

UKIP donations: Where does the public interest lie?

Although UKIP is at fault it looks as if, having been ineffectual in dealing with the big parties, the Electoral Commission is now bullying a small one

Just as the workings of a vigorous free enterprise system require that it should admit new market entrants, so the vitality of the democratic system requires that it should be open to new political players. It is, of course, in the nature of things that many new political initiatives will be taken over by others, or that they will fizzle out once the concerns that led to their creation are finally addressed. But it is crucially important that it remains possible for ordinary citizens to challenge the established order if they believe that existing parties do not meet their concerns, and, if necessary, to start their own political parties. It is also important that unnecessary barriers are not placed in their way.

Biggest Donor

This is just one reason why the decision of the Electoral Commission to demand the forfeiture of donations amounting to £363,000 given to UKIP by Alan Bown, the party's single biggest donor, is wholly disproportionate. A sharp rap over the knuckles would have been more than enough.

Although the matter may be ultimately settled in the courts, as matters stand the donations are to be trousered by the State because Mr Bown was not on the electoral register at the time the donations were made as required under Section 54 of the Political Parties, Elections and

Referendums Act 2000. It appears that as soon as he realised this the matter was corrected.

The purpose of the Act is to prevent British political parties being funded from dubious overseas sources. Mr Bown has worked in this country throughout his working life and paid his taxes here. The offence is therefore of a purely technical kind. Unlike some prominent Labour and Conservative supporters who have recently been in the headlines, Mr Bown handed over the money because of strong personal convictions rather than from a desire for personal aggrandisement. Public life could do with more patriotic ex-bookies with principles and fewer company chairmen with an unquenchable craving for peerages.

In this controversy the strong impression has therefore been created that, having been widely criticised for being ineffectual and weak in its dealings with the big parties, the Electoral Commission is trying to look authoritative by crushing a small one.

Ideological Zeal

None of this is to suggest that UKIP should be free of criticism. Like many political campaigns and pressure groups in the past the ideological zeal of its leading members has tended to exceed the enthusiasm for creating transparent systems of accountability and sticking to them. For a small party it also contains a truly remarkable

number of rifts and rows, and its leader, Nigel Farage, although politically gifted, sometimes gives the impression that he is running the party single-handedly by means of a mobile phone from a bar. Nevertheless, UKIP remains the only remotely credible political party committed unreservedly to withdrawal from the EU. Its leadership has also grasped a vital truth - that goals which are dear to the hearts of many voters can only be achieved if national sovereignty is regained. Hence the party's decision to link the issue of withdrawal to a range of central economic and social issues in order to provide a genuine alternative to the middle-ground philosophies of Cameron and Brown.

Vital Role

Whatever its ultimate role in British politics UKIP has a vital role to play at the present juncture in our history. Given that it is not short of enemies, either in London or Brussels, it can be taken for granted that any departures from the rules or any behavioural lapses by its MEPs will be seized on by its opponents. Moreover, its complaints about EU fraud and corruption will lack all credibility unless its own house is seen to be in order. It would be tragic if it were to be destroyed as a consequence of carelessness or a cavalier attitude towards bookkeeping and

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: Burden of red tape hits new record p.2 - Poles sending back 'massive sums' p.2 - EU's mission 'to save civilisation' p.2 - You British are European, Amato insists p.2 - EU states can't agree on 50th birthday card p.3 - EU directive threatens our favourite brew p.3 - New EU-group casts interesting light on the division of opinion about the EU p.4 - Norris lines up with the 'Outers' p.4 - Top eurocrats have bigger role p.4 - US missile defences: some EU states sign up while others support Russia p.5

Burden of red tape hits new record

The burden of red tape on British business has hit a record of nearly £56 billion and shows no sign of slowing, according to figures to be published by the British Chambers of Commerce. The BCC which compiles its "burdens barometer" on a regular basis, says the cumulative cost of regulation on British business is now £55.6 billion.

A year ago that burden was £44.8

billion, revised figures reveal, implying an increase in red tape of more than £10 billion in the past 12 months.

The BCC said the increase was particularly disappointing in the light of the government's pledge to make 2006 the "year of delivery" on cutting red tape.

The figures show that the biggest burden on business comes from the working-time regulations - the 48-hour

week - and data protection. Environmental regulations are increasingly burdensome to business. But the problem is often the sheer scale of red tape faced by business, particularly smaller firms.

The latest estimate of the burden, which does not include the minimum wage, lists 77 separate groups of regulations that have a significant impact.

Poles sending back 'massive sums'

Expatriate Poles who left their country following its entry to the EU in 2004 are sending money back home at the rate of 6 billion (£3.9 billion) a year, according to the Polish Government. "It's a massive sum", a Government spokesman told the EUobserver on 22nd February.

Estimates of how many Poles have arrived in the UK since EU enlargement vary. The UK has suggested that the figure may be around 370,000, but the Polish government reckons the figure is probably between half a million and 600,000 (*Times*, 10th February) which means that the total number of Poles

living in the UK is around two million.

The figures for money sent back to Poland cast a new light on the claims that the influx of Poles and other Central Europeans has represented a net benefit to the UK*.

*(see *eurofacts* for 8th September 2006).

EU's mission 'to save civilisation'

"Europe is today the only force capable of counterbalancing the hegemonic tendencies of the world", declared Nicolas Sarkozy (*International Herald Tribune*, 22nd February). *"It alone is capable of opposing the all-powerful market. The only moderate force capable of furthering a project of civilization."*

The French have frequently suggested that the main purpose of the EU under French leadership was to

provide a counter-balance to an over-mighty US. But evidently the front-running French presidential candidate believes that its role is both more fundamental and more glorious than that; indeed it is nothing less than that of saving civilization from the consumer.

Sarkozy's words reflect a tradition that runs deep in French politics and society. Writing in the *Financial Times* in 1993, the former French prime

minister Edouard Balladur declared: *"What is the market? It is the law of the jungle. And what is civilization. It is the struggle against nature."*

Anyone who believes that Sarkozy represents a break with the past and, if elected, will turn out to be less intransigent than his predecessors over the reform of the CAP and other, trade liberalisation issues may well be in for a nasty shock.

You British are European, Amato insists

These islands are an essential part of Europe. They should stop thinking of themselves as the 'Islanders'. Like it or not, they [the British] are Europeans, Italian Interior Minister Giuliano

Amato speaking at the London School of Economics on 20th February. Mr Amato, one of the principal architects of the European Constitution said he wished *"to change the name but not the*

substance" of the constitutional text. *"The good thing about not calling it a Constitution is that no one can ask for a referendum on it"*, he said.

Continued from p.1

UKIP donations: where does the public interest lie?

administration.

As for the Electoral Commission we would probably be better off without it. It has been far too passive in the cash for peerages controversy, it has failed to respond adequately to the very

serious problem of electoral fraud and it showed itself perfectly willing to give its blessing to a referendum question on the Constitution which displayed a built-in bias in favour of a

yes vote.

The purported aim of the Electoral Commission is to strengthen the democratic process; at present it is acquiescing in its decline.

EU states can't agree about what should go on the 50th birthday card

Reports that the Prime Minister may be about to sign Britain over to a federal Europe for all time may be somewhat wide of the mark

"Tony Blair is about to secretly sign Britain over to a federal Europe FOREVER", screamed the *News of the World* on 25th February.

The main basis for this claim is the apparent readiness of the Prime Minister to agree to a 50-page draft of a Declaration on the Future of Europe - the so-called "Berlin Declaration" - which is seen by the German presidency as the first step in getting agreement on the EU Constitution.

However, in suggesting that the Declaration was a done deal the *News of the World* was at variance with many other media outlets. Its report also conflicts with Foreign Office briefings to the effect that Britain wanted "something short and technical" that could be written on a single page and which makes no reference to the Constitution.

Considerable Differences

The explanation for the wide divergence of interpretation is that the attitude of Downing Street to the document differs from that of the FO and the Treasury.

Euro-sceptics can also take heart from the fact that as the halfway mark of the German presidency looms, there continues to be considerable differences among member states about what should go in the Declaration, whose formal purpose is to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding Treaty of Rome.

Germany and Spain are reported to want the declaration - due to be published on 25th March - to look

forward to the Constitution. But the Dutch, like the British, are opposing this.

Poland and Italy want to emphasise Christian values, but the French are against.

Luxembourg favours a prominent mention of the euro - but, for obvious reasons, this does not play terribly well in Copenhagen, Stockholm or London.

The eastern and central Europeans want reference to their experience under communism, and to stress the need for collective security, but the Germans, always anxious not to offend the Russians, do not.

Nine countries - Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg and Spain - have signed a statement which says that the Declaration should proclaim the "*indispensable balance between economic freedoms and social rights, so that the internal market can become an area also regulated by a social plan*". Britain and the Netherlands are opposed to anything which suggests that the torrent of EU regulation will increase, even if they have been too polite to point out that by Western standards these are countries which score particularly badly in terms of economic freedoms and that their emphasis on social rights has led to high unemployment and low growth.

As time begins to run out it seems most likely that the declaration will be short and bland, although it will probably include the 'social' word in order to satisfy the French. The alternative would appear to be a very long document which would include

the main items from everyone's wish-list and would consequently end up trying to reconcile the irreconcilable. Mr Blair, may or may not have seen a 50-page document, and he may even have liked its contents, but it is unlikely to be the version which is approved in just over two weeks time.

If this turns out to be bland and non-committal, as seems likely, it is difficult to believe that the Declaration will represent an important stage in winning support for the Constitution, a task which, according to Mrs Merkel's spokesmen, is proving even tougher than she expected.

Political Crisis

Uncertainties about the forthcoming French elections, the likely attitude towards EU matters of Gordon Brown as Prime Minister and the implications of the political crisis in Italy all add to her problems.

If she fails to find a basis for an agreement on the Constitution the task will pass first to Portugal, and then to Slovenia. Neither is thought to have the necessary weight to get a deal, in which case there may well not be one before the 2009 European parliamentary elections - an outcome which should greatly assist euro-sceptic candidates.

So while there may not be a great deal for euro-sceptics to cheer about at the present time there is no need to subscribe fully to the deep, dark pessimism of the *News of the World* - at least not yet.

EU directive threatens our favourite brew

One of the many dire consequences of the new EU Reach Directive governing the regulation of chemicals is the impact it will have on the production of Earl Grey tea, a tippie much favoured in the editorial office of

euofacts. This is because the producers of the citrus fruit bergamot which is unique to Earl Grey, but which is mainly used in the manufacture of perfume, is classified as potentially dangerous and will

therefore have to be tested and registered with the European Chemical Agency. The Italian farmers who grow the commodity say that the £35,000 cost of testing means that they are likely to change the crops they grow.

New EU-group casts interesting light on the division of opinion about the EU

Plans for a new pro-EU pressure group - to be named the Robin Cook Foundation - cast an interesting light on the division of opinion about the EU in this country.

Euro-sceptic bodies can claim substantial public support and a growing measure of backing from business as well as the support of a majority of conservative and centre-right think-tanks. But there is a distinct shortage of those among the Great and the Good who are prepared to say publicly that they are willing even to consider EU withdrawal. This has proved a major problem for the euro-sceptic cause.

In contrast the euro-ophile cause has virtually no public support and a

falling level of business support - hence the virtual collapse of Britain in Europe in August 2005. But it can still count on the Good and the Great who have invested a huge amount of personal and political capital in the European project. According to the *Sunday Telegraph* on 19th February, among those who will chair debates under the auspices of the new foundation are Lord Kinnock, Lord Ashdown and "a prominent Conservative".

Past sea-changes in opinion suggest that the establishment is the last to change its mind. If and when former Chancellors, Cabinet Secretaries, ex-FO mandarins, former chiefs of the defence staff, Bishops and vice-chancellors start to defect from the

euro-ophile camp we will know that the battle is entering its final decisive stage.

Meanwhile, some heart can be taken from the fact that the Robin Cook Foundation will apparently acknowledge that "some of the arguments advanced by the euro-sceptics have been right". The fact that euro-ophile strategists have been forced to acknowledge this and to re-group accordingly demonstrates the extent to which the euro-sceptic argument has prevailed. But getting the Good and Great to admit they have been wrong - massively and incorrigibly wrong over decades - is an entirely different matter.

Norris lines up with the 'Outers'

Steven Norris, the former Tory Minister and London mayoral candidate, has revealed that he is in favour of formal withdrawal from the EU. Speaking on Ian Dale's, 18 Doughty Street's *Live at Nine* programme Norris said that Britain "just doesn't belong in the same institutions" as other European countries.

Norris, who hopes to stand against Ken Livingstone again in 2008 went

on: "*The institution of the European Union which I think is corrupted and corrupting and largely redundant...if it were put to me that it were practicable, the intention of Cameron's Conservative party to withdraw ourselves formally from the European Union wouldn't cause me a single moment's distress.*"

"I would say...we have a completely different tradition in terms of democracy, in terms of institutions, in

terms of economy, in terms of our use of the English language, our transatlantic connections...We just don't belong in the same institutions...We want a relationship that is constructive in Europe and will continue to be, you need us, we need you, but what we don't need is the institution of the European Union of which I'm profoundly suspicious."

Top eurocrats have bigger role, says Commissioner

Which EU institution has grown in power most since EU enlargement? Last autumn Gunter Verheugen the German industry Commissioner caused uproar in Brussels when he suggested that senior bureaucrats were now effectively running the EU show often ignoring the Commissioners in the process.

On 22nd February, speaking to journalists, Danuta Hubner, the Polish

Commissioner for the regions confirmed the substance of Mr Verheugen's claim but evidently saw no reason to regret the fact that under what she described as an 'increasingly presidential system' growing power lay with the secretariat general.

"The presidential system doesn't mean that the president is making all the decisions, it means that there is a strong role for the Commission

Secretariat", she said.

"With a big Commission you are becoming more disciplined...We don't have long Commission meetings. What we discuss is always what has not reached final agreement at cabinet level", she explained.

In other words the wholly unaccountable secretariat "pre-cooks" the decisions in the interests of "efficiency".

US missile defences: some EU states sign up while others support Russian protests

When it comes to a really serious security threat some look to the US for assistance - but no one looks to the EU

According to press reports, Downing Street has confirmed that it has been engaged in talks with Washington over options for siting elements of an US anti-ballistic missile system in Britain. Few things are as unpopular in the Labour Party as the so-called "son of star wars" ABM system and this revelation has sparked protests from Labour MPs who fear that by the time Gordon Brown gets his feet under the Downing Street table his government will be irrevocably committed to measures which are anathema to a majority of Labour MPs.

Downing Street 'sources' are reported to have revealed that the talks with Washington had focussed on two options: silo-based missile interceptors and missile tracking radar. However, since the Fylingdales early warning system in Yorkshire has already been incorporated in the US missile defence programme, it seems more likely that London and Washington will settle on the first and somewhat more politically difficult of these two options.

Rogue State

Poland has already agreed that ten silo-based interceptors will be based on its territory while the Czech Republic has agreed to host missile tracking facilities. Other EU states have either firmly rejected US overtures to provide similar facilities, or signalled the political impossibility of even being drawn into discussions on the subject.

The purpose of the US-defence shield is to provide protection against a limited missile attack, the kind of attack that might be launched by a rogue state, the most obvious possible threats being posed by Iran.

Iran, which is on the verge of becoming a nuclear power, presently lacks the ability to strike European targets, but future stages of its Shahab missile programme are likely to bring

all of Europe, including Britain, into range in the relatively near future.

Moscow has strongly criticised the US programme, threatening to target the anti-missile facilities in Poland and Central Europe and to tear up the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty which banned the deployment of medium range missiles in Europe. Under the treaty, which was signed in 1987, America withdrew the Cruise and Pershing missiles based in Europe while the then Soviet Union removed the SS-20s based on its side of the East-West divide.

Huge Implications

These issues - to which too little attention has been given by the British media - are likely to have huge implications, not only for the future of UK defence policy but also for the political development of the EU and for relations between EU states.

In the present controversy Germany has sided with Moscow arguing that the US and Poland should have taken greater account of Russian sensibilities and done more to consider them. Under both Schröder and Merkel Germany has sought closer ties with Russia and evidently sees no reason to regard Mr Putin's increasingly bellicose foreign policy rhetoric and growing authoritarianism as impediments.

Poland and the Czech Republic argue that the planned missile system represents no threat whatever to Russia. While literally true the statements of the Polish and Czech governments do not tell the whole story. A credible defence against missile attack would increase US influence in Europe and beyond, while diminishing that of Moscow. For that reason Nikolai Solovtsov, the head of Russia's strategic missile command has issued a series of dark warnings.

"Russia will have to take additional measures to counter missile defence systems to prevent its strategic deterrent potential being downgraded", he said recently. Since, by definition, an ABM system has no offensive capabilities, these words are in need of interpretation. In effect, they mean that Russia does not care for measures which will limit its ability to re-assert lost influence in Eastern Europe and to use military assets - assets which Putin is keen to modernise and strengthen - for the purpose of political coercion. Understandably, the Czech Republic and Poland are keen to limit its ability to do so.

Increasingly Belligerent

In one respect, however, the Poles and Central Europeans are at one. Neither looks to the Common European Foreign and Security Policy for protection against either an attack by a rogue state or from pressure from a resurgent and increasingly belligerent Russia. Poland, which has powerful reasons to feel anxious when Moscow and Berlin cosy up, seeks US protection. Germany has apparently decided that its security interests are served by an accommodation with Russia.

The EU's ambitions to build its own defence capabilities consequently look even more incredible than ever. In earlier centuries it would have been taken for granted that a state that could not defend itself would not long survive. Europe's problem today is yet more serious. Not only can it not defend itself against the most obvious threats that it faces, but it is also divided about the nature of those threats and about whom it should turn to as allies.

LETTERS

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

Finding the Right Lever

Dear Sir,

I agree with most of Frederick Forsyth's article (9th February) but regret that he does not wish to use the Better Off Out Campaign (of which he is joint Patron). I regard the BOO Campaign as a very worthwhile cross-party rallying point for winning hearts and minds in Parliament where it really matters.

I share his perception that David Cameron is in cahoots with half a dozen EU fanatics at the top of his Party. My hope is that, while he still may be malleable under pressure, he can be encouraged/frightened out of their unpatriotic company. It's time that the collaborationist elite were all individually called to account.

"A referendum is the only viable way left". Yes, it is democratic and we can win it. Here I agree with Mr Forsyth that it is a much better bet for us to have one on a unilateral taking back of certain powers about which nearly everyone will agree rather than an stark In or Out one that can be subverted. That also applies to one on the EU Constitution which, in any case, will almost certainly not be allowed on Constitutional Treaty mark 2.

The great advantage of the limited referendum is that when won its implementation will inevitably lead to complete withdrawal. That formidable Eurorealist guru Richard North (www.eureferendum.com) has for years espoused the repudiation of the CFP as the ideal jemmy to lever us out of the EU altogether. Perhaps that is why Cameron dropped that Tory promise.

SIR GEORGE EARLE
Devon

Party Bias?

Dear Sir,

I first subscribed to *eurofacts* because of the information you published on the EU. However, in my opinion you appear to be giving more coverage to Mr Forsyth and his views on escaping from the EU.

In his latest contribution he reiterates his desire to get out of the EU through the Tory Party by means of a

referendum. Unfortunately he failed yet again to state that a referendum has two glaring faults i.e. they are not binding and it is the politicians who will do the crucial wording. This will undoubtedly be biased towards the required result.

You may have been reluctant to edit such a prominent author's letter but you could have added a footnote to this effect, which conveys to me that you also have a preference for a Tory government.

WILLIAM S. McGEARY
Dumfriesshire

eurofacts does not seek to express a party political preference. We published Mr Forsyth's article because we judged he had something interesting to say, and said it well. Following similar criteria we published in the previous issue an article by Lords Pearson of Rannoch and Willoughby de Broke explaining why they were **leaving** the Conservative Party. In the same issue we published in full a letter by Nigel Farage, the leader of UKIP, to Conservative MPs urging them to back the Better Off Out Campaign if they wanted to avoid facing a UKIP challenge. Scarcely evidence of a pro-Tory bias!- Ed.

What the records show

Dear Sir,

In reply to Lord Pearson's question regarding the UK's power to withdraw from the EU, Lord Triesman, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, pointed out that we would be legally free to withdraw from the treaty signed in 1972, but given that "our laws and economy are so 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".

Interesting that in January 2002 a confidential document addressed to his department was released under the 30-year-rule. It concerned sovereignty both internal and external and made clear that EU law would override legislation by the UK parliament but with little immediate effect since it was likely to be incremental. "Even with

the most dramatic development of the Community the major member states can hardly lose the 'last resort' ability to withdraw in less than three decades. The Community's development could produce **before then** a period in which the political practicability of withdrawal was doubtful...In the last resort the ultimate sovereignty of the state will surely remain unchallenged **for this century at least**" (my emphasis).

So in 1971 Lord Triesman's department was envisaging the introduction of Community Laws not officially in existence then, which would be transposed into national law within 30 years. It was even able to list them at the time:

A) Areas of significant restraint on a national government: customs duties, agriculture, fisheries, free movement of labour, services and capital, transport, monopolies and restrictive practices, state aid for industry, coal steel and nuclear energy, company and insurance law, social security for migrant workers and VAT.

B) Areas of less significant restraint; laws regarding matrimony, family and inheritance, crime, contract and civil wrongs; land, housing and territorial planning, nationality, trusts, social services, education, technology, health, local government, rates of direct taxation, economic policy, exchange rates and balance of payments."

And the list does not include what is now the most comprehensive body of EU law, that on the environment, which formed no part of the original Treaty of Rome.

Lord Triesman's "more than 25 years in the EU" is a curious choice of time span. The EU was only established at Maastricht in 1992 and if he is referring to its predecessor, the European Economic Community which we joined in 1972, his quarter-century is wide of the mark.

Perhaps he is sensitive about the 30 years of European integration as predicted by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the alleged complexities now facing UK withdrawal.

MARY ROLLS
Dumfriesshire

MEETINGS

**Campaign for an
Independent Britain**
01243 821311

Saturday **10th March 2007**, 7.30 pm

“We Want Our Country Back”

Rodney Atkinson, *author*
Ashley Mote MEP, *Independent*

PUBLIC MEETING
Assembly Rooms, Chichester W. Sussex
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01503 230055

Saturday **10th March 2007**, 7.45 pm

Roger Knapman MEP
Michael Wood, *South West Regional
Organiser, UKIP*

PUBLIC MEETING
Public Hall, Liskeard, Cornwall
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01635 255582

Tuesday **13th March 2007**, 8.00 pm

Christopher Gill RD
Chairman, **Dr John Beatham**

PUBLIC MEETING
The Guildhall, Andover, Wiltshire
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

FREE - Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting we
may be able to advertise the event.

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **27th March**, 6.00 pm

“Northern Ireland and the British-Irish
relationship: The Gladstonian
Settlement revisited”

Vernon Bogdanor, CBE. FBA,
Gresham Professor of Law

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

Freedom Association
01746 861267

Tuesday **3rd April 2007**, 1.00 pm

Tom Wise MEP

PUBLIC MEETING
The Counting House, 50 Cornhill,
London EC3V
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

**Campaign for an
Independent Britain**
020 8340 0314

Saturday **21st April 2007**, 2.30 pm

Frederick Forsyth CBE, *journalist and
novelist*
The Lord Willoughby de Broke, *UKIP*
Chairman, **The Lord Stoddart of
Swindon**

PUBLIC MEETING
Pimlico School, Lupus Street, London
Admission Free

**British Weights & Measures
Association**
020 8922 0089

Saturday **19th May**, 1.30 pm

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING
Victory Services Club, 63 Seymour
Street, London W2 2HF
Admission
(details to be announced)

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Wednesday **14th March**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on the *The EU/US
Passenger Name Record Agreement* and
*The Prüm Convention on cross-border
cooperation in combating terrorism,
cross-border crime and illegal migration*
from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **14th March**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard by the *Inquiry into
the EU Wine Sector* from Wine
Intelligence.

Wednesday **14th March**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard by the *Inquiry into
a European Supervision Order in pre-trial
procedures* from Commission officials.

Tuesday **20th March**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *UK
Economic Regulators* from the Financial
Services Authority.

Wednesday **21st March**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard by the *Inquiry into
the EU Wine Sector* from the UK
Vineyards Association.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Commonwealth Day | 12th March |
| Finnish Parliamentary Elections | 18th March |
| UK Parliamentary Budget | 21st March |
| Berlin Declaration on the Future of Europe | 25th March |

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.

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.

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.

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.

Better Off Out! Okay What Next?

by *Bruges Group* DVD

Per Session *Morning/Afternoon/Evening* **£10.00 each** Complete Boxed Set **£25.00**
The 2006 Conference, held in the Great Hall of King's College, London.

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

