

## Bland, vague and historically questionable

*The only consequence of the Berlin Declaration was to highlight once again the gulf between the attitudes of ordinary people and those of Europe's political elites*

The German Chancellor treated the signing of the Berlin Declaration as if it were a diplomatic triumph, promising to adopt the same approach in pursuit of an agreement on the Constitution. The reality is that there was no breakthrough or any convergence of opinion about how Europe should extricate itself from its present crisis. The Declaration constitutes a mixture of the banal, the vague and the factually inaccurate. Consider, for instance, the opening sentences: *"For centuries Europe has been an idea, holding out hope of peace and understanding. That hope has been fulfilled"*. If the word 'Europe' is intended to denote the process of political unification, as the context would seem to imply, this assertion is simply false: from Napoleon to Hitler the drive for a unified Europe has been accompanied by war and mutual suspicion. What has driven the European project has not been "yearning for freedom" as the Declaration goes on to claim, but French fear of Germany and Germany's fear of itself.

### Perpetual Crisis

Nevertheless, the content of the Declaration and the way in which agreement on it was reached tell us much about the condition of the European Union and the perpetual crisis in which it has become stuck.

In our issue of 9th March we pointed out that, given the differences about

what should go in, the Declaration would either be brief and vague, or a composite wish-list that would be lengthy, ambivalent and internally contradictory. Neither would do much to assist the cause of winning approval for the Constitution. Mrs Merkel chose the first of these two options - the Declaration is a mere 700 words - but winning support for an agreed text was still difficult.

Negotiations over the wording were carried out in secret by "sherpas" - unnamed senior civil servants from member states - and continued right up until the deadline. When the European Parliament came to discuss the Declaration two weeks before publication date they found themselves in the extraordinary situation of doing so without having seen the text, causing complaints even from Europhiles MEPs.

### Public Derision

Instead of being signed by representatives of the 27 governments as originally envisaged the Declaration was signed by just three people: Mrs Merkel, Manuel Barroso and Hans-Gert Pöttering, the president of the EU parliament.

It was also noteworthy that in order to escape possible public derision those responsible for translating the German text of the Declaration into other languages were allowed a remarkable degree of licence.

The original German version reads:

"We, the citizens of the European Union, are united *"zu unserem Glück"* - which means "united in our fortune/happiness". But the English text reads: *"We, the citizens of the European Union, have united for the better"*. The Danish version is similar to the English, but then Denmark, like Britain, has a proud record of self-government and a literal translation would not have played well there, either.

The passage which has been widely interpreted as agreement on the need to move rapidly to a constitutional text reads as follows: *"...we must always renew the political shape of Europe in keeping with the times. That is why 50 years after the signing of the Treaties of Rome we are today united in our aim of placing the European Union on a renewed common basis before the elections to the European Parliament in 2009"*.

### Weak and Vague

Mrs Merkel repeatedly made it clear that she wanted the Declaration to serve as a springboard for a new constitutional text which would preserve all the main elements of the old. But the wording quoted above is in fact weaker and vaguer than the conclusions adopted by the EU leaders nine months earlier at the June summit when they agreed that "necessary steps" in the "reform process" should be taken "in the second semester of

**Continued on p.2**

---

**INSIDE: Why 'fax democracy' is better than EU rule p.2 - The meaning of 'Europe' p.2 - Why no Treaty limiting EU powers can ever be relied on p.3 - Monet's view about European withdrawal p.4 - The coming EU demographic winter p.5 - The bee in Lord Carrington's bonnet p.6**

# Why 'fax democracy' is better than EU rule

The thing that really puts the wind up the federalists is that the UK might choose a Norwegian-style relationship with the EU rather than stay in the EU. Europhiles object that it wouldn't do to copy Norway "because Norway must abide by every piece of EU legislation, without, like the UK, having any say in the passing of the legislation". This supercilious remark about Norwegian democracy is usually finished off with the sneer that "Norway has to put up with fax democracy" i.e. merely implement faxed instructions from Brussels.

As so often with europhile arguments, the description of Norway's position is far from the truth.

The truth is that Norway (and Iceland) shape draft EU legislation through two formal treaty-based bodies, the Council of the European Economic Area (EEA) and the EEA Joint Committee, in which they retain the veto. It is true that Norway has no

vote "downstream" at the EU Council of Ministers. It is equally true, as is being demonstrated by the UK's contortions over the proposed US-EU Open Skies agreement, that in practice the UK's position, as a full EU member, is not that different. The UK has no veto on Single Market matters (or much else) and its voting power in the Council of Ministers is currently 8 per cent (and heading inexorably towards 5 per cent as EU enlargement continues).

Meanwhile, Norway remains contentedly - unlike the UK - outside the Common Agricultural Policy, the Common Fisheries Policy, Common Foreign & Security Policies, Common Justice & Home Affairs Policies, Economic & Monetary Union, and - crucially - the EU Customs Union.

As a member of the EU Customs Union, the UK - unlike Norway - has no vote at the World Trade Organisation (the WTO). The UK

doesn't even have "observer status" in WTO meetings. The Commission represents all 27 member-states including the UK and negotiates as an EU bloc. EU trade policy in practice is in hock to France's determination to preserve the CAP at all costs (as poor Mr Mandelson has been finding out the hard way: were it not for French obstructionism, a deal would have been done on the Doha Round years ago).

Norway, in contrast, sits, negotiates and votes at the WTO exclusively on behalf of itself. Norway, a far smaller country than the UK, has far more clout at the WTO than the UK. Norway, unlike the UK, sets its own levels of customs duty and quotas. Norway, unlike the UK, determines its own trade policy as a function of its own trading patterns worldwide. Norway, unlike the UK, can and does negotiate trade agreements with other countries and regional groupings.

## The meaning of 'Europe'

*"I have always found the word 'Europe' on the lips of those who wanted something from others which they dared not demand in their own names."* - German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, *Gedenken und Erinnerungen*, 1890.

Continued from p.1

## Bland, vague and historically questionable

2008".

But while Mrs Merkel has got absolutely nowhere in achieving her central aim she appears to have further alienated some EU members - most notably the Poles and Czechs - as a result of the secretive and undemocratic manner she went about her task. This, as they rightly pointed out, prevented public discussion of the contents of the Declaration and they have consequently signalled their public opposition to similar tactics being used in the case of the Constitution.

Given that an independent Europe-wide poll organised by *Open Europe* in the same week demonstrated that a majority do not think that the EU

"represents ordinary people" the only appreciable effect of the Declaration was to point to the gulf in attitudes which exists between ordinary people and Europe's political elites.

Linguistic slipperiness and indifference to the views of ordinary people have characterised the EU since its inception; it seems only fitting that these qualities should have manifested themselves when the EU marked its 50th anniversary. The surreal atmosphere which exists at the higher levels of EU decision-making may have enabled Mrs Merkel to convince herself that she had achieved something - but she deludes herself. Following the signing of the Treaty the former Commission President Jacques

Delors expressed a more realistic view when he said that the EU's current "crisis" was worse than those experienced in the past, because *"I have the feeling that those who reject political Europe in all forms... think they have won the game"*.

Euroscptics have not yet won the game, although with some justice they may believe that they have won the argument. The reality is that political and economic integration is continuing furtively and unlawfully outside the context of the talks about a constitution. This process will not succeed in the long term but the truth is that matters may get very much worse before they get better.

# Why no Treaty limiting EU powers can ever be relied on

*On the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome a leading barrister describes the role of the European Court of Justice in expanding the powers of the EU*

**By Martin Howe QC**

What is the key feature that makes the Treaty of Rome different in kind from every other international Treaty to which this country belongs, and quite possibly makes it unique in the world? To this question, a lawyer can give only one answer: the key feature is Community law - a system of law that penetrates inside the member states and takes precedence over national laws in the domestic courts of the member states.

Many treaties bind states with rules at the international or external level - but it is this internal penetration which marks out the Treaty of Rome as different from other treaties. In fact, this internal penetration is a classic characteristic, not of international treaties, but of the internal constitutional arrangements of federal states. And like a federal state, the European Union has its own supreme court, the European Court of Justice, which has the ultimate power of decision over both the content and the scope of Community law.

## Profound Changes

This court is not a neutral or impartial interpreter of the rules. The perspective of looking back over 50 years allows us to see clearly how profoundly the Treaty of Rome has been changed from what it was in 1957. I am not speaking here of the many changes to its text which have been made by successive amending treaties such as the Single European Act, Maastricht or Nice. I am talking of the profound changes in the effective content of the Treaty which have occurred as a result of a process of so-called "interpretation" of the Treaty by the Court.

The key point that Treaty articles have direct effect inside the member states is nowhere stated in the Treaty, but was decided by the European Court in the Van Gend en Loos case in 1963.

It said:

*"The Treaty is more than an agreement which merely creates mutual obligations between the contracting states. This view is confirmed by the preamble to the Treaty which refers not only to governments but to peoples. ... the Community constitutes a new legal order in international law for whose benefit the states have limited their sovereign rights, albeit within limited fields, and the subjects of which comprise not only the Member States but also their nationals".*

## Sovereign Rights

Shortly afterwards in 1964 in the Costa v. ENEL case, the Court ruled that Community law over-rides conflicting national laws:

*"The transfer by the States from their domestic legal system to the Community legal system of rights and obligations arising under the Treaty carries with it a permanent limitation of their sovereign rights ...".*

By 1970, in Internationale Handelsgesellschaft, the European Court had declared its view that Community law should take precedence even over the constitutional laws of the Member States - including basic entrenched laws guaranteeing fundamental rights.

In the 1987 Foto-Frost case, the European Court ruled that national courts had no power to question the validity of Community measures and reserved that power exclusively to itself, even though there is nothing in the Treaty or in general principles of international law which would require states to recognise the validity of acts which are outside the powers conferred by the Treaty.

During the early period of the common market, free market economists would have approved of

the court's activism in the field of free movement of goods. But this activism became a poisoned chalice, since the Court made clear that it regarded a European free market not as an end in itself, but simply a means to a greater end.

## Concrete Progress

The court spelled out its thinking in 1992 in the European Economic Area Agreement Case:

*"An international treaty is to be interpreted not only on the basis of its wording, but in the light of its objectives. ... The Rome Treaty aims to achieve economic integration leading to the establishment of an internal market and economic and monetary union. Article 1 of the Single European Act makes it clear that the objective of all the Community treaties is to contribute together to making concrete progress towards European unity. It follows from the foregoing that the provisions of the Rome Treaty on free movement and competition, far from being an end in themselves, are only means for attaining those objectives. ... As the Court of Justice has consistently held, the Community treaties established a new legal order for the benefit of which the States have limited their sovereign rights, in ever wider fields, and the subjects of which comprise not only the member States but also their nationals [emphasis added]".*

In the last sentence, the important change in wording from the 1963 Van Gend case should be noted. By 1992, "limited fields" had become "ever wider fields", reflecting the Court's endorsement of the doctrine that there can only ever be a one-way transfer of powers from the member states to the centre.

The Court has also expanded the

**Continued on p.4**

## Why no EU treaty can be trusted

powers of the Community over the external relations of the member states. It developed a doctrine of implied external competence - that the Community has power to make external agreements relating to fields over which it has acquired internal competence. Furthermore, under this doctrine, the member states lose their own powers to conclude international agreements relating to areas of policy over which the Community has attained an internal competence.

Under this doctrine, in 2002 the Bermuda Agreement between the UK and the US relating to trans-Atlantic air transport was struck down. British Airways at the time welcomed the fact that such arrangements would in future be negotiated by the EU rather than bilaterally. I must confess to a slight sensation of *schadenfreude* at British Airways' present reaction to what the EU has apparently succeeded in negotiating on our behalf.

Whilst the Court has liberalised the internal market, it has often used its growing powers over the external trade of the member states in a way which inhibits the liberalisation of trade across the external borders of the EC.

In the 1998 *Silhouette* case, it interpreted the Trade Marks Directive as requiring member states to prohibit so-called "parallel imports" of genuine trade marked goods from non-member states when the proprietor of the mark has not consented to the marketing of his goods within the Community. This enables trade mark proprietors to prevent the importation of their own genuine goods into the EC from other countries where they have placed them on the market (e.g. the USA), so enabling them to charge consumers within the EC a higher price than in

other markets.

Similarly, in the field of regulations and technical standards, the Court has ruled in the 1999 *Agrochemicals* case that the UK is prohibited by Community law from licensing "parallel imports" from non-EC countries, even though the products are identical to agrochemicals licensed inside the EC and made by the same manufacturer.

The economic rationale of this "fortress Europe" mentality is baffling, and it cuts against our global trade obligations under the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade.

### Onward Progress

Where the onward progress of European integration has been blocked by national vetoes, the Court has been willing to re-interpret the Treaty to make up for the lack of progress on the legislative front. In a whole series of recent tax cases, the Court has invoked the general clauses of the Treaty on non-discrimination to strike down national tax legislation. An important example is the 2002 *Lankhorst-Hohorst* case on tax credits on payments by a subsidiary to its parent in another member state. What is significant is that the Court departed from its earlier cases which had decided that such arrangements were compatible with the Treaty.

The Treaty had not changed, but its meaning, according to the Court, had. Thus, the effective harmonisation of direct taxes proceeds step by step at the hands of the Court despite the UK's theoretical veto on this area under the Treaty.

More recently in the 2005 environmental protection case, the Court decided that the EC can, under

its first-pillar supranational law-making powers, specify and impose criminal offences and penalties in the very wide fields where the EC has an existing competence. The remarkable thing about this decision is that, if it is right, the EEC had these powers over criminal law from the day the Treaty of Rome was signed on 25th March 1957.

Yet if this had been suggested to those who signed the Treaty in 1957, or to those who signed Britain's accession treaty in 1972, they would have laughed.

We see, with the perspective of 50 years, how powerful has been the effect of the rolling process of re-interpretation of the Treaty of Rome carried out by the Court over that period.

What conclusion should we draw from this?

If we believe that it is right to halt or reverse the ongoing process of the transfer of powers from the UK to the European institutions, then we should recognise a simple point.

We saw how the so-called Social Chapter opt-out negotiated at Maastricht was rapidly undermined by the abuse of health and safety powers under the Treaty to by-pass the UK's veto on the Working Time Directive. This abuse of the Treaty was of course sanctioned by the Court.

If we remain subject to Community law, and to the European Court's interpretation of the Treaties, no agreement or treaty defining or limiting the powers of Europe can be safely relied upon - simply because it will be re-interpreted by the Court, over time, to expand those powers again.

## Monet's view about European withdrawal

*"The withdrawal of a State which has committed itself to the Community should be possible only if all the others agree to such withdrawal and to the conditions in which it takes place. The rule in itself sums up the fundamental transformation which the French proposal seeks to achieve. Over and above coal and steel it is laying the foundations of a European federation. In a federation no State can secede by its own unilateral decision. Similarly, there can be no Community except among nations which commit themselves to it with no limit and no looking back."* - Jean Monnet, document on the European Coal and Steel Community, June 1950, quoted in *Memoirs*, 1978.

# The coming EU demographic winter

*Between now and 2050, while the US gains 46 million in working-age population, the EU-27 will lose 64 million*

“The European project, with a black hole forming at its epicentre, will disintegrate”, **Yves-Marie Laulan** (in *Allemagne, Chronique d'une mort annoncée*, Paris, 2004, published by François-Xavier de Guibert, ISBN 2 86839 959 2).

The latest population projections of the United Nations Population Division point to the huge demographic problems that Europe will face over the coming decades. These show that, between 2005 and 2050, EU-27 will lose 19 per cent, or 64 million, of its current working-age population. Over the same period, the USA gains 46 million of its working-age population.

For EU-27, such a drop in its working-age population is more than the entire present-day working-age population - 55 million - of EU-27's

most populous country and biggest economy, Germany. The working-age population of Germany itself is projected to drop to 45 million by 2050. (Only four EU-25 countries: Luxembourg, Ireland, the UK and Sweden will see increases in working-age population during this period; Bulgaria and Romania, which joined the EU on 1st January 2007, will experience steep declines).

To appreciate the magnitude of the contrasting changes in the working-age populations of, respectively, the USA and EU-27, it might be helpful to imagine some divine hand detaching Germany and all its population from the European continent, towing it across the Atlantic and attaching it to the American mainland. Europe, roughly-speaking, loses the entire productive power of Germany; the

USA gains most of it.

Putting it another way: the ‘swing’ of working-age population from Europe to the USA in the next 43 years is 110 million: EU-27 loses 64 million and the USA gains 46 million.

Working-age population (15 to 64 years inclusive in the UN definition) is a proxy for the “productive” part of the whole population: the men and women whose work and incomes provide for children at one end of the spectrum and for old-age pensioners at the other. Changes in working-age populations may be a better predictor (than changes in whole populations) of countries’ economic growth, strength and prospects.

The table below sets out the key data:-

| Working-Age (15-64 years) Population in 2005 & 2050 |         |         |           |          |
|---|---------|---------|-----------|----------|
| Country/region                                      | 2005 mn | 2050 mn | Change mn | Change % |
| EU-15 <sup>1</sup>                                  | 257     | 218     | (38)      | (15%)    |
| EU-10 <sup>2</sup>                                  | 52      | 35      | (17)      | (33%)    |
| EU-2 <sup>3</sup>                                   | 21      | 13      | (8)       | (39%)    |
| EU-27 <sup>4</sup>                                  | 330     | 266     | (64)      | (19%)    |
| USA   | 199     | 245     | +46       | +23%     |
| NAFTA <sup>5</sup>                                  | 290     | 357     | +67       | +23%     |
| Anglo-Sphere <sup>6</sup>                           | 281     | 334     | +53       | +19%     |
| Germany   | 55.34   | 44.66   | (10.68)   | (19%)    |
| France  | 39.46   | 36.07   | (3.39)    | (9%)     |
| UK  | 39.44   | 40.56   | + 1.12    | + 3%     |
| Italy   | 38.35   | 26.14   | (12.21)   | (32%)    |

Source: UN Population Div: World Population Prospects: The 2004 Revision: Medium Variant  
www.un.org/esa/population

<sup>1</sup>EU-15: the fifteen EU members pre-May 2004  
<sup>2</sup>EU-10: the ten countries which joined the EU in May 2004  
<sup>3</sup>EU-2: Bulgaria & Romania, which joined the EU in January 2007  
<sup>4</sup>EU-27: the present (2007) 27-member EU  
<sup>5</sup>NAFTA: USA + Canada + Mexico  
<sup>6</sup>Anglo-Sphere: USA + Canada + Australia + New Zealand + Ireland + UK

# LETTERS

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

## Fraudulent Declaration

Dear Sir,  
Although the March 25th Berlin Declaration claims to speak on behalf of nearly 500 million people - "We, the citizens of the European Union" - many like myself would certainly not have endorsed it, if we had been asked beforehand.

But of course we were not asked - indeed Chancellor Angela Merkel took pains to ensure that the document was drawn up in secrecy, with perhaps one citizen in a million being privileged to know its contents before it was sprung upon the unsuspecting masses.

The Berlin Declaration is inherently fraudulent, but at least it is not legally binding. However it calls for a new treaty to be in force by June 2009, and we may expect that the same underhand and undemocratic approach will be adopted towards that treaty.

Continental politicians are openly saying that a new treaty should install core elements of the rejected Constitution, but that word should be avoided and the true purpose should be

disguised.

Above all, they say, this time there must be no referendums. Even though a recent poll found that 75 per cent of those "citizens of the European Union" want a national referendum on any new treaty - a majority in every country, and 83 per cent in the UK.

So much for "the European Union will continue to thrive on openness", and "we are striving for democracy", to quote from their own hypocritical Declaration.

Dr D R COOPER  
Berkshire

## Putting Country Before Party

Dear Sir,  
David Owen asks "What is the point of UKIP?" Simple. Within the confines of a serious publication like *eurofacts* it enables those of us with a principled objection to membership of the EU to express those views backed by a party with an unambiguous view of that membership and to expose the duplicity of high profile personalities

and Tory MPs who snipe at the EU from the safety of a political party dedicated to staying within the EU; they say what they think is popular knowing jolly well that nothing can change.

In the wider area of the national and local press, UKIP is the only voice telling the public the facts simply as they are and offering the only party to vote for which is honest about its stand on the EU. At the moment, if one is concerned about the sovereignty of this kingdom, it doesn't matter which of the three big parties one votes for, we are lost.

Mr Owen happily snipes at us over the alleged (a word he omits to use) irregularities within the party, but I can assure him that under its new leader and the highly competent team he has constructed around him, UKIP will not only continue but go on to attract an increasing number of good people who care about this country more than a particular party. That is the point of UKIP, Mr Owen.

ROGER WILSON  
Hampshire

## The bee in Lord Carrington's EU bonnet

In an interview with Con Coughlin of the *Daily Telegraph*, the former British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington, who spent much of his political life arguing for British membership of the EU, said: "I thought we were joining a common market. It did not occur to me that the Europeans would interfere in our affairs".

The release of government papers under the Thirty Year Rule make it clear that during Lord Carrington's tenure the FO was perfectly well aware of the full constitutional, legal and political implications of the European project - and the need to keep these secret so that the public could not do

anything about the matter until it was too late.

What then has led to a cooling of Lord Carrington's ardour for the political cause to which he devoted himself for so long? The evidence that CAP has contributed to Third World poverty and starvation? The realisation that EU membership is sapping Britain's economic vitality? The extent and scale of the 'democratic deficit'?

It would seem that the explanation has nothing whatsoever to do with these things, but with a certain amount of grief the EU has been giving the Tory grandee over his plans to site

beehives on one of his many acres:

*"The land was not doing anything so I thought we could put some hives on the set-aside. Then I got a call telling me there is an EU law that prohibits set-aside being used for any purpose...This is the kind of thing that people find really frustrating"*.

His Lordship's sense of outrage that he could not enjoy both EU set-aside subsidies and home-grown honey on his scones is likely to have eurosceptics collapsing with mirth. But such laughter should not conceal the extent of the intellectual moral failure of a political class which Lord Carrington typifies so well.

## Easter publishing arrangements

The next issue of *eurofacts* (Vol 12 No 14) will appear on 27th April 2007.

# MEETINGS

## 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**

### The Bruges Group

020 7287 4414

Tuesday **1st May**, 7.00 pm

“Celebrating the Act of Union and the  
creation of a Great Nation”

**Reception**

7.00 - 7.30 pm Princess Alexander Hall

**Supper - 7.45 pm** Hall of India

**Speeches - 9.15 pm**

**The Countess of Mar**

**Andrew Roberts, broadcaster and  
historian**

**Lord Tebbit, former Chairman of the  
Conservative Party**

TERCENTENARY DINNER

Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St.  
James's Street, London SW1A

**Admission £70 in advance**

(tables of 10 are available - includes  
three course supper, wine and refresh-  
ments)

## 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)**

### The First Goldsmith Lecture

020 7247 2524

Tuesday **22nd May 2007**, 7.00 pm

**Prof Stephen Bush, Manchester  
University**

**The Rt Hon Lord Tebbit CH**

**Chairman, Dennis Delderfield**

PUBLIC MEETING

Sir Ambrose Fleming Lecture Hall,  
Roberts Building, University College,  
London

**Admission £3**

(From New Britain, 10 College East,  
Gunthorpe Street, London E1 7RL)

### FREE - Advertising Space

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

**euofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65**

**or Email: euofacts@junepress.com**

### DIARY OF EVENTS

#### 2007

French Presidential Election **22nd April**

French Parliamentary Election **June or July**

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

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

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

## SELECT COMMITTEES

### House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **17th April**, 3.35 pm

Evidence will be heard by the *Economic  
Affairs Committee* from (a) Lord Leitch;  
(b) Sir Roy Gardner, and Mr Rod Kenyon,  
Apprenticeship Ambassadors Network.

Tuesday **17th April**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *UK  
Economic Regulators* from (a) a Gas and  
Electricity Industry Panel; (b) a Water  
Industry Panel, witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **18th April**, 10.30 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Foreign  
Affairs, Defence and Development Policy*  
from Dr Kim Howells MP.

Wednesday **18th April**, 11.15 am

Evidence will be heard by the *Science and  
Technology Committee* from Mr Ivan  
Lewis MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary  
of State for Care Services, Department of  
Health.

Wednesday **18th April**, 3.30 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Personal  
Internet Security* from Professor Jonathon  
Zittrain and Mr Andrew Cormack.

Wednesday **18th April**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *European  
Supervision Order in pre-trial procedures*  
from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **19th April**, 10.00 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into  
Labour Law* from Mr Alan Tyrell,  
Chairman, and Ms Lucie Goodman,  
Policy Development Officer, Federation  
of Small Businesses.

Wednesday **25th April**, 3.30 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Personal  
Internet Security* from Commander Sue  
Wilkinson, Metropolitan Police, and Mr  
Bill Hughes, Director-General, Serious  
Organised Crime Agency.

Thursday **26th April**, 10.00 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into  
Labour Law* from Mr Owen Tudor, Head  
of European & International Relations, Ms  
Hannah Read, Senior Employment Rights  
Officer, and Mr Richard Exell, Senior  
Policy Officer, TUC.

Thursday **26th April**, 10.30 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Foreign  
Affairs, Defence and Development Policy*  
from Lord Patten.

*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.

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

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

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)**

**20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

## 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"

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

AGAINST "EU"

|                                   |                      |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Britain Out</b>                | <b>01403 741736</b>  |
| British Weights & Measures Assoc. | 020 8922 0089        |
| <b>CIB</b>                        | <b>020 8340 0314</b> |
| Democracy Movement                | 020 8570 5681        |
| <b>Freedom Association</b>        | <b>01746 861267</b>  |
| Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign   | 020 7691 3800        |
| <b>New Alliance</b>               | <b>020 7386 1837</b> |
| Save Britain's Fish               | 01224 313473         |

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

**Congress for Democracy 01372 453678**

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

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

## POLITICAL PARTIES

|                                |                      |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Conservative</b>            | <b>020 7222 9000</b> |
| Rt Hon David Cameron MP        |                      |
| <b>Democratic Party</b>        | <b>01684 891700</b>  |
| Mr Geoff Southall              |                      |
| <b>Green Party</b>             | <b>020 7272 4474</b> |
| Richard Mallender              |                      |
| <b>Labour</b>                  | <b>08705 900 200</b> |
| Rt Hon Tony Blair MP           |                      |
| <b>Liberal</b>                 | <b>01562 68361</b>   |
| Mr Michael Meadowcroft         |                      |
| <b>Liberal Democrats</b>       | <b>020 7222 7999</b> |
| Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell MP |                      |
| <b>New Britain Party</b>       | <b>020 7247 2524</b> |
| Mr Dennis Delderfield          |                      |
| <b>UK Independence Party</b>   | <b>01626 830630</b>  |
| Nigel Farage MEP               |                      |

ISSN 1361-4134

