, all dedicated to bringing the fantasy army into existence.

## State of the Art

Nothing was too much or too expensive, from French designed air-launched cruise missiles for the Eurofighter, at a million pounds each - six times the cost of the US equivalent - to German built state-of-the-art counter-battery radar sets at nearly twice the price of US-built equivalents, and a complete new fleet of Austrian built army lorries, at nearly £1.5 billion.

Amongst the first of the new equipment off the production line, however, was an armoured 4x4 "command and liaison" vehicle called the Panther, a "battlefield limousine" for image-conscious officers of the new European Army, 401 vehicles at £166 million, a mere snip at £413,000 each.

Italian-built, the MoD went to great pains to conceal their origin. But these vehicles typify the European experiment. Useless for anything else but their designated function, they were chosen in preference to a cheaper, better protected vehicle called the RG-31, produced by a British-owned South African company. This could not only

**Continued on P.6**

# European Parliament to have its own television channel - but who will watch?

Every EU Parliamentary session is poorly attended - despite the inducement of a daily attendance allowance. It is not difficult to work out why: the fact that important decisions are made elsewhere combined with the stultifying effect of simultaneous translation makes debates as riveting as watching paint dry. This, however, has not stopped the EP from approving a million euros pilot project to run its own web-based television channel - in the apparent belief that there is a large potential audience just clamouring to watch MEPs make speeches.

If the scheme is deemed a success costs are expected to jump to 7-9 million in 2007-9.

Just how remote MEPs are from the

real world is revealed by an EU budget committee report which predicts that the project "*matches changing social patterns, with many Europeans, particularly the young, looking increasingly to the internet for news and information*".

A Dutch liberal MP Jan Mulder who supported the scheme is reported as saying that a web TV station could correct 'rhetoric' which portrayed the CAP as 'devilish'.

In addition to screening parliamentary debates the channel will also carry reports, interviews and summaries. The idea that the EP should make programmes about itself at the expense of the taxpayer smacks of totalitarianism and would be deeply worrying if the scheme were not so

obviously doomed.

Aware of possible criticisms the EP has set up a panel comprising its president and vice presidents to act as a watchbody to ensure "*editorial independence and adequate political oversight*" - a step which is bound to make the programme output even more tedious than it would otherwise be.

In the the 11th July parliamentary debate which approved the project a welcome note of realism was struck by Valdis Dombrovskis a centre-right MEP from Latvia:

*"I have asked people during the last month: how many hours have you watched web-TV? Almost nobody watched. Who will watch us?"*

## BBC accepts £100 million loan from EU bank

The BBC - the biggest barrier to a fuller public understanding of the costs of EU membership - has disclosed that it has successfully applied for a £100 million loan from an EU bank which exists to promote European political integration. The money, £25 million of which has already been received, comes from the

European Investment Bank in Luxembourg. The EIB, created in 1957 by the Treaty of Rome, declares that its mission is to "finance capital investment furthering European integration by promoting EU policies"

Mark Thompson, the BBC Director-General has denied that the loan carries any editorial obligations but the

Conservative eurosceptic MP Philip Davies has pointed out that it is bound to raise questions about the BBC's impartiality. Such suspicions are also strengthened by the fact that the EU regularly funds television programmes which are judged to be helpful to the European project through its PR budget.

Continued from P.5

## Defence: all the money has gone

have carried out the Panther functions but also served as an excellent patrol vehicle.

Back in Iraq and then in Afghanistan the local sentiment was turning against the occupation and troops were finding that their unarmoured Land Rovers provided inadequate protection against the weapons being used against them. The call went out for more armoured vehicles, but there were no luxuries such as £413,000 Panthers for the real army.

Stores were raided in Belfast and a batch of 200 surplus-to-requirements lightly armoured "Snatch" Land Rovers was assembled and shipped out to Basra. Battered and distinctly second hand, not even modified for the

desert heat that they would encounter, when they were not breaking down, these woefully inadequate vehicles - worth less than £50,000 new - became the front line equipment for troops engaged with increasingly vicious insurgents.

And, since their introduction in November 2003, more than a quarter of all British battlefield deaths have arisen from attacks on these Land Rovers.

As recently as last week, the newly appointed Secretary of State, Des Brown, admitted that there was a "capability gap" in Iraq and Afghanistan, with the lack of a suitable medium armoured vehicle.

American forces, on the other hand,

have been buying RG-31s, the Canadians have bought RG-31s for their operations in Afghanistan, the Germans have a similar vehicle there and the Australians have their mine protected "Bushmasters". Uniquely, though, the MoD claims that its Land Rovers, built for the streets of Belfast, give the "protection and mobility needed".

Of course, the MoD must argue this way. It has nothing left for new equipment for the real army. All the money has been spent on Blair's fantasy European army.

*Richard North is Co-editor of EU Referendum: [www.eureferendum.blogspot.com](http://www.eureferendum.blogspot.com)*

# Football may enthral millions - but it can't help build the European Union

*Hector Boffey, eurofacts' soccer correspondent reflects on the political dimension of the World Cup*

According to Romano Prodi, this summer's World Cup was a great victory for 'Europe' because all four semi-finalists were EU members.

The competition was of course no more a victory for 'Europe' than the previous competitions in which Brazil emerged triumphant were defeats for 'Europe'. 'Europe' wasn't playing: the former EU Commission President was merely trying to establish a spurious connection in the public mind between a tarnished political project and the world's most popular and most rapidly expanding sport.

Other europhiles have tried to make similar connections. A recent book, *The United States of Europe: The new Superpower and the end of American Supremacy* by T.R. Reid, an ardent American europhile, attributes truly amazing powers to football in the creation of a European consciousness. Reid quotes a young Frenchman he met during his researches who told him: *"Football brings millions and millions of us together. I myself have travelled to, let's see, nine countries. Football is Europe, don't you see. If I meet someone from England, or Norway, or Spain, I just say, 'David Beckham' and we immediately have something we share"*.

## Similar Response

Given his celebrity status no doubt the name Beckham would have evoked a similar response in Taiwan, Rio, or a colony of penguins in South Antarctic. And presumably 'Pele' or 'Maradona' would have evoked a similar if not equal response, although neither are Europeans. Whatever football is it isn't 'Europe'.

Still more hilariously, Reid refers to a conversation between the Queen and President Chirac about the best possible treatment for the minor foot injury suffered by Beckham prior to the 2002 World Cup (the Queen's prescription was massage therapy) in

the apparent belief that the French President would have shared Her Majesty's ardent wish for a speedy recovery for England's then star player.

Although most of the final matches of the 2006 World Cup were a disappointment there is no doubt about the ability of 'the beautiful game' to enthral and to grip the imaginations of millions. Nor is there any denying that the game can have far-reaching political and economic consequences. The so-called "Soccer Wars" between El Salvador and Honduras began over a football match. Harold Wilson reckoned that England's victory in 1966 helped him in the polls. The French press reports that de Villepin's tottering administration would be assisted by a World Cup triumph while Mrs Merkel's advisers apparently believed that given Germany's poor recent form even a lengthy run in the competition would be sufficient to lift flagging public support for the German Chancellor. Economists have suggested that a win in the World Cup can deliver an increase of up to 0.7 per cent to a nation's GDP.

## Abiding Memory

However, football is not the kind of human activity that is capable of creating international togetherness. The Olympic Games ends in a party atmosphere and a sense of shared endeavour, the recollection of which remains throughout the lives of the participants and spectators. Football isn't like that. It's not just that highly organised policing is necessary to prevent widespread violence amongst the fans (this time, thanks to highly effective policing the arrests ran to mere hundreds) but that as in warfare, with which football shares a number of characteristics, coming second is no fun. Whereas the Olympic runner-up can mount the rostrum to claim his silver medal with pride before jogging off to join the celebrations, the abiding

memory of the defeated finalists in an international football tournament is one of humiliation, despair and tears. Jimmy Greaves, the former England, Chelsea and Tottenham player once remarked: *"People think that football is all about triumph and glory. It's mostly about pain, humiliation and failure"*. The England team members are well qualified to vouch for the truth of his insight.

## Obvious Reasons

For obvious historical reasons Germany has always avoided being rude about others on racial or national grounds. But from the opening rounds of this year's World Cup competition the German tabloid press displayed a tub-thumping nationalism and xenophobia. The daily *Bild Zeitung*, for example, described the Italian team as a "bunch of oily mamma's boys" - only to find that this particular bunch of "oily mamma's boys" soundly beat the German side two days later. There were similarly rude remarks about other teams. The loss of this particular German inhibition now appears to have spread beyond sport. On the same day as Germany took on Italy in the World Cup Lech Kaczynski the Polish president cancelled a meeting with members of the German government after *Die Tageszeitung (Taz)*, Germany's leading leftwing paper referred to him as a potato.

Whatever its faults and virtues international football is incapable of assisting the construction of the European project. Indeed, in as far as it demonstrates the importance of national sentiment and consanguinity it is far more likely to do the opposite. This can be shown by posing a simple question. If Australia had not been cheated out of a place in the fourth round by Italy, and had gone on to play against France in the Final, which side would most British fans have supported?

# Lost in translation? Muddles and mix-ups in EP likely to grow

The affairs of the European Union are currently carried on in 20 different languages - but this number will grow to 21 when Gaelic becomes an official EU language on the 1st January next year. It will grow by a further two when Romania and Bulgaria join, and will increase further if Catalonia achieves its ambition to have Catalan recognised as an official language.

On the 4th July by a majority of one the vice presidents in the European Parliament's so-called "bureau" voted in favour of allowing EU citizens speaking Catalan, Basque or Galician to communicate with the EU Parliament in their own language. This decision will almost certainly encourage Catalans in their bid to achieve full official status for their language.

More than 10 million people speak Catalan which has equal status with

Castilian not only in Catalonia itself but also in the Balearic Islands and Valencia. It is the language used in all Catalan schools and public authorities with the result that the total number using the language on a regular basis is steadily growing. It is also the language of the mini-state of Andora.

Galician is spoken by 3-4 million people in Spain's north-western region.

By contrast Irish is spoken by only 1,670,000 out of a population of 3,750,000. It will be the first official language that is not the most widely spoken in any state.

According to the EU's English language website, the cost of multilingualism is 1.123 billion, which is 1 per cent of the annual general budget of the EU. The cost of declaring Gaelic an official language will be 3.5 million.

EU institutions currently require around 2,000 written-text translators

while the European Parliament requires some 60 interpreters to help elected politicians from the 25 member states understand each other.

This task is clearly becoming more difficult as the number of official languages increases. The comic misunderstandings that arise from the problems of simultaneous translation have become part of Brussels lore.

Earlier this year the system came to a sudden halt when a British MEP described the EU Constitution as 'gobbledygook' - a word for which there is no equivalent in several EU languages.

On one occasion, during an agricultural working group session, "frozen semen" was translated into French as "frozen seamen" while on another occasion "out of sight, out of mind" became "invisible lunatic" as the result of a computer-aided translation.

## Ministers can't find a single example of subsidiarity in action

What powers have been returned from Brussels to the nation state under the subsidiarity principle established in the Maastricht treaty? We have never been able to find a single such example. But politics being what it is, we assumed that, if pressed on the issue, the government could in some strictly unimportant or trivial matter make a half-credible case that in certain circumstances a smidgen of power had been transferred back to Westminster. But the only interpretation of the extraordinarily evasive reply from the Government to a written question from the redoubtable Lord Stoddard of Swindon makes it plain that even a response of that kind cannot credibly be advanced. The answer to the question, When has the principle of subsidiarity been successfully evoked to effect a return

of powers from the EU to the Parliament of the UK? is quite simply never. The full exchange is published below:

**Lord Stoddard of Swindon asked Her Majesty's Government:** Further to the reply by the Lord Triesman on the 6th June (Official Report, cols. 1131-32), whether they will give details of powers which have passed from the United Kingdom to the European Union and those which have passed back since the implementation of the Treaty on the European Union (the Maastricht Treaty) which introduced the concept of subsidiarity. [HL6270].

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Lord Triesman):** Changes to the EU's

competences since the Treaty of Maastricht were made in the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) and the Treaty of Nice (2001). The Government submitted explanatory memorandums to Parliament on these treaties (Amsterdam Cm 5090 and Nice Cm 3780) summarising their contents.

The principle of subsidiarity ensures that, "In areas which do not fall within its exclusive competence, the Community shall take action...only if and in so far as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States and can therefore, by reason of the scale or effects of the proposed action, be better achieved by the Community".

This principle has been applied in our discussions both with the European Commission and with other member states.

# LETTERS

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

## UKIP's Only Objective

Dear Sir,  
Roger Wilson (letter 7th July) is an ardent supporter of UKIP and so am I. His letter is typical of the principled, unswerving 'let's go down fighting' attitude of so many of our splendid UKIP members. He doesn't expect to form a Government at the next General Election but would like to see one or two UKIP MPs. It's simply not going to happen under the FPTP Westminster system.

Look at Bromley. UKIP had everything going for it. A brilliant attacking candidate who also lives locally, bags of money lavished on a well supported campaign and Tory dissatisfaction with its Europhile candidate. It got us 2,347 votes (8 per cent). We are not a Westminster Party and the fact that for the first time we also put forward other policies - low taxes, immigration control etc.- did us no good either.

We are a pressure group with electoral teeth and whereas Euro-elections are tailor-made for us we can really only act as spoilers in Westminster elections. A few hundred more votes in Bromley and we might have 'lost' the Tories a safe seat - an unignorable blow to their high command.

As it is, we are now seeing the pro and anti-EU factions in the Tory Party getting more outspoken by the day and not just about the EPP issue - thanks to the efforts of UKIP and others over the years. So maybe the next game in town will be a Tory split on 'Europe' with consequences very exploitable by the withdrawalist cause.

What UKIP now has to do is come out of its current leadership election united and geared up to play the political games ahead to achieve its one and only objective.

SIR GEORGE EARLE  
Devon

## Back to the Drawing Board?

Dear Sir,  
Your last letters page was full of the

long-running argument between UKIP and the Tories. While it is a fact that David Cameron's silence on the EU leads eurosceptics to harbour the gravest misgivings about him, UKIP's showing in the Bromley by-election was none the less a disaster. The party spent unprecedented sums of money, put forward its de facto leader as candidate in his home territory, yet received only just over 2,000 votes.

After thirteen years of existence, this must give even UKIP fanatics cause for concern. UKIP won only a single seat in the local elections this year, (the BNP did much better on a similar platform), and has never won a by-election or a parliamentary seat. Its real purpose now seems to be to keep a lot of MEPs in the European Parliament.

The truth is that, given its reputation as "the BNP in blazers" or "the anti-immigrant party", given its intellectual vacuum, and given the extremely poor quality of its MEPs, educated or respectable voters choose to ignore it.

Perhaps it is time to return to the drawing board.

Dr ALAN SKED  
London

## Tory Failures

Dear Sir,  
Thank goodness for some common sense from Roger Wilson in the UKIP/Conservative voting debate (letters 7th July).

It never ceases to amaze me how the apologists for the Conservative Party, some of them high profile, queue up to slate UKIP as a 'wasted vote' and plead with everyone to vote Tory, to stop Labour getting in again. The huge flaw in this argument, which they seem quite incapable of grasping, is: what difference would it make to the cause of extracting Britain from the EU, if the Conservative Party was elected to Government again? Answer: No difference at all.

While the Tories remain committed to the dogma of British membership of the EU in perpetuity and their leader continues to backtrack on previous commitments to EU-sceptic policies,

voting for them really is a wasted vote. Those who keep on apologising for the Conservative Party's abject failure to tackle the European Union membership issue and telling us things will get better if only we will keep voting for them are, in my view, propping up the whole crumbling edifice and actually preventing any serious change in policy.

In regard to the nine Tories who have committed to the 'Better Off Out' campaign, their influence over Party policy will be at best minimal, not least because David Cameron has said he will not have such people in his Shadow Cabinet. Furthermore, I should like to know how many of the nine actually believe in British withdrawal. Is it cynical of me to think that at least some of them might be jumping on the bandwagon in order to give themselves a better chance of being re-elected, knowing full well that they will never actually have to do anything about getting Britain out?

STUART GULLEFORD  
Essex

## Mistaken Strategy?

Dear Sir  
I am perplexed that Roger Wilson chides me for telling people that it is awful to vote UK Independence Party (Letter, 7th July).

He must have missed the words "good luck to Nigel Farage in that contest" in my letter! (June 23rd).

However there is a world of difference between UKIP trying to prevent a known europhile from entering Parliament (so nearly achieved in Bromley), and UKIP deliberately targeting known eurorealists who have publicly stated that we should leave the EU - a strategy which if successful could only ensure that all three major parties will always remain committed to staying in the EU.

Dr D R COOPER  
Berkshire

# LETTERS

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

## Economics of Migration

Dear Sir,

I welcome Lionel Bell's cogent reply (7th July) to my article on the economics of immigration of the previous issue.

I certainly agree that there is only 'one true market rate for labour which is the least [consumers] can get away with'. The point is that migration of labour reduces that market rate. But Mr Blair has said in his CBI speech in 2004 "*some [of those vacancies] are for unskilled jobs, which people living here are not prepared to do*".

It is this assumption by Mr Blair which encourages a helot class stuck in jobs which pay wages which no native worker will accept. If immigrants were not available, market rates for such labour would have to rise until native workers accepted the jobs.

Lionel Bell also states that 'money can always be created for investment in profitable projects'. This somewhat Keynesian view assumes there is, therefore, no immediate constraint to capital formation. Certainly, if a new, potentially profitable, project appears investors will re-rank their re-assessment of projects and may divert some capital into this new venture. In addition, consumers may decide to forego some consumption and add to investment. However, the arrival of a new profitable project does not increase the resources or factors in an economy (we are assuming they are all employed at equilibrium in a closed economy). Therefore, resources must be diverted from other investment or consumption.

What I am not clear about is whether Lionel Bell regards the arrival of migrant labour as a "profitable project"?

A classic statement on migration economics is put by the US National Academy of Sciences in 'The New Americans', a report commissioned by the US Congress and published in 1997 and constantly referred to.

*"If immigrants have exactly the same skill distribution as domestic workers*

*(the same fractions are skilled and unskilled workers) and if they have brought sufficient capital with them to maintain the US capital/labour ratio, then natives will neither benefit nor lose from immigration. In this case, all inputs and national output will increase by the same amount and the wages of all workers will remain constant."*

Obviously if they do not bring that capital with them and it is provided by natives, it must, therefore, be a diversion from natives' investment in increasing their own capital or from natives' consumption.

Fortunately we have estimates by the Economic Research Institute of the Dutch government showing that if capital is fixed, the arrival of an additional 5 per cent migratory workforce with exactly the same skill distribution as native labour only increases GDP as a whole by 2.9 per cent, thus reducing the GDP of natives [Note that this refers to production and not accumulated wealth].

Think of it another way. If money can always be found for profitable projects and capital equipment supply is not important, it would make no difference to the GDP of early America if the Pilgrim fathers had chucked all their resources of capital equipment overboard before landing. The world Zionist movement must also have been wasting its time raising billions for supplying capital for Israel over the last one hundred years.

ANTHONY SCHOLEFIELD  
London

## The EU Rules, OK!

As many *eurofacts* readers will know, EU Directives require the use of 'supplementary information' on packaging or labelling of products or produce to cease unless a derogation, (permission to continue using supplementary indications), is applied for by the government. This has not happened and the present government has set a date for ending the display of this information, which of course, is

normally expressed in traditional British imperial units. Therefore, from the 1st of January 2010 it will become illegal to display anything other than metric units.

On the 30th January 2006, John Gardner, Director of the British Weights and Measures Association wrote to Mr Sutcliffe at the Department for Trade and Industry asking if they could confirm that mention of the pint will be banned on milk bottles, non-returnable milk containers, and imported cartons of fruit juice based on the US pint. The DTI was also asked if imperial units such as the pound and half-pound would be banned on labels describing the contents of jars or containers of items such as coffee, jam, syrup, and preserves, etc. John Gardner also asked the DTI to provide the government's own view on the matter.

The DTI recently responded to the BWMA Director's letter as follows: The DTI will take no view or actions on supplementary indications until after the European Commission has decided what to do. The DTI will then hold a UK consultation on 'government proposals'. The letter was on grey paper with a dual DTI/Foreign Office letterhead.

So apparently there is liaison between the DTI and the Foreign Office on this matter. This surely indicates that the Foreign Office, via the DTI, will ensure that British industry and commerce comply with the European Union's Metrication Directives on and after the 1st January 2010.

Isn't it nice to know that the Labour Government and the Civil Service are working so purposely for their masters in Brussels to ensure elimination of our British way-of-life, culture, heritage, and history? Brussels rules; OK!

DEREK NORMAN  
Cambridgeshire

# MEETINGS

## 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**

## Conservative Party Fringe Meetings Bournemouth

Save Britain's Fish  
01224 313473

Tuesday **3rd October**, 6.30 pm

“Why sink the fishing policy”

**John Ashworth**, *Save Britain's Fish*

### PUBLIC MEETING

The Cliffside Hotel, East Overcliffe Drive, Bournemouth.

**Admission Free**

**Freedom Association**  
01746 861267

Tuesday **3rd October**, 1.00 pm

“Better Off Out Campaign”

**Philip Davies MP**  
**Daniel Hannan MEP**

**Roger Helmer MEP**

**Laura Midgley**, *Campaign Against Political Correctness*  
Chairman, **Mark Wallace**, *Campaign Manager, Better Off Out*

### PUBLIC MEETING

De Vere Suite, De Vere Royal Hotel, Bath Road, Bournemouth BH1

**Admission Free**

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **26th September, 2006**,  
6.00 pm

“The Civil Service and the Constitution”

Over fifty years ago, the Head of the Home Civil Service declared that civil servants would always remain good material for jokes, like mothers-in-law and Wigan pier. But of course the civil service plays a vital role in our system of government. Recent years have seen a spate of civil service reform - the so-called ‘Revolution in Whitehall’. What have been the main consequences of these reforms? Have they undermined the traditional non-partisanship of the civil service?

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

### PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

**Admission Free**

### FREE - Advertising Space

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

**eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65**  
**or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com**

**Australian Monarchist League**  
00 (02) 9327 4582

Friday - Sunday **27 - 29th October**

“The Queen, the Realms and Europe”

### Speakers to be announced

*The Rt Hon Lord Tebbit CH to address the Dinner on Friday 27th October*

### CONFERENCE

The Skempton Building, Imperial College, Kensington, London

**Admission £100 (2 day conference)**  
**(Opening Dinner plus £75)**

For further details contact Australian Monarchist League, PO Box 1068, Double Bay, NSW 1360 or by Email: secretary@monarchist.org.au

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
0151 426 1784

Friday **10th November**, 7.00 pm

**Speakers to include;**  
**Godfrey Bloom MEP, UKIP**

### NORTH WEST RALLY

Tower College, Rainhill, Merseyside L35

**Admission Free**

## DIARY OF EVENTS

### 2006

Liberal Democrats Party **16-21st Sept.**  
Annual Conference  
Brighton

Labour Party **24-28th September**  
Annual Conference  
Manchester

Conservative Party **1-4th October**  
Annual Conference  
Bournemouth

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

UK Parliamentary **9th October**  
Recess Ends

### 2007

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

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

Berlin Declaration on the Future of Europe **27th March**

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

**2008**  
France takes over EU presidency **1st January**

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

### 2009

European Parliamentary Elections **June**

**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.

**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.

**Corruption - The World's Big C**

Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures

by *Ian Senior*. **£12.50**

Senior shows how corruption in the EU is becoming worse and why the UK should not sign up to the proposed European Constitution.

**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](mailto:info@junepress.com)

**WEB SALES [www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)**

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

## euofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

**RATES**

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£16
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

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

I enclose my payment of £.....  
to *euofacts*: PO Box 119  
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Name .....

Address .....

Postcode .....

Date .....

*Please print clearly in capital letters*

FOR "EU"

<b>European Commission</b>	<b>020 7973 1992</b>
European Movement	020 7940 5252
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020 7735 4000</b>

AGAINST "EU"

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403 741736</b>
British Housewives League	020 8445 4848
<b>British Weights &amp; Measures Assoc.</b>	<b>020 8922 0089</b>
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071 663876
<b>CIB</b>	<b>020 8340 0314</b>
Democracy Movement	020 7491 3072
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>01746 861267</b>
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
<b>New Alliance</b>	<b>020 7386 1837</b>
Save Britain's Fish	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

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

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

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

## POLITICAL PARTIES

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>020 7222 9000</b>
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
<b>Democratic Party</b>	<b>01684 891700</b>
Mr Geoff Southall	
<b>Labour</b>	<b>08705 900 200</b>
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
<b>Liberal</b>	<b>01562 68361</b>
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	<b>020 7222 7999</b>
Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell MP	
<b>New Britain Party</b>	<b>020 7247 2524</b>
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
<b>UK Independence Party</b>	<b>0121 333 7737</b>
Roger Knapman MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

