

Britain betrays its free-trade principles

A squalid deal struck in Brussels demonstrates why EU membership is bound to damage the UK's long term interests and limit its influence

September was a normal month in Brussels: officials and representatives of member states, recently refreshed by their summer vacations, went about their usual business of political horse-trading. One example of every-day life in the Belgian capital stands out, not because it is in any way atypical - quite the reverse - but because it illustrates why membership of the EU will constantly damage any member state that believes that the interests of its citizens are best served by free trade.

Deeply anxious that the UK is in danger of losing its partial opt-out from the Working Time Directive, it seems that British officials offered a secret deal under which it would back Rome's demand for punitive tariffs on Chinese and Vietnamese shoes in return for Italian support over the opt-out. The Italians indicated that they would accept the deal, but apparently declined to put this in writing.

Earlier this year Romano Prodi's government indicated that it was no longer willing to back Britain on the opt-out, leaving support for the British position extremely fragile. A number of Mr Prodi's socialist colleagues had been arguing that the opt-out gives Britain an unfair advantage. But it is also entirely possible that Mr Prodi who, as a former Commission President is deeply versed in the ways of the EU, recognised the leverage he would enjoy as a result of a temporary suspension of support for the Blair government on the issue of working hours.

Reporting on a secret deal apparently struck between British and Italian officials on the 23rd September the *Financial Times* said that it had learned from several sources that the British had shown themselves "desperate" to bring Italy back on board. It was consequently prepared to betray its free-trade principles by joining a bloc of protectionist states - led by Italy - that wants 'anti-dumping' duties on Chinese and Vietnamese shoes.

This despite the fact that in August 14 member states - including the UK - registered their intention to vote against the measure which was negotiated by the Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson. Italy and Spain, however, refused to accept the deal was dead and have continued to wheel and deal. As *eurofacts* goes to press it looks as if they are about to triumph.

British trade officials may conclude that in an imperfect world the British somersault is justified; at least the opt-out from the Working Time Directive is safe. It is, of course, questionable how valuable and long-lasting an unwritten commitment from a slightly-used Italian Prime Minister is likely to be. But even if Mr Prodi is as good as his word there are reasons for being deeply unhappy about the implications of this back-room deal.

First, and most obviously the 16.5 and 10 per cent in tariffs on Chinese and Vietnamese shoe prices respectively will hurt British manufacturers (many of whom buy in from China and Vietnam), British retailers and British shoppers

(especially the poorest of them).

It will also send an unambiguous message to all of Britain's EU partners that despite its lofty free-trade aspirations Britain is perfectly willing to sign up to protectionist measures providing the right pressure is exerted. The reality is that Britain is now locked into a process whereby it is forced to protect major interests which would not be at risk but for EU membership by compromising its principles and by accepting damage to what at the time are considered to be lesser interests. The cumulative impact of this process is likely to outweigh short term advantages.

A spokesman for the British Retail Consortium gave specific examples of the implications of the deal: "*After this there will be further cases of even greater importance to the Italians on furniture and ceramics. What price will the consumer have to pay then?*"

Would unwritten Italian support over the Working Time Directive survive a British decision to refuse to punish the Chinese for producing ceramics and furniture that Europeans want to buy?

More generally, the deal makes nonsense of Britain's intention to lead a group of European states which are committed to free trade at a moment when the future of the international trading system requires such leadership. On trade Britain is gradually surrendering the moral high ground it could once claim to occupy - and without securing a net economic advantage in return.

EU in decline, Commission admits

The relative decline in Europe's prosperity is attributed to a lack of investment in high-tech products and a low level of R&D

A new report* from the Commission in Brussels says that, unless the Lisbon reforms are implemented, "the EU's ongoing decline as a global economic power" will be confirmed. "GDP per capita trends have been deteriorating in the EU relative to other OECD countries since the mid-1990s", it states, and concludes bluntly: over the period 1990-2003 "the EU has not benefited from globalisation". *Le Monde*, in its 11th August issue, described that 13-year period as a "black hole".

The problem, says the Commission, is that "the real source of the EU's present low growth problem is domestic, not external in origin". One factor is that "the EU's production and trade structures have a substantially higher share of low and medium-low technology products compared with both the US and Japan". It points out that in the crucial area of R & D, the US has continued to increase its world share of total internationally mobile R & D expenditures from 45 per cent in 1995 to nearly 65 per cent by 2000. The US, it says, has "unrivalled research and teaching institutions as well as a highly-integrated innovation system [with] a proven track

record...".

So what's to be done? First, says the paper "the EU must in particular learn the basic lessons of the post-war period and move towards a knowledge-based, flexible economic model". "An essential pre-requisite" for this is "labour-market flexibility". Then, "Member States will have to implement a productivity agenda focussed on:

- Action on the level of regulation
- The structure of financial markets
- The structure of financial markets
- Product and service market integration
- Adapting to ageing populations
- Progressively moving towards an innovation, as opposed to an imitation, based economic model."

All very logical and sensible. How odd that the report does not mention the Commission's role in swamping Member States with ever-more regulation, (item one above) and in imposing the costly and damaging directive-driven Continental model on the internationally-competitive and highly successful British financial market model (item two). How curious that the mechanism through which the

Commission (and the Court of Justice) force "integration" (item three) on the reluctant Member States is "regulation", of which (item one) they say less is needed. As to the fourth item on the agenda: "adapting to ageing populations", the report appears to acknowledge that there's nothing to be done but accept the inevitable. As to the fifth item, (though it's not spelt out in this paper) the Commission wants a far higher Commission-managed R & D budget - in effect, to do to R & D in the EU what the CAP's done to farming in the EU.

Common sense suggests that the solution to Europe's productivity problem is to abolish the EU. But as we know, when it comes to "Europe", common sense is in short supply

**Globalisation: Trends, Issues and Macro Implications for the EU*, by Denis, McMorro and Roger; Paper No 254, July 2006, ISSN 1725-3187, Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs.

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_financial/publications/economic_papers/2006/ep254en.pdf

Eurozone to go on shrinking

The European Central Bank (ECB), which runs the Eurozone's monetary policy, forecasts a continuing decline in the Eurozone's shares of both world GDP and world trade in 2006 and 2007.

The ECB expects annual growth in world real GDP outside the Eurozone to be 5.2 per cent in 2006 and 4.9 per

cent in 2007. Inside the Eurozone, annual growth in real GDP is expected to be less than half that: 2.5 per cent in 2006 and 2.1 per cent in 2007.

Trade growth in the Eurozone's external export markets is projected at 8.7 per cent in 2006 and 6.6 per cent in 2007; but growth in the Eurozone's exports is only expected to be 7.4 per

cent in 2006 and 5.0 per cent in 2007.

The "weight" of the Eurozone in world markets will thus continue its apparently inexorable shrinkage through 2007.

Source: Box 6, *ECB Monthly Bulletin*, September 2006, www.ecb.int

Euro 'a source of conflict and division'

"The single currency was supposed to bring Europe together, but it risks becoming a source of economic dislocation and political division. Italy is the country which is most likely to

trigger a crisis. It is not far-fetched to imagine a scenario in which the country is forced to quit the single currency. It could also force other members to quit the eurozone and

could even precipitate the unravelling of the single market." Simon Tilford, the author of "Will the Eurozone Crack?" published by the pro-EU Centre for European Reform.

Justice and home affairs: the national veto is still under threat

In the end, ten countries resisted the attempt by the EU Finnish presidency to end the national veto on justice and criminal affairs. But it should not be thought that the battle to preserve the veto has been won; the battle is likely to be resumed and the prospects for preserving it look increasingly uncertain.

The aim of the Finns was to invoke the “passerelle clause” in order to move justice and home affairs issues from pillar three of existing treaty arrangements (i.e. those where policy issues are a matter for cooperation) to pillar one where decisions are taken by qualified majority voting. The use of the clause enables such changes to be made without there having to be alterations to the structure of the existing EU Treaty.

Up until a year ago British ministers were adamant that there could be no weakening of the veto in this area, arguing that this would damage fundamental principles of British justice, including that of habeas corpus. Speaking at the European Convention on the 3rd April 2003, Peter Hain declared: “*Criminal procedures go to the heart of our legal system and this is one area where we have got to keep the veto*”. But at Tampere, where the issue was discussed by home affairs ministers on the 22nd September, British officials said that the Government now had an “open mind” on the subject. Earlier Geoff Hoon, the European Minister angered eurosceptics by an apparent surrender of the principles for which ministers said they would fight,

declaring that the Government was giving “careful consideration” to the Finnish proposal.

Resistance to the proposal was led by Germany and Ireland - Germany not because it is opposed in principle to killing off the veto but because it wants to do so in a new version of the Constitution, Ireland because of concerns that it would be forced to hold a referendum on the issue which it might not win.

After the meeting Franco Frattini, the EU justice commissioner announced that the Commission would continue to push for an end to the veto, citing the war against terrorism as justification for the change as well as the need to maintain progress in building the European project.

Oft-used cliché

Repeating that irritating and oft-used cliché he said:

“It’s like a bicycle, either it goes ahead or it falls to the ground”.

Earlier, in order to win support Mr Frattini accepted that the end of the veto would greatly enhance the powers of both the European Court and the Commission, but claimed that he and his successors would use their new powers “pragmatically” with “sensitivity to national sensibilities”.

Since the battle to get rid of the veto is likely to be resumed very shortly it is important that eurosceptics should be clear about the consequences of transferring justice and home affairs to the first pillar:

■ It would bring all such matters

under the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice which until now has had a limited say in such matters.

■ It would give the Commission the sole right to initiate legislation in this area.

■ It would confer more power over criminal matters to the EU - once the EU obtains competence in a particular area the member states lose the right to propose laws in that area.

■ It would prevent the UK government from blocking laws with which it disagrees or which it believes harms our distinctive legal system (which, of course, differs from the systems which exist in Continental Europe in fundamental respects).

The Finns may have been naive in supposing they would be able to kill off the veto in justice and home affairs with a single strike. But the reality is that the issue is now higher up the agenda and with the abandonment of Britain’s formal opposition the disturbing fact is that no major EU member is in favour of maintaining it.

An opinion poll by ICM for *Open Europe* published to coincide with the Tampere meeting found that the British public is opposed to giving up the veto by a proportion of nearly three to one. 72 per cent of respondents said that the UK should retain its right to veto Brussels laws about crime, justice and policing. Only 26 per cent were in favour of giving up the veto.

A rare example of a Cameron commitment?

“Our key commitment is to get back for Britain our opt-out from the Social Chapter. It is through the Social Chapter that so much of this legislation

is coming. It is all very well Blair going on in the European Parliament about the failure of the European social model. He signed up to it.”

David Cameron interviewed by *Real Business* magazine, September 2006.

UK Imports - No Benefit from EU Membership

EU-24, as a source of imports into the UK, offers UK importers and consumers no significant advantage or benefit compared with imports from elsewhere

Under the terms of the EU Customs Union, of which the UK has been a member since 1973, UK importers of goods are obliged to pay customs duties, comply with quotas and suffer the consequences of EU anti-dumping restrictions, on the goods they import from OUTSIDE the EU. There are no such duties or restrictions (officially anyway) when UK importers import goods from EU countries.

Thus, other things being equal, one would expect UK importers to favour imports originating inside the EU over imports originating OUTSIDE the EU.

However, the 1999 - 2005 growth rates indicate that, for British importers and consumers of goods, EU-originating imports appear to be no more attractive than imports originating outside the EU. The rates of growth of UK imports of GOODS

from EU-24 and from OUTSIDE the EU were similar over the period 1999 - 2005 (6.13 per cent and 6.07 per cent respectively), suggesting that, despite the handicaps - customs duties, non-tariff barriers etc - associated with imports from OUTSIDE the EU, the EU-24, as a source of imports into the UK, offers UK importers and consumers no significant advantage or benefit compared with imports from elsewhere (Tables 1 and 2).

The same goes for services, where the rates of growth of UK imports from EU-24 and the world outside the EU are also very similar (6.75 per cent and 6.46 per cent respectively). Imports of services into the UK from other EU countries are not subject to customs duties or anti-dumping measures, though, as the fuss over the "Bolkestein Directive" showed last

year, exports and imports of services within the EU are still hampered by all sorts of national restrictions. (Tables 1 and 2).

In (imports of) income - that is to say, principally, payments by UK residents to non-residents on the latter's investments in the UK - growth between 1999 and 2005 was greater in respect of EU-24 than in respect of the non-EU world. This, possibly, was a reflection of a stronger appetite on the part of EU investors for UK assets than that of non-EU investors. (Caution is advisable here though, because of the effect of the Netherlands Distortion, which substantially over-states the importance of the EU in worldwide UK inflows and outflows of income.) (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1: UK Imports from EU-24

	1999	2005	Growth ¹
Imports:	Value £ bn	Value £ bn	%
Goods	109.3	156.2	6.13
Services	31.9	47.2	6.75
Income	38.6	65.6	9.24
Transfers	12.6	15.6	3.62
Total	192.4	284.6	6.74
<i>Source: The Pink Book 2006</i>			
¹ annual average compound rate of growth			

Table 2: UK Imports from World excl. EU-24

	1999	2005	Growth ¹
Imports:	Value £ bn	Value £ bn	%
Goods	85.9	122.3	6.07
Services	28.1	40.9	6.46
Income	63.0	91.6	6.44
Transfers	8.2	12.9	7.84
Total	185.2	267.7	6.32
<i>Source: The Pink Book 2006</i>			
¹ annual average compound rate of growth			

Germany plans to revive EU Constitution

Germany aims to map out a timetable and blueprint for the EU Constitution by the end of its presidency, according to German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier. In a speech to members of

his Social Democratic Party (SPD) ahead of Germany's Presidency in the first half of 2007, Steinmeier urged critics of the Constitution to start moving activities along. "Two thirds are behind the Constitution", he said.

"I believe everyone should feel an obligation because of that. If it is to be saved, and we urgently need it, everyone has to move their position. But some have to move more than others."

EU economic system in perilous condition, says top French think-tank

The real cause of European economic failure is the EU itself - but French economists still advocate more of the same

The economic condition of the EU is “perilous”. Its inability to overcome its problems turns away investment funds while persistent under-employment undermines social provision. Such intractable economic difficulties, combined with poorly managed EU enlargement and a “manifest exhaustion with community procedures”, threatens to trigger a vicious circle that will unravel the body of EU law. At the root of the problem lie institutions that don’t work and principles that are “dysfunctional”.

The views set out above are not those of Lord Tebbit or Global Britain (although they may well share them) but of the authors of a closely argued report from the *Conseil d'Analyse Economique*, a body comprising leading members of the French political elite.

The authors consider a number of explanations as to why the USA enjoys faster economic growth than the euro area and continues to maintain a higher standard of living:

- Europe’s weaker economic performance is due to Europeans’ preference for leisure as opposed to work;
- Europe suffers from weaker demand that may be attributed to a history of restrictive macroeconomic policies;
- The dominant analysis maintains that Europe’s growth lag is the result of a combination of incomplete economic integration and insufficient structural reforms among the member states, particularly reforms in labour, goods and services markets;
- The last explanation is that the problem is not so much with “Europe”, but with Germany, France and Italy. These countries, unlike the smaller and faster-growing members, are unable to make the necessary reforms.

The authors do not systematically

reject the above explanations but feel that no single one is satisfactory. In their view “deficiencies in the EU’s economic policy system are a main cause of inefficiency and slower growth...”

“...no sudden burst in the trade of goods and services has been observed since the Single Act entered into effect in 1993, nor since the euro was introduced in 1999, as was seen [in North America] after the NAFTA agreement was signed in 1989. The price convergence that EU monetary union was supposed to bring also did not occur, and convergence even came to a standstill in 1999.....The authors believe that these problems may largely be attributed to the EU’s institutional shortcomings.”

....“Economic integration has stagnated and no longer promotes growth. The euro’s creation has not produced the knock-on benefits expected.”

In other words the principal cause of the EU’s economic problems is the EU itself.

Other reports and documents from elite French institutions have come close to saying as much, but none have done so quite so explicitly or have come from bodies quite so close to the heart of the French political establishment. But like earlier reports and documents this latest report does not believe that the way forward lies in rejecting the ideas and approaches that are responsible for the ‘perilous’ condition of the EU economies.

Despite pinning the blame for the malady squarely on EU governance in its widest sense, “...**the authors do not however recommend changing the current institutional framework since they feel that attempting institutional changes would be costly and not very realistic...**”.

Extraordinarily, their solution for the EU turns out to be: even more EU. Their recommendations are: more economic integration, (essentially

“deepening” from Brussels); “reforming” the economic governance of the eurozone (essentially diluting its anti-inflation policies); and improving the interaction between “structural” policies and macroeconomic policies (essentially by creating yet more “coordinating” committees.)

It is true that the political fall-out from a more radical approach to the problems described above would be far more profound for France than for other EU members. From Monnet onwards the ideas on which the EU has been based have been French ideas; it has been the French who have shaped its institutions and framed its laws; any radical move to place European political cooperation on a different footing would have explosive consequences for French politics and for the French political elite in particular. This, no doubt, explains why major institutional changes are ruled out as ‘unrealistic’.

Britain, of course, is in a wholly different position.

Sadly, its own elite institutions are too timid to produce reports of comparable rigour. What criticism of the EU there has been - and there has been a good deal - has come almost entirely from those outside the political establishment and from eurosceptic think-tanks and pressure groups. What a pity mainstream British politicians, journalists and broadcasters are too parochial, too timorous and too ill-informed to enter into a debate about the French report, to praise the rigour of its analysis and the intellectual élan of its authors - while pointing out that for Britain, at least, its conclusion points not to more ‘Europe’ but to no ‘Europe’ at all.

***Politique Economique et Croissance en Europe*, Aghion, Cohen, Pisani-Ferry, ISBN: 2-11-006149-9, March 2006, available in pdf at www.cae.gouv.fr.

LETTERS

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

Eurosceptics have a Simple Choice to Make

Dear Sir,

As one who, like Roger Wilson (letters 8th September) can clearly recall the events of 1972, it is hard not to sympathise with his anger at 'the very party responsible for creating and perpetuating the whole sorry mess we have today'.

But that was thirty-four years ago. Most of the then-active quislings are dead or retired to oblivion. Thousands and thousands who were duped then (Margaret Thatcher included) have changed their minds. A whole new generation has taken over the Tory party.

History is history, Mr Wilson. It never stops moving. It rolls from the past through the present into the future. When the people who predominate in a party change, that party changes. Seeking revenge for a generation ago may be satisfying but it serves no purpose. Consider the present and the trends pointing into the future.

Back then Labour was die-stamped with loathing of the EEC. It has been almost totally converted to present and future appeasement and capitulation. The Lib-Dems are agreed in that. The Tories have undergone a huge sea-change, but the other way. On June 8th 2005 fifty five new Tory MPs came to the House. Twenty two were replacements of retirees; thirty three were reclaimers of clawed-back seats lost earlier. But for UKIP there would have been another twenty five. Of the fifty five some forty five are Euro-sceptics, varying from firm to fierce.

Take Connor Burns. This ardent sceptic was denied Eastleigh by UKIP insisting on splitting the vote. It went to Lib-Dem former MEP and eurofanatic Chris Huhne who may succeed Menzies Campbell as leader and, who knows? be part of a Lib-Lab Coalition government. Shrewd tactics?

Hardly.

Your readers really have two simple choices. Do they want more Labour or Lib-Lab euro appeasement from 2009 in the knowledge that by 2014 the transformation to a devolved regional territory would have become irreversible; or would it be better to have a party so changed that it is now 80 per cent sceptic in the shires and 70 per cent sceptic in the House. There is no third choice.

One last point. To re-enter office the Tories need to claw back another 136 seats that Major and the euro-appeasers lost. The way the selection committees appear to be working, well over a hundred of them would be eurosceptics too. Eschew the dismal past Mr Wilson. Look at the trend, look at the trend.

FREDERICK FORSYTH
Hertfordshire

The Role of the FA

Dear Sir,

Whilst Roger Wilson's commitment to freeing our country from the European Union has been unstinting, he is mistaken about the nature of The Freedom Association (letters, 8th September). We take our non-partisan principle very seriously indeed and welcome those from a wide range of parties (and indeed no party at all) who believe in our fundamental principles. Rather than as Mr Wilson suggests working "to ensure the return of one political party", impliedly the Conservatives, we work to promote the values of a free society with all those who share our belief in them. If that were not the case, then I am certain that our membership would not reflect the healthy mix of members of various parties and independent voices that it does.

Where people agree with us, we are happy to work alongside them, and by the same token if they are opposed to freedom we are the first to make clear our disagreement. The Better Off Out

campaign is a good example of our work. All those who clearly and unequivocally want the UK to leave the EU are welcome, and the current list includes Conservative MPs and MEPs, UKIP MEPs, Independent Labour Peers and non-aligned journalists and economists. We campaign to promote and defend principles, not particular politicians.

MARK WALLACE

The Freedom Association
London

Where Are the Benefits?

Dear Sir,

Has anyone been more successful than I have in attempts to discover from our leading politicians what the benefits of EU membership to the UK and its population are supposed to be? When Prime Minister Heath originally got us in he was so sure that he could not persuade the electorate that there actually were such substantial benefits that he said he had signed up only to joining a European common market.

If Gordon Brown agreed with Prime Minister Blair's voluntary and apparently uncompensated abandonment of Margaret Thatcher's huge rebate of UK contributions to the EU, how did he persuade Gordon Brown to make the consequent huge increases in taxation? Or if he forced this on Gordon Brown why does Brown not win the leadership of his party by promising the huge tax cuts which would be possible if he was willing to grab back the remissions got by Margaret Thatcher?

In a word, why won't the leaders of the three main parties reveal to the UK electorate what they believe are the huge benefits which warrant the payment of its enormous costs?

ANTONY FLEW
Berkshire

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **10th October**, 6.00 pm

“Should we take our leaders as seriously as they take themselves”

Rodney Barker, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

Monday **16th October**, 6.00 pm

“Standard Markets: The free market response to regulation”

Michael Mainelli, *Mercers’ School Memorial Professor of Commerce at Gresham College*

Paul Stennett, *Chief Executive, UK Accreditation Service*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

Better Off Out
07979695611

Friday **13th October**, 1.00 pm

“Freedom in the City”

Philip Hollobone MP, *Conservative*

PUBLIC MEETING

Function Suite, Counting House Pub, 50 Cornhill London

Australian Monarchist League
00 61 (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

Democracy Movement
Louth Branch
01507 601699

Friday **27th October**, 7.30 pm

“Stop the Cheques”

Rodney Atkinson, *Author*
Marc Glendening, *Campaign Director, Democracy Movement*
Roger Helmer MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

Conoco Room (Above Louth Library), Northgate, Louth, Lincolnshire
Admission Free

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
Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

2006

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

UK Parliamentary **9th October**
Recess Ends

2007

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

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

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

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

2008

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

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **10th October**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Economic Affairs* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **11th October**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Second Generation Schengen Information System (SIS II)* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **12th October**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on *The European Commission Green Paper on EU Mental Health Strategy* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **17th October**, 11.30 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Management and Audit of EC Expenditure and Accounts* from representatives of Commissioner Hubner’s cabinet, European Commission.

Tuesday **17th October**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Economic Affairs* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **18th October**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Second Generation Schengen Information System (SIS II)* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **19th October**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on *The European Commission Green Paper on EU Mental Health Strategy* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **24th October**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Management and Audit of EC Expenditure and Accounts* from Rosalind Wright, Supervisory Committee, OLAF.

Wednesday **25th October**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Second Generation Schengen Information System (SIS II)* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **25th October**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *CAP Simplification* from Lord Rooker, Minister of State (Sustainable Farming and Food) Defra.

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

The European Question and the National Interest

by *Jeremy Black*. **£16.99**

A leading historian's interpretation of Britain's relations with EU/EC/EEC.

The Great Deception:

Can the European Union survive

by *Christopher Booker*. **£9.99**

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

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

About the EU

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£9.99**

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

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**

An inside story of the rise of the UK Independence Party.

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 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

WEB SALES www.junepress.com

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

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

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

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

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

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

European Commission	020 7973 1992
European Movement	020 7940 5252
Federal Trust	020 7735 4000

AGAINST "EU"

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

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy 01372 453678

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org	
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
Democratic Party	01684 891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Labour	08705 900 200
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771 361 413006