

Does *anyone* scrutinise our laws?

The use of the scrutiny “override” at Westminster and short-circuiting in the EP means that legislative proposals can become law after only cursory examination

Modern society is confoundingly complex, which is why even well-intended legislation that has received careful parliamentary scrutiny can fail to achieve its goals while producing unintended side-effects. The volume of legislation has increased massively in recent years which means that it has been less well scrutinised than it ought to have been. As every eurosceptic knows, an increasing proportion of that legislation has originated in Brussels which retains the exclusive power to initiate EU laws.

Brussels produces four major pieces of legislation every week, and in 2005 produced a total of 1,691 Regulations, Directives and Decisions. Around 70 per cent of UK law thus begins its life as an idea in the mind of a Brussels bureaucrat (although Roman Herzog, a former president of Germany has calculated that in his country 84 per cent of laws stem from the EU Commission and has consequently raised the question of whether Germany can any longer be regarded as a parliamentary democracy).

Weak and Ineffectual

The means by which EU legislation is scrutinised at Westminster is weak and ineffectual. The primary vehicles for scrutiny are the House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee and the Lords EU Committee.

The ESC functions primarily as a sifting organisation; it has no real power and consequently fails to attract much interest; its task is to signal whether EU documents are politically important and if so, to recommend that

they be debated by a standing committee. The Lords EU Committee produces wider background studies. The only power of the two committees is the “scrutiny reserve” whereby they can request the Government not to approve a piece of EU legislation until Parliament has debated it. About half of EU members have similar mechanisms, although some are much more robust.

The problem with the present system is not just the volume of legislation or even the limited nature of the powers of the committees, but the fact that the UK regularly takes advantage of a loophole which enables it to override the scrutiny reserve. According to Open Europe the Government has used the “override” 346 times since 2001 when figures were first collated. It has quite frequently been used in the case of controversial legislation such as that creating the European Arrest Warrant and the European Defence Agency - and indeed from the point of view of the Government this is its principal virtue.

The Government has tended to respond to complaints about the mounting proportion of legislation deriving from Brussels by implying that really important laws are still made in the UK. This is not merely untrue; it conceals the reality that many important legislative proposals are not even scrutinised here. During one year alone - 2005 - the “override” was used 52 times in the case of the ESC and 28 times in the case of the Lords EU Committee.

Those concerned about the present poor quality of legislation will also be interested in the reply given by the EU

President Barroso to a question from the independent MEP Ashley Mote about the proportion of proposals which were adopted by the European Parliament as a result of a short-circuiting procedure under the Amsterdam Treaty; this enables proposals to be enacted after a single reading. Mr Barroso replied that during 2006 this figure was 56 per cent. In each instance the law was subsequently incorporated into British law.

The frightening reality - one which mocks this nation’s democratic pretensions - is that legislative proposals can become law without being properly scrutinised by anyone other than the EU bureaucrats who create them.

Unnecessary Costs

The result can only be bad law - law which imposes unnecessary costs on business and consumers, law which erodes traditional liberties, law which has many unwanted side-effects, law which creates problems to which more hastily and ill-considered law is deemed to be the answer.

If the political will existed it would be possible to find palliatives. For example the UK could adopt the Danish model of scrutiny whereby legislation cannot go ahead if it does not have the support of the majority of a powerful scrutiny committee sitting all the year round. But as a means of ensuring proper scrutiny of legislative proposals no solution compares to the most obvious available remedy - that of ensuring that the United Kingdom is once again able to make its own laws.

Treasury worried about dodgy statistics

We know the Home Office hasn't a clue how many immigrants are in the country, how many prisoners are on the run or how many failed asylum seekers are still here. In having lost control of its statistics the Home Office cannot implement policy, let alone make it.

What with taxes going up, inflation going up, unemployment going up, interest rates going up, the trade deficit going up and - of course - our net contribution to "Europe" going up, one begins to wonder whether the Treasury is taking on some of the more regrettable characteristics of the Home Office. A glance at the small print in the Chancellor's Pre-Budget Report doesn't provide much comfort. On page 22, under "Risks", it says "considerable uncertainty remains over the extent to which official population and labour supply data adequately measure migration flows".

Much the same warning is given on page 194, where the talk is of the "key ongoing uncertainty" surrounding migration flows and the size of the working-age population.

Then there's VAT fraud (on page 126). "Missing Trader Intra-Community [MTIC] VAT fraud is a large-scale organised criminal attack on the EU VAT system, with the aim of creating large unpaid VAT liabilities and fraudulent VAT repayment claims. The scale of the attack on the VAT system increased...largely as a response to a European Court case that created legal uncertainty and removed HM Revenue and Customs arguments used to deny suspect VAT repayment claims. New estimates published today show that the scale of attempted MTIC fraud was between £3.5 billion and £4.75 billion in 2005-2006..."

No need to worry though. "Over 600

extra staff have been re-deployed during 2006-7, meaning that the vast majority of suspect repayment claims are now subject to in-depth checking...". The implication being that previously such checking just wasn't taking place. "A further 100 staff are being redeployed to MTIC strategy, bringing the total to 1,500." That's all right then. Assuming each of those 1,500 staff costs on average £30,000 a year all-in, their total cost would be £45 million a year.

There is of course a simple way out of these problems, for both the Home Office and the Treasury. Leave the EU. We could then get control of our borders back; we could abolish VAT altogether; and we wouldn't have the European Court of Justice handing down dubious rulings either.

EU green cards in the pipeline

A European Commission proposal for an European Union green card scheme is to be launched later this year, despite EU member states having different rules and regulations in their labour markets.

The introduction of a US-style green card in the EU would give highly skilled migrants easier access to the 27-member bloc.

"We are going to make a specific proposal for the admission of high skilled workers. We foresee a green card", a Commission official told *Reuters* on 10th January.

The EU executive is to present the proposal for a directive on an EU green card in the second half of 2007. The details are still being hammered out.

But such a proposal could face resistance from EU member states,

which have previously fiercely opposed EU interference within their labour markets.

Up to now Germany - which currently holds the rotating EU presidency and which already has its own green card scheme - is one of the countries that has spearheaded opposition to any cross-border policy on legal migration, saying its labour market is a purely domestic matter.

To make an EU green card become a reality all EU countries would have to agree on the scheme.

The systems of legal immigration differ from country to country in the EU, with most allowing only limited new immigration except for family reunification and work permits for people with specific skills and a

contract.

Even within the Union, movement between some old and new member states remains subject to restrictions.

The description "green card" comes from the first version of the US resident card which was printed on green paper and which gives the holder permission to permanently reside and take employment in the US.

EU justice commissioner Franco Frattini has previously said that the idea of a directive on the conditions of admission to the EU for highly skilled workers - including the possibility of an EU green card - responds to an "economic necessity".

He said the US, Canada and Australia are able to attract talented migrants while Europe continues to receive low-skilled or unskilled labour.

So who should apologise to whom?

"I've never heard a Muslim apologise for having occupied Spain for eight hundred years."

José-Maria Aznar, former Spanish prime minister, in *Jeune Afrique*, 1st October 2006.

Government admits acting illegally over EU proposals - well, almost

In a recent letter to the *Daily Telegraph* (24th January), Geoff Hoon angrily dismissed claims that the Government was turning a blind eye to new laws for which there was no legal basis. This followed a story in that newspaper which suggested that leaked papers from the House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee showed that the Minister candidly accepted that this was happening in order that the Government could get its own way in other matters. But Mr Hoon now declared: "If we felt the measures fell outside the EU's legal competence, we would not hesitate to vote against".

Well, a recent exchange in the House of Lords demonstrates that Mr Hoon's denials should be treated with the same degree of scepticism as the annual EU accounts.

On 17th January Lord Pearson of Rannoch asked the Government:

"Whether they have supported, in the Council of Ministers, the European Union's use of Article 308 of the Treaty establishing the European Community as the legal basis for the European

Union's Civil Protection Mechanism".

For the Government Lord Bassam of Brighton replied: "In 2001 the United Kingdom supported the adoption of a council decision establishing the EU Civil Protection Mechanism. The mechanism has Article 308 of the Treaty establishing the European Community as its legal base. The mechanism provides a means for member states to prepare for and to offer mutual assistance and assistance to third countries in the event of natural or man-made disasters".

This would seem close to an admission that the Government has been permitting the EU to act illegally. As Lord Stoddart pointed out: "If Article 308 is designed to deal with matters Common Market, how can it be used for matters that are clearly nothing to do with the Common Market?" He also asked what other measures are taken under this article.

Having appeared to accept that the EU had been acting illegally, Lord Bassam immediately backtracked: "My Lords, first, I do not recognise it

as an entirely new power. It has been there for a number of years. I also take issue with the disparaging comment the noble Lord appeared to make about the value of Article 308, which enables the European Union to make aid and assistance available to those who undoubtedly need it when there is a man-made or natural disaster. Those are surely extreme circumstances, and it seems entirely right that we act within the remit of Article 308 to provide such assistance".

Subsequent remarks make it clear he was referring to natural disasters such as the Sunami in Indonesia and droughts in sub-Saharan Africa.

To argue that the EU's new powers are justifiable because natural disasters and acts of terror can disrupt the workings of the market is stretching a point, to put it mildly. To suggest that they are necessary so that we can respond to tragedies in the Third World is absurd; those who framed 308 were plainly referring to the common market that the EU aspires to be - not to Third World economies.

You know it makes sense...

There were those who said that Dominique de Villepin's parody of a French intellectual would have to come to a halt when he became Prime Minister - and that he would consequently cease to provide innocent entertainment to millions of appreciative Anglo-Saxons. But his interview with the *FT* on 6th February proved the pessimists wrong:

"The risk was to leave Europe without

soul, without ambition. The genius of Europe is for me resumed by a formula; creative dissatisfaction. We are never totally satisfied, always thinking we can do better. We are a continent founded on doubt and on an ideal. We are always preoccupied by universalism. So we have a primary responsibility to make sure Europe never betrays its founding ideal..."

Just in case there were one or two *FT*

readers who couldn't work out what this might mean in practice, he was, for once, quite specific:

"I am thinking of an extension of qualified majority voting, a durable and continuous president of the European Council, and a European foreign minister. These are all necessary if Europe is to assert itself both internally and on the international stage".

EU: Can we get out?

Lord Pearson of Rannoch asked Her Majesty's Government: Whether, under international treaties presently in force, the United Kingdom would have the legal power to withdraw from the European Union if Her Majesty's Government or Parliament so resolved. [HL1863]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Foreign and

Commonwealth Office (Lord Triesman): Parliament may amend or repeal any existing Act of Parliament, including the European Communities Act 1972. There is no formal procedure for withdrawal in the EU treaties, nor are there any provisions in the treaties or any other international obligations which affect the ultimate ability of the UK to withdraw from the EU.

However, given that the UK has been a member of the EU for more than 25 years, and its laws and economy are intricately bound up with those of the EU, the Government would in practice have to negotiate the terms of any departure over a lengthy period.

House of Lords Hansard, 8th February 2007 - Parliamentary Copyright.

The EU is conflating the issues of global warming and pollution in its own interests

Graham Booth explains how “beneficial crises” enable the European Union to maximise its power and its income

The EU can be counted on to seize on issues which generally have negative connotations but which can be exploited in order to enhance its power through the imposition of regulations, compliance processes and even taxes.

Such events are termed “beneficial crises” in the Commission, and include the rise in terrorism which has enabled the EU to push the case for identity cards and data bases. In the last few weeks we have seen a flurry of environmental activity from the Commission with new proposals for strict limits on exhaust emissions and a call for a common approach from all 27 members states to “crimes against the environment”.

Universal Concern

Global warming is the biggest potential such crisis since it is one which genuinely does require cross-border cooperation and because it has enabled the Commission to exploit the near universal concern about the environment. But whether deliberately or not, global warming - over which we have little or no control - is being conjoined with pollution over which we clearly have some influence. But they are separate issues as the scientific facts amply demonstrate.

Our elliptical orbit around the sun means that our distance from it varies by five million miles during each yearly orbit and, despite our tilted axis giving us hot and cold seasons we are so perfectly placed that life can exist here from the poles to the equator throughout the year, through a range of temperatures between sub-zero and 50 degrees Centigrade.

The sun is immense - over one million times the size of the earth by volume - and takes up 99 per cent of the entire mass of the Solar System.

At its centre the sun is 14 million degrees Centigrade and some 5,500

degrees at the surface and yet, at our distance of approximately 90 million miles the temperature is not only perfect for our survival; it is also just right to control the evaporation of sea water, so that it can fall as fresh water over the land. That recycling process has been going on, non-stop, for billions of years.

It is also volatile: ‘spots’ on the sun’s surface go from maxima to minima at fairly regular intervals. The word “spot” is rather misleading - the largest group of spots ever recorded (1947) had an area of over 10 billion square miles. During one “minima” period there were almost no spots on its surface - between 1645 and 1715 - during which time there were very cold periods in Europe. During the 1690s the Thames froze regularly each winter.

Core Samples

We know that, as the number of sunspots gets smaller, the earth gets cooler and likewise, when the opposite happens, the earth gets hotter. Core samples taken from the earth show that we go through “ice ages” and “warm periods” approximately every 100,000 years and yet our precise position in space has enabled us to live through these variations.

The next ice age, which could be upon us within 2,000 years, will see about a third of our planet under ice - and yet we are being told to worry about global warming!

Man’s input into global warming is very small compared to natural cycles and fluctuations in the earth’s temperature which occurred long before the industrial revolution.

Tiny and fragile as the earth is in the scheme of things we have shown little respect for it. The careless growth of industry has polluted our planet. It has also enabled us to transform our

economic prospects. If we now stopped all production to meet stringent demands to reduce CO₂ the resultant economic dislocation would cause widespread poverty.

If the sun DOES decide to warm up or cool down we WILL follow its lead and there is nothing we can do to stop it. What we CAN do, voluntarily, is to reduce pollution and keep our fragile and precious atmosphere fit for human consumption for future generations.

Scare -Mongering

There are many things that Governments could - and should - do to help to make the environment cleaner and healthier - introduce many more “park and ride” schemes; dramatically improve public transport; encourage “video conferencing” by exempting it from VAT; accept that nuclear is the cleanest form of power and look further into tidal power and wind turbines - providing there is candour about their true costs.

All of us can contribute in many ways - buying more economical cars; using low energy light bulbs; walking short distances to the shops, or cycling etc.

By scare-mongering about global warming and using that as an excuse to raise “climate change levies” and to maximise their own powers governments, and especially the EU, are being dishonest.

It also needs to be borne in mind that the EU is in desperate need of more tax income to extend its powers for fiscal transfers to support the ailing euro, and will grab an opportunity to tax pollution-emitting activities such as flying and driving. What a pity it is not possible for them to tax hot air emitted by bureaucrats and politicians!

Graham Booth is UKIP Member of the European Parliament for the South West region.

The David and Victoria story: an allegory for Britain's EU experience?

A soccer match has been chosen to mark the 50th anniversary of the EU because no symbol can be found to conjure up warm feelings about British membership

While other EU countries mark the 50th anniversary of the EU with concerts, recitals, art exhibitions and 'youth summits' later this year the UK will do so by means of a soccer match. The form of celebration is a revealing one, not least because it demonstrates that there is literally nothing about the EU to which our political elites can point that the public will acknowledge as a symbol of success; football, a game invented in these islands but now played in every continent, has nothing to do with the European Union.

When the average Brit is asked to think 'Europe' he is likely to dwell on mountains of surplus food, or the regulation governing the dimensions of the cucumber, or the decimation of the British fishing industry. But the symbolic torching of a British trawler or the construction of a food mountain to dwarf Nelson's column is hardly the kind of thing that will engender warm feelings about the process of European political integration.

So, national stereotypes being what they are, and because soccer is the world's most popular human activity, the signing of the Rome Treaty will be marked in this country by 90 minutes of sporting rivalry between Manchester United and an all-star European team

led by David Beckham.

Anyone looking for a deep europhile message behind the fixture will be frustrated. Indeed such significance as can be divined would seem to point in the wrong direction from an EU perspective. After all, the fixture will take the form of a nominally British team playing against a European one (from a purely PR point of view a match between a European team including British players and a world team would surely have made more sense). Unlike economic competition, sport is a zero-sum game; unless a draw can be contrived someone has to lose. And if sport is to imitate politics the most appropriate result would be a six-nil thrashing for Manchester United with all the ref's decisions going against the British side.

Nor should it have escaped the attention of the Brussels PR machine that Manchester United is now American-owned (significantly the benign US owners whose bid for the club sparked public protests have not interfered in the management of the team which has played even better since the change of ownership).

David Beckham has no doubt been chosen to lead the European team because... well, because he is David

Beckham. Given the Beckhams' love of celebrity we are sure that if asked Mrs Beckham would also take part; she would make an excellent cheer leader. But, just a minute, haven't the Beckhams just decided to turn their backs on Europe (which Mrs Beckham reportedly doesn't care for) in order to seek better pay, prospects and shopping opportunities in the Land of the Free? Given their aspirations LA will surely provide a more suitable base for the still-upwardly mobile couple than Madrid where the player's sporting career went into decline. Certainly it is hard to interpret their story as a plea for greater European engagement.

All of this might seem merely to be grist for the mill of eurosceptic humorists. But political symbols are important; failure to find credible symbols speaks eloquently about the consequences of British membership of the European Union. There are opportunities for eurosceptics here. If UKIP cannot mark the 50th anniversary of the EU by coming up with suitable ways to symbolise the loss of sovereignty, prospects and liberties that Britain has suffered as the result of EU membership it will not be doing its job.

Freest economies 'all British ex-colonies'

The world's five freest countries in economic terms are all former British colonies, according to the annual Index of Freedom published by the Heritage Foundation and the Wall Street Journal. Hong Kong has the highest level of economic freedom for the 13th successive year, followed by Singapore, Australia, the US and New Zealand. Britain is in sixth position, trailed by Ireland, although the latter scores considerably higher in terms of fiscal freedom and freedom from government while the UK scores well in terms of labour market freedom and

freedom from corruption. Of the top ten countries in overall terms no less than eight are part of the Anglosphere, the exceptions being Luxembourg in 8th position and Switzerland in 9th position. Canada is in tenth place. EU countries scoring relatively well include Estonia in 12th place, Denmark in 13th and the Netherlands in 14th position. France in 45th position, Romania in 67th place and Greece in 95th place are among EU countries which score relatively very poorly.

A commentary accompanying the data states: "Not only is a high level of

per capita income clearly associated with a high level of per capita gross domestic product, but those higher GDP growth rates seem to create a virtuous cycle, triggering further improvements in economic freedom. Our 13 years of Index data strongly suggest countries that increase their levels of freedom experience faster growth rates... Countries that are able to reflect the desires of their people for better lives will adopt economic freedom, and countries that repress their people for political reasons will cause economic suffering".

LETTERS

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

No Difference between Cameron and Brown

Dear Sir,

I don't understand why Frederick Forsyth is so sanguine about David Cameron's reaction to the pledge idea. Cameron already knows the UKIP position and has written us off. He has also decided that when it comes to the voting moment, Conservatives will vote for him despite disagreeing with almost everything he stands for, just to avoid another Brown government. And this would certainly be the result if Conservatives abstain. I know people who take this view.

I voted for Liam Fox in the Conservative leadership election and have always seen Cameron for the Blair-lite carpetbagger he is. Recently I joined UKIP (which I would like to see renamed the Restoration Party) because on all aspects of policy, not only the EU, where I do not know UKIP policy I am confident that it will reflect my own views; and when I look the policy up that turns out to be true.

I am afraid that it does not matter much whether Cameron or Brown forms the next government and only a substantial vote for UKIP will force a reconfiguration of the political

landscape for the subsequent election.
MICHAEL BRIGHT
Kent

Is UKIP Closet Labour?

Dear Sir,

I am not sure what to make of Lord Pearson of Rannoch and Lord Willoughby de Broke's defection to UKIP. UKIP's basic agenda is beyond reproach. However, its determination to contest all seats - except, apparently those contested by candidates supporting the Better Off Out policy - makes me wonder what its covert agenda is. Apparently, UKIP's intervention in marginal constituencies in 2005 cost the Conservative Party approximately 25 seats and gave Labour a majority of about 66 instead of 16. At the next election, UKIP's intervention may keep Labour in office and that will be a disaster.

Conservative policy on the EU is bad enough but that of Labour is immeasurably worse, for Labour is dedicated to taking us ever deeper into the EU until we are just a handful of unimportant regions in a Europe-wide, soviet-style megastate. Nevertheless, UKIP constantly attacks the Conservatives while never saying a word against Labour. I do not believe that UKIP is "closet racist" as David Cameron said; but I have a sneaking suspicion that it is closet Labour and,

therefore, closet Europhile.
RICHARD CLEMENTS
Essex

More Support for UKIP

Dear Sir,

Frederick Forsyth tells readers of *eurofacts* that of course he supports the Better Off Out movement "but it is not going to change David Cameron's mind". But that is not an objective of the Freedom Association. We know better than anyone else just how bigoted are the MPs of all the main parties. For our members have so far failed to find any MP supporting the continued membership of the EU willing and able to find any fault in Lord Pearson of Rannoch's case for the United Kingdom to leave the EU.

I would like to report a shift towards support and even actual membership of UKIP. The chairman of the Freedom Association, Christopher Gill and another prominent member of our Council, Lord Pearson are both now members of UKIP. Our constitution says we are Independent non-Party. My personal view is that as soon as possible we shall have to change the constitution. I believe that the new constitution should say we are pro-freedom and pro-UK.

PROFESSOR ANTONY FLEW
Reading

Why there has been no cost-benefit analysis

"Unquestionably, of course, the main reason why no such document [a cost benefit analysis of British membership of the EU] is on the cards at the moment is because the government is well aware of what any objective analysis would exhibit. This is, however, a very dangerous situation. Officialdom may not want to recognise what the real position is but the electorate at large, judged by all the opinion polls, is quite capable of doing

so and is drawing its own conclusions. We are then left with a state of affairs where all our major political parties simply refuse to recognise facts which a majority of the people of Britain, including nowadays much of the press, increasingly take for granted. It is not a healthy situation when awkward facts are brushed under the carpet and policies are followed which are therefore based on entirely false premises. It is even less healthy when a

majority of the electorate realise that this is what is happening. Nothing brings politicians and the political process more into disrepute than seeing an increasingly wide gap opening up between perception and reality. How much longer can this go on?"

Labour Euro-Safeguards Bulletin,
January 2007.

MEETINGS

Brighton Philharmonic Orchestra
01273 709709

Sunday **25th February 2007**, 14.45 pm

A British Symphony, conducted by Barry Wordsworth.

(Mr Rodney Atkinson, the well known political author commissioned Andrew Grant, the organist, Choirmaster and Composer at Her Majesty's Chapels Royal, to compose "A British Symphony" - The work is in the form of a unified symphony which links, inter-plays and unites the separate strands into a musical finale of one British identity.)

CONCERT

Concert Hall, Brighton

Admission £6 to £23 by ticket

(Mon-Sat at the Brighton Dome Ticket Office - Tel: 01273 709709 - 29 New Road, Brighton. or online at www.brightondome.org)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **6th March**, 6.00 pm

"What do rulers do when they rule?"

Mark Twain commented that anyone who actively sought to become president was clearly thereby morally disqualified from holding the office.

Rodney Barker, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

Wednesday **7th March**, 6.00 pm

"Schools and Politics"

Schools and politics do not mix. They are, as Woody Allen would say "at two". The sad consequences are there to see over the last half-century. Can they be disentangled?

Lord Sutherland of Houndwood KT, FBA, *Provost of Gresham College*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01686 669945

Friday **2nd March 2007**, 7.30 pm

"The EU Laid Bare"

Mike Natrass MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Dragon Hotel, Montgomery, Powys

Admission Free

UK Independence Party
07900 438489

Tuesday **6th March 2007**, 8.00 pm

"Christianity in Politics"

Geoff Locke

PUBLIC MEETING

Butcher's Arms, Audley, Staffordshire

Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01934 644253

Monday **19th March 2007**, 7.30 pm

Christopher Booker, *Journalist and author*

Nigel Farage MEP

Chris Lees

PUBLIC MEETING

Royal Hotel, Weston-Super-Mare

Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01722 744814

Saturday **14th April 2007**,
Open 10.00 am

Graham Booth MEP

Nigel Farage MEP

Lindsay Jenkins, *author*

Lord Willoughby de Broke

Further speakers to be announced

ALL DAY SPRING CONFERENCE

Exeter University, Great Hall, Exeter, Devon

Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **27th February**, 10.40 am

Evidence will be heard by the *Inquiry into VAT and Carousel Fraud in the EU* from a) Mr Royston Ford, Cunningham Lindsay Marine; and b) Mrs Angela O'Hara, Vodafone, Mr Fred Howarth, Federation of Technological Industries; and Dr Michael Cheetham.

Tuesday **27th February**, 3.40 pm

Evidence will be heard by the *Economic Affairs Committee* from the TUC and Ofsted.

Tuesday **27th February**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *UK Economic Regulators* from a) The Office of Fair Trading; and b) The Competition Commission.

Wednesday **28th February**, 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Environment and Agriculture* from the Wine and Spirits Trade Association.

Wednesday **28th February**, 11.15 am

Evidence will be heard by the *Science and Technology Committee* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **28th February**, 3.40 pm

Evidence will be heard by the *Science and Technology Committee* from Prof Ross Anderson; Prof Mark Hanley and other witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **1st March**, 10.30 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Foreign Affairs, Defence and Development Policy* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **7th March**, 10.40 am

Evidence will be heard by the *Constitution Committee* from Prof Dame Hazel Genn and Mr Paul Dacre, *Daily Mail*.

Note:

Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

ECOFIN **27th February**

Countries that have not Ratified the Treaty on the Constitution **27th February**

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.

A Democratic Europe: An Alternative to the EU

by *Richard Body*. **£10.00**

Sir Richard lays out the case for a truly democratic European Union as opposed to an undemocratic super power.

The Great Deception: Can the European Union survive

by *Christopher Booker*

& *Richard North*. **£10.99**

This book is the most comprehensive history of the EU.

Living in a Fascist Country

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£15.99**

The disappearing freedom and privacy.

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 UKIP.

Britain and the EU: Time to Move On

by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£3.95**

The European Union malaise and the future direction for a nation state.

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.

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.

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 8570 5681
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	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender	
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

