

## The EU is an implacable enemy of the poor

*The policies of the EU are forcing Britain to confront some fundamental choices - but they also present the Tories with a golden opportunity*

Recent developments have brought home an important truth about the European Union: that it is the implacable enemy of the poor, both the poor at home as well as the most wretchedly poor in the world's most abject nations. The Doha round gave such nations hope by promising greater access to the agricultural markets of the developed world, but the EU, largely as the result of French intransigence, cruelly dashed those hopes. The French seem largely satisfied with this outcome (see page 5). It is absurd that hopes of reviving the talks should have to wait upon the next French Presidential election especially as there is no reason to be confident that the result will lead to conditions that are propitious to the revival of the negotiations. It is no less absurd that Britain, whose leader talks glibly about abolishing world poverty, should put European unity before the interests of the poor as well as Britain's own interests as a trading nation.

The immediate outcome of the breakdown of the WTO talks will be the growth of protectionism and the emergence of rival trade blocs. It is clear that this has given new impetus to the attempt to create a Pan-Asian trade bloc including countries with a combined population of 3.1 billion people - that is around half the world's population - and a combined GDP totalling US \$10 trillion. For as long as Britain remains both a member of the EU and a major trading nation it is difficult to believe this is a development which will suit Britain.

Meanwhile, our net contribution to the EU budget has grown to £6.1 billion - an increase of 20 per cent over 2004 and equivalent to £117 million a week or £17 million a day, as the recently published 2006 *Pink Book* reveals (a breakdown of the figures will appear in a subsequent issue of *eurofacts*).

All of this provides a golden opportunity for a Conservative Party which is desperate to recast its image. As Marian L Tuppy, an American trade analyst recently observed "*The repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 showed that unilateral trade liberalisation, in addition to making economic sense, was also a moral thing to do. The primary beneficiaries of trade liberalisation were the British poor who suffered under protective tariffs designed to benefit the wealthy landowners....the Conservative party has an opportunity to become a party of free trade and the champion of the poor*".

The Conservative Party also has an opportunity to stand up for Britain's own poor as almost unprecedented levels of immigration force down wages reportedly by as much as fifty per cent in the building industry - and breed resentment and potentially explosive tensions in Britain's cities.

A Tory leader who was alive to such opportunities could reshape the boundaries of what is politically possible if he declared:

*"Trade is the primary means by which poor nations can raise themselves from poverty. If I have to*

*choose between free trade and 'Europe' I will choose free trade.*

*If membership of the EU entails an immigration policy that forces down wage levels and destroys jobs in Britain I will put the interests of Britain's poor before the interests of the EU."*

For good measure he might continue: "*It is clear that EU membership forces upon us a number of other choices, however much we might like to pretend otherwise.*

*I have observed the failure to do anything about the 'democratic deficit' and I have decided that nothing can be done without recasting the entire European project; if forced to choose between democracy and the EU I will choose democracy.*

*For all its faults I believe that America remains a more valuable ally than 'Europe'; if forced to choose between them I choose America.*

*Having observed with sadness the illiberalism of the EU in all its guises I have come to recognise the threat it poses to individual liberties; if forced to choose between the EU and liberty, I unhesitatingly choose liberty.*

*I used to think such choices could be avoided. They can't. It has been the besetting sin of the modern Conservative Party to convince itself otherwise. It has been a form of self-delusion comparable in its scope to that which in the 1930s persuaded fashionable opinion to accept the case for appeasing Germany. Self-delusion can lead to self-destruction: it is time to face reality."*

**INSIDE: Spain heads for a housing crash p.2 - Immigration policy: shouldn't there be a role for analysis and principle? p.3 - France welcomes Doha breakdown p.5 - British voting power in EU to be further reduced p.5**

# Spain heads for a housing crash

*Gerald Frost extrapolates from his own experiences to reflect on the causes and consequences of Spain's runaway housing boom*

As I sit sipping a glass of chilled fino in the plaza major in the little Catalan town of St Feliu de Codines the tranquillity of the evening is fractured by the sound of builders - well, actually as it turns out, by three sets of builders. It is mid-August, the shops in the plaza are closed and most people are on holiday. But Spain is experiencing a housing boom and the building workers seem to have forgotten the meaning of the word manana.

True, the word figures prominently in the vocabulary of my builder, the man who we asked to carry out modest improvements to the house we bought outside St Feliu more than a year ago. He can be seen running between tasks, but he still hasn't finished the work he said would be completed months ago. This is hardly surprising: he turns up only after we arrive from London in order to be paid, and he disappears as soon as we leave. He explains that there is simply too much work, but he seems unwilling to turn new work down. Even when he is on the job he remains for only a short period before departing in a presumably vain attempt to please other customers. All estimates about completion dates turn out to be exercises in wish fulfilment, as indeed are his invoices (currently the subject of a heated dispute between us).

## Sound Investment

House prices in Spain have soared by 150 per cent since 1998 and house price inflation remains at 12 per cent (although the figure in Catalonia is still higher.) We liked to think that our Spanish house was a sound investment as well as an idyllic escape from London but the Bank of Spain has recently shattered our illusions. According to the Bank, house prices were overvalued by eight per cent to 20 per cent in mid-2002 and by 24 per cent to 35 per cent in 2004 - implying an over-valuation rate of at least 50 per

cent now.

The causes of the boom are not hard to find. When we inquired about a mortgage from a Spanish bank we were offered a loan at a rate of interest at not much more than half the current inflation rate i.e. at a negative real rate of interest. How ironic, I thought at the time, that about the only beneficiary of a one-size ECB interest rate that fits none should be the editor of *eurofacts*! Now, as I examine the various forecasts of an early end to the present boom, I realise that our investment may not have been as well-judged as I believed.

Among the major eurozone economies Spain has been the strongest performer, having grown for 11 years in a row with an average growth rate of 3.6 per cent compared to two per cent for the zone as a whole. But of course it can't go on. Some of the growth was due to Aznar's economic reforms, although much of it is accounted for by the construction sector and record levels of immigration (there were 650,000 legal immigrants to Spain in 2005 - many of them reckoned to be working in the 'black economy' on building sites).

## Public Protests

Booming house prices have resulted in public protests by young people who complain that they cannot afford to leave their parents to buy a place of their own until their mid-30s. The destabilising effect on the economy is likely to be equally profound. The boom has helped fuel a spending and borrowing binge with the result that Spanish household debt is more than 110 per cent of GDP and household saving has collapsed. The ECB calculates that next year Spain's current account deficit will reach 9 per cent of GDP - the highest in the world.

Even as I enjoy my fino and the warm Spanish sun it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Spain will soon be experiencing a major housing market

crash with all of its attendant miseries.

Most Spaniards are strongly pro-EU. They equate 'Europe' with modernity and, more remarkably, democracy. They have done extremely well out of the CAP and the Common Fisheries Policy and they have not bothered much about enforcing bothersome regulations. The mores of the country's politicians are such that they adapt to the Brussels scene far better than those from the UK. But a housing crash from which Spain would find it extremely difficult to extricate itself because of the constraints of eurozone membership would undeniably have a major impact on attitudes.

Maybe it will be the Spaniards rather than the Italians who will be the first to quit the eurozone - many Spaniards still calculate in pesetas, anyway, so there would be no problem of mental adjustment.

## Improving Effect

I contemplate explaining all of this to my builder in the hope that it might have an improving effect on his pattern of work. I rehearse the conversation we might have. *Look here, old boy, I would say, the good times can't last forever. You are most likely to survive during the hard times if you treat loyal customers with respect. So be a good chap and get on with the work on my kitchen. And no more unrealistic demands for bundles of euros - your country probably won't be trading in them much longer, anyway.*

On reflection I conclude that my words are unlikely to have the desired effect on this shrewd Catalan. He will simply decide to continue making hay while the sun shines - and for the time being the sun is still shining. In which case it will be a long time before he gets round to finishing my kitchen. So instead of preparing a lecture about the folly of Spain's entry into the eurozone I do the sensible thing. I order a second fino and another plate of tapas.

# Immigration policy: shouldn't there be a role for analysis and principle?

*On both immigration and EU issues public relations has replaced rational thought*

By Anthony Scholefield

EU membership and the issue of migration are, once again, topping the political agenda. With the accession of Bulgaria and Romania due on the 1st January 2007 they are likely to remain among the biggest issues in British politics, however much the major political parties may regret this.

It is often pointed out that the Home Office study, *"The Impact of EU Enlargement on Migration Flows"* of 2003 spectacularly misforecast the likely influx of workers from former Eastern and Central Europe as the result of EU enlargement in 2004. This estimated that the influx would be between 5,000 and 13,000 per annum. But it should be noted that the forecast was made before the decision of Germany and others not to let in immigrants from the new member states. The Home Office study in fact predicted that, in that case, migration from the Accession Eight (A8) to the UK could be between 12,000 and 82,000 a year and it drew attention to academic forecasts showing a range of possible migration figures to the EU-15 of between 100,000 and 260,000 a year. It also emphasised the draw of the English language as an important migration driver.

## Living Standards

Given that the population of Bulgaria and Romania is about 30 million and that their standard of living is 28 per cent of the EU-15 as against 45 per cent for the A8, is it now possible to estimate the number of likely migrants to the UK from Bulgaria and Romania?

The decision of the other major EU countries in the Spring to continue restrictions on the A8 for another three years means that they will not let in migrants from Romania and Bulgaria. The Blairite think tank, the IPPR, which the government has

commissioned to look at this, forecasts an inflow of 68,000 to the UK in the first year.

The twin issues of EU membership and migration share many characteristics and illuminate the dysfunctional nature of British politics. As Jeff Randall, the BBC's economics correspondent has remarked, modern British politics represents the triumph of public relations over rational thought. It is quite clear that the major parties have no idea of what the EU principle of 'freedom of movement' is likely to entail in practice. They have been protected from exposing their ignorance by the fact that little intra-EU migration took effect before 2004.

## Dogmatic Statements

All the major parties are in favour of the EU and immigration. All make dogmatic statements about the benefits without scruple or evidence. All refuse to consider impartial 'cost/benefit' analysis. All ignore the obvious losses to Britain's poorest people. All profess support for the 'free movement of labour' without understanding its implications. Incredibly, all, ultimately, favour a completely free movement of labour with Turkey without any analysis of the likely economic and social impact. All ignore an important truth: that very large-scale immigration means that the receiving economy begins to take on the characteristics of the country from which the immigrants have come. The National Research Council of the US National Academy of Sciences acknowledged this in its study "The New Americans": *"In the extreme case in which immigrants' descendants never assimilate and have a higher rate of natural increase, the nation to which they have immigrated eventually takes on the same economic characteristics as the one they come*

*from"*. **Given that Turkey will soon have a labour force as big as that of Germany and the UK combined this is something worth bearing in mind.**

On immigration, as on 'Europe', all parties are careless about history, evidence and principle. Instead, the parties quarrel over the second order issues of management and presentation. Thus, when the assumption that A8 immigration would be between 5,000 and 13,000 turned out to be wildly incorrect, no action was taken or apologies made. Instead the government follows the advice of its PR experts by 'accentuating the positive'. So, having reassured the voters that A8 migration would be a fraction of the 400,000 who actually arrived, the Government suggests that the actual outcome constitutes an unmixed economic blessing.

## Free Movement

As of the 20th August the Labour Government had not said whether or not it would allow in migrants from the two new states. It was reported that the Conservatives had decided to remain united in their indecision about immigration from the two new countries, at least for the time being. Meanwhile there was a major effort to rearrange the presentation of Conservative immigration policy. Conservative policy has always been in favour of free movement of labour in the EU and indeed in favour of wider immigration. The party manifesto for the 2005 election said, *"Britain has benefited from immigration. We all gain from the social diversity, economic vibrancy (what that?) and cultural richness that immigration brings"*. David Davis has opposed Labour only on managerial grounds:

Continued on P.4

## Immigration policy: no place for analysis or principle

*“What you have to do is to manage the system properly in order to provide the skills we need, without overwhelming local social services or the housing market, without upsetting community relations”.*

It is difficult even to take the remarks of Damian Green, the shadow spokesman on immigration (*Times*, 8th July 2006) seriously. According to Mr Green, a new immigration policy must have the consent of ethnic minorities. Precisely how this consent is to be elicited and why the consent of the indigenous population is not required is not explained. Even Green must realise there is something bizarre about approaching Muslims in Coventry and, by implication, promising them a vote over whether Bulgarians and Romanians should be admitted to the UK.

As for the UK Independence Party, its outgoing leader Roger Knapman, replying to criticism over his setting up a family company to import Eastern Europeans to undercut British workers, reminded us that it too is in favour of some immigration, *“For such long term work as opposed to my short term guest workers, UKIP has proposed a proper [sic] work permit scheme”.*

During July and August a number of prominent politicians and media figures began to warn that the large scale of immigration from Eastern Europe was impacting on the wages of British people and producing a number of other undesirable consequences of a kind which are likely to follow when an influx of labour is not matched by the requisite increase in capital spending on houses, roads, water, etc. These included John Denham MP, Frank Field MP, Susan Anderson of the CBI, Bob Cotton of the British Hospitality Association and David Frost of the British Chamber of Commerce, Polly Toynbee of the *Guardian* as well as sections of the media.

Extraordinarily, within less than

twenty four hours both Labour and the Conservatives announced inchoate, media-driven changes in position. The Conservatives decided to call for ‘strict quotas’ on the number of workers allowed in from Bulgaria and Romania, whatever that means, while Alastair Darling, the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry in answer to a question as to whether Britain would offer an open door, said: *“No. No-one who deals with immigration fails to realise that we have to have a system which is properly managed, properly constructed. That is essential”.* Downing Street later claimed no decision had been made.

The two crucial questions on the Bulgarian and Romanian issue are - does migration benefit the British people as a whole and is the free movement of labour in the EU in the interest of the British people as a whole?

### Substantial Evidence

In order to demonstrate that it achieves the first of these goals those advocating the free movement of labour would have to show that reducing the earnings of the indigenous population in order to pay for the additional capital expenditure necessary to raise the living standards of imported labour is likely to have compensating long-term benefits. But they do not do this. Nor do they explain why the arrival of capital-less labour is in some peculiar way more beneficial than the addition of migrants with exactly the same capital and skills as indigenous populations which, as the US National Research Council frequently points out, would simply enlarge the economy without achieving a positive impact on GDP per head.

There is substantial evidence, for example, that provided by the Economic Institute of the Dutch government, that, with capital fixed, almost any type of immigration reduces GDP in per capita terms with

considerable losses to wage earners outweighing extra returns to capital. Leaving aside important issues relating to national identity, there are quite obviously considerable fiscal costs in importing workers with low marginal productivity into a welfare state.

Only the most highly selected skilled or wealthy immigrants could possibly increase the prosperity of the native population. In 2004, only 25 out of 582,000 immigrants qualified for investors’ immigration consents and the hurdle for being an ‘investor’ is extraordinarily low - being less than the cost of a house in a salubrious area of London.

Lord Turner, a very europhile former Director of the CBI, said on the 11th July, *“The economic disbenefit is that in the short term, at least, high levels of unskilled immigration are bad for unskilled workers and I think to deny that is nonsense. There is an attempt to deny that but it just flies in the face of all economic theory”.* Given such views one wonders how he can support the EU with its emphasis on the free movement of labour - but at least his statement exposes the weakness of the parties’ policies on the EU and immigration.

Now that the two major parties appear to be less certain about the benefits of the influx of capital-less labour, a few questions may be asked. Are they prepared to stop the immigration from the A8 countries? Are the A8 immigrants considered to be a permanent addition to the British labour force? Or are Bulgaria and Romania going to be the only EU countries from which immigration is controlled? Are they prepared to conform to the EU agreement to take unlimited labour from the A8 countries after 2011 and Bulgaria and Romania after 2014? Are they still serious about enlarging the EU and allowing (eventually) free movement of Turkish labour? Is it not time they based their immigration and EU policies on analysis and principle?

# France welcomes Doha breakdown

*Now that the WTO talks are comatose France will have even less reason to contemplate reform of the CAP*

Towards the end of July the Doha Round, of talks aimed at furthering world trade liberalisation, broke down. On the 27th July, in a *Figaro* op-ed article, the French agriculture minister, Dominique Bussereau, celebrated the breakdown as "A welcome failure of a warped negotiation". It was the same Mr Bussereau, a few weeks earlier, who observed publicly that France would prefer Doha to fail rather than accept any real change to the CAP.

In his *Figaro* article Mr Bussereau says:- "There was never any question [in the Doha talks] that France, in order to ensure that multilateralism [in the World Trade Organisation] survive, would accept an unbalanced agreement which was contrary to our interests". Elsewhere in his article he emphasises that "French interests" mean preserving the CAP in the interests of French farmers; also - as usual in France - the agricultural interests of France are taken to be identical with those of its other EU-24 "partners".

Mr Mandelson, who led the Commission negotiations on behalf of the EU-25 members, keeps on saying that the EU is "the most open market in the world". Mr Bussereau confirmed that EU agricultural protection is very high, with stiff customs duties on imports of farm produce from outside the EU. So much for the Mandelson

line. Mr Bussereau also criticised Mr Mandelson for his ineffective negotiating tactics, in "putting on the table, at regular intervals, offers which were conditional [on concessions from other negotiators]". The Commission, said the Frenchman, "had stretched, and even gone beyond, the limits of its negotiating mandate" - limits, needless to say, which were set by France.

Poor Mr Mandelson never had a chance. Paris had him sewn up right from the start. He can't have had much help from London: during most of the Doha Round the British agriculture minister was none other than Margaret Beckett, who presided over the fiasco of non-payments of EU subsidies to British farmers. Mr Mandelson didn't help himself, throughout the negotiations, by publicly, and at every opportunity, blaming the Americans for each setback. He never seemed to understand that in a multilateral negotiation of this kind the last way to succeed is to make offensive remarks in public about your negotiating partners.

All of which appears to confirm that France will block the "review" of the CAP scheduled for 2008/9, which Mr Blair obtained in exchange for even greater amounts of British taxpayers' money being thrown at 'Europe' during the 2007-2013 Financial

Perspective. Indeed, that was precisely what the French government said immediately after the deal was announced last December. British governments, including Mr Blair's, have always been in denial about the harsh, unforgiving reality of the CAP, professing to believe that "reform" was just around the corner, needing "one more heave". Dream on. Now that Doha is comatose, France will have even less incentive to contemplate reform of the CAP. The rest of us are stuck with its lunacies.

On the 2nd August, demonstrating that the WTO works, President Bush announced that the USA was cancelling its subsidies to domestic cotton growers, in response to a complaint lodged by Brazil. A day earlier, Hank Paulson, US Secretary of the Treasury, announced that, following the Doha breakdown, the USA would continue to encourage globalisation through regional and bilateral free trade agreements (FTAs). The US has recently signed FTAs with Oman, Peru and Colombia, and negotiations are under way with South Korea, Thailand, Panama, the United Arab Emirates and the five countries of the Southern African Customs Union. The UK, having outsourced the totality of its trade policy to Brussels in 1973, is powerless to sign FTAs with anyone, anywhere.

## British voting power in EU to be further reduced

If Romania and Bulgaria join the EU on schedule on the 1st January 2007, the UK's voting power in the Council of Ministers will drop from its current level of 9 per cent to 8.4 per cent.

In the European Parliament, there will be 72 British MEPs, as at present, but the total number of MEPs will rise to 732. Thus, British MEPs total voting "weight" (purely theoretical, since

British MEPs represent different UK political parties, so never vote as a bloc) will drop to 9.8 per cent.

As other countries join the EU - Croatia in 2008 perhaps, then other Balkan countries - all existing EU members will automatically experience a further dilution of their voting power. Meanwhile, countries' vetoes in the Council of Ministers

continue to be eroded, meaning, paradoxically, that the importance of voting power is enhanced. The result, inevitably, will be a further transfer of power from nation-states to the permanent bureaucracy in Brussels, principally the Commission and its hand-maiden the Court of Justice; and a corresponding further emasculation of democracy.

# LETTERS

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

## **Paying to Lose our Sovereignty**

Dear Sir,

Your main article, "EU issues set to return to centre stage", 7th July 2006, is a valuable reminder that the apparent doldrums of the EU constitution is, typically, a deceit behind which the whole EU bureaucracy is geared to ensure that at all costs it will be enacted. The ploys are byzantine, from Giscard's crudely arrogant, 'Vote again!' to the multifarious sleights of hand to try to 'legalise' the illegitimate. These drive home the warning that we are dealing with the appalling confluence of gross naiveté and supreme self interest made even more devastating because propelled by a pseudo-religious zealotry. The impeccable logic, as your article points out, is withdrawal from this anti-democratic EU behemoth where in the C21st most decisions are taken in secret with minutes (let alone a Hansard equivalent) never published.

But when we are finally exhorted, "Let the battle commence" EU-realists must again face reality. Indeed it *will* be a massive battle against Brussels, against all main British Parties and as was tellingly noted in the article, against "the wishes of the BBC". For, despite some improvements, this powerful institution's actual reaction to the damning independent Wilson Report's accusations that it had a pro-EU "institutional mindset" (para 1) and displayed "EU ignorance at every stage" (para 4) was to term such criticisms as simply "PERCEPTIONS" (Heading, BBC Governors/Management Papers 2005). The impact of this unholy alliance is that only some 35 per cent of the public want to leave the EU.

So even to *consider* a battle there must be at least a degree of coordination between sceptics to decide what to do to draw from the huge body of Eurosceptic literature, and then translate it into the language of the public - succinct, immediate and telling.

The central incredible fact to be conveyed is: We are actually paying to

lose our independence. (see Ian Milne, "A Cost Too Far" and G. Booth MEP *eurofacts* 12th May 2006). At the same time, there must be systematic, concise demolition of the government's string of 'Goebbel's lies' by showing that employment does not crudely depend on the EU, that 'shared sovereignty' is by definition a nonsense while strength through unity with the continent is also made a nonsense by QMV where we are in a minority of some 9 per cent - etc.

All this needs huge preparation. Without it Blair, the master of spin, could win a poll and we would be signed up to all things EU permanently.  
C. FRANCIS WARREN  
Lancashire

## **A Question of Quality**

Dear Sir,

I am sorry that Alan Sked thinks we UKIP MEPs are of such poor quality (letters, 28th July). Perhaps he could run a few names past us of other British MEPs whom he feels are better? And in what way?

GODFREY BLOOM MEP

## **The Purpose of Controls**

Dear Sir,

Your readers will hardly wish Tony Scholefield and me to pursue our debate down the byways of economic theories (letters, 28th July). It will, I think, suffice for me to thank him for making it clear that he sees immigration control as a device for boosting the returns for unskilled services above the level domestic consumers are willing to pay. This is on a par with barring imports from Third World countries to protect domestic production at the expense both of our consumers and their producers.

LIONEL BELL  
Surrey

## **The Case for UKIP**

Dear Sir,

Sir George Earle courteously advises me (letters, 28th July) that UKIP

cannot achieve even a couple of Westminster seats under the FPTP voting system. May I, with (I hope) equal courtesy, suggest that the more times that mantra is repeated, the more people will come to believe it and the more likely it is to come true; although a member, he considers UKIP is a pressure group.

In my mid-seventies I am not prepared to continue using up my health, money and what few years of life I might have left to me in order to simply support a pressure group. The Freedom Association (TFA) and other groups are, of course, hard working, valuable and very important, but exist in the main to ensure the return of one political party, the very party responsible for creating and perpetuating the whole sorry mess we have today. This is a matter I really feel needs more honest discussion: is the majority of the 'EU-sceptic' lobby more concerned to leave the EU or return a Conservative government? I have feared for some time that the latter is the case.

I belong to UKIP because I want to live in an independent, sovereign and democratic nation. We are losing more and more of those three blessings not only because of the EU, but because of the ghastly lot we have governing us now. However; I want to see this position changed by the democratic process which involves an informed 'people' not just one section of the Conservatives. A political party is needed to effect this change, not a pressure group, otherwise TFA, which I am a member of, would have done so earlier in its 31 years' existence.

It is always sad to see the founder of UKIP, Dr Alan Sked, unable to resist putting the boot into us with his allusions to the BNP and other unpleasant things; ironically it was Alan who, some twelve years ago, opened my eyes to the EU and the duplicity of the Tories. Perhaps his question about returning to the drawing board was self-questioning?

ROGER WILSON  
Hampshire

# MEETINGS

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
01722 744814

Thursday **14th September**, 7.30 pm

“Justice & Home Affairs and Corpus Juris”

**Torquil Dick Erikson**  
**Chris Lees**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Bicton College, East Budleigh, Devon  
**Admission Free**

---

**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**  
01224 313473

Monday **25th September**, 5.45 pm

“The European Union - What Next?”

**Tony Benn**  
**Sr Brian Burlitt**  
**Kelvin Hopkins MP**

LABOUR PARTY FRINGE MEETING  
Charters Suite, Arora Hotel, 18-24  
Princess Street, Manchester M1 4LY  
**Admission Free**

---

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **26th Sept. 2006**, 6.00 pm

“The Civil Service and the Constitution”

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

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

---

**Democracy Movement**  
01424 848964

Thursday **28th September**, 7.30 pm

**Christopher Heaton-Harris MEP,**  
*Conservative*  
**Mark Wallace, Freedom Association,**  
*Campaign Manager*

PUBLIC MEETING  
The High Beech Hotel, Eisenhower  
Drive, Battle Road, St Leonards-on-Sea,  
East Sussex  
**Admission Free**

## Conservative Party Fringe Meetings Bournemouth

**Open Europe**  
0207 197 2333

Tuesday **3rd October**, 12.30 pm

“Can the EU be reformed? If so how?”

**Speakers include;**  
**Graham Brady MP, Shadow Minister**  
*for Europe*

**Anthony Browne, Brussels**  
*Correspondent, The Times, 2003-2006*  
**David Heathcoat-Amory MP, Member**  
*of the European Convention*  
Chairman, **Charles Moore, former**  
*Editor, Daily Telegraph*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Dorchester Two, Marriott Highcliff,  
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**

---

**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 Cliffeside Hotel, East Overcliffe  
Drive, Bournemouth  
**Admission Free**

**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

**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>01626 830630</b>
Roger Knapman MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

