

The greatest EU deception of them all

What happened at the June summit was that Britain's partners agreed to become willing accomplices in the attempt to deceive the British electorate in return for Blair's support for an almost unchanged Constitution

The June EU summit - the latest phase in what Christopher Booker and Richard North have aptly termed the Great Deception - exceeded in dishonesty anything that has gone before. In the weeks running up to it we were told over and over again that there would be a referendum if powers were to be transferred from member states to Brussels and that is precisely what will now happen - but there will be no referendum. We were told that an agreement would not lead to a constitutional treaty, merely an amending treaty. But if the "Reform Treaty" to which the forthcoming IGC is intended to lead does not merit the description of a constitutional treaty what does? Its impact will be to create new EU institutions, to redefine the relations between EU institutions and member states, to abolish qualified majority voting in more than fifty areas, to change voting procedures, and to give the EU legal personality. Only those who wish to be deceived or wish to deceive others can seriously question that the treaty to which the June summit will lead will have huge, profound and far-reaching constitutional implications.

Those Red Lines

We were told - and continue to be told - that British interests could and would be protected by opt-outs, that Mr Blair's "red lines" would not be violated. In fact Mr Blair defined his

"red-lines" so loosely that a half plausible case that 'victory' had been secured could be made; but as is becoming increasingly obvious the opt-outs which he negotiated are likely to prove worthless (see p 3).

We were told that the exercise was necessary in order to avoid a legislative log-jam and as a spur to efficiency. But as *The Economist* was first to point out this is nonsense; there is no log-jam. More recently, Renaud Dehousse, professor at Paris-based University Sciences Po has shown that before enlargement in May 2004, it took on average 18 months between the deposit of a Commission proposal and its adoption by the Council and the Parliament. Since the entry of the 10 new member states, this has gone down to less than 12 months. The fears of a blockage, were therefore unfounded: the EU regulatory machine is running at a faster pace than ever.

The British Way

Mrs Beckett's insistence that having referendums was not "the British way" was similarly dishonest: the government of which she is a member has held more referendums than any in history. Mr Barroso, who made a point of making himself available to the British media, assured the British radio listeners that no referendum was necessary because British interests would be protected during ratification by "*the greatest Parliament in the*

world" and that the deal would in any case be put to an Inter-governmental conference (IGC). He did not mention that a way had been devised to ensure that the mandate approved in Brussels would provide the exclusive basis for discussion so that no other matters might be raised.

Tedious Necessity

Opinion surveys in each of the EU's 27 member states demonstrated overwhelming support for a referendum. But Mrs Merkel surprised many by achieving exactly what she set out to do which was to preserve the existing constitutional text while tweaking a little of the terminology and, as far as possible, avoiding the tedious necessity of consulting the electorate. And she did so ruthlessly. German influence and her reputation has grown significantly, even if her attachment to democracy is looking increasingly flimsy. The outcome of the summit has also strengthened the reputation of Nicolas Sarkozy who has finally demolished the view that the EU might have something to do with competition. The Franco-German relationship is stronger than for several years. British influence over political developments in Europe, already feeble, has been diminished still further. Last week French newspapers talk of Sarkozy's 'triumph' while reporting that Britain's influence had

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: What others have said about the EU treaty p.2 - The Prime Minister's parting gift to the nation p.3 - Is the "Reform Treaty" a done deal? p.4 - EU introduces 'Big Brother road charging scheme' p.4 - Blair 'offered to trade top job for euro membership' p.5 - Call for openness in EU debates p.5 - 67 % want powers returned from EU p.5 - A pain in the back - or the neck?

The greatest deception of them all

been marginalised. What in effect happened in Brussels was that Britain's partners agreed to being willing accomplices in the attempt to deceive the British electorate in return for real concessions - while Gordon Brown in his now familiar role of Macavity demonstrated that in his view absence is the better part of valour.

However, the deception about which we complain was almost entirely British-made. Once the deal was struck only British ministers denied that the summit outcome represented a major step in the political development of the EU. European prime ministers and the European media agreed with British eurosceptics about the impact of the Draft IGC Mandate: it will result in a deal that will preserve about 90 per cent of the original constitutional text and its effect will be almost identical. In the words of a leader in *Le Monde* on 23rd June: "...all the institutional advances brought in by the Constitution have been maintained. While the symbols - anthem, flag etc - have officially disappeared, the permanent presidency remains; and while the minister of foreign affairs has gone back to high representative, he

keeps all the new powers that Valery Giscard d'Estaing's text gave him."

Two aspects of the document, however, exceed the worst fears of British eurosceptics. The relegation of the commitment to free markets will assist French governments to pour the taxpayers' subsidies into French 'national champions' to the detriment of British companies and will encourage protectionism more widely. Second, the clause that insists that the mandate will provide "*the exclusive basis and framework for the work of the IGC*" represents an unprecedented attempt to control not only the ratification process but also the debate which will take place in member states.

It is difficult to be clear about the long run consequences of what happened in Brussels. However, it is likely that in Britain eurosceptic opinion will harden and that those moderate eurosceptics who continue to believe in "reform" will conclude that their position has become untenable. Many of those who have been unhappy about the political aspects of European integration have lent their somewhat reluctant support because of their commitment to a common market in goods and services.

Now that Sarkozy has weakened a commitment that was already suspect an increasing number may conclude that there is no point to the European Union at all and that British withdrawal is the only viable option - a view expressed incidentally by Valery Giscard d'Estaing on French radio on 27th June.

As Lord Owen has recently argued, unless Gordon Brown is prepared to re-think the matter the refusal to hold a referendum could poison his prime ministership from the very start. There is also the possibility that the House of Lords would seek to assert its constitutional right against a measure that runs counter to the manifestos of all main political parties. A referendum has been viewed by many as a democratic safeguard. If the electorate is to be denied this safeguard the sense of anger and frustration among eurosceptics of all stripes is likely to grow. And, as the scale of the deception which made British support for Europe's new constitution possible becomes more widely recognised, so will the clamour for withdrawal.

What others have said about the EU treaty

"I think all the changes that we have made are for the worse. Thankfully, they haven't changed any of the substance, so I will be talking about the 90 per cent [of the treaty that is left]."

Bertie Ahern, the Irish Taoiseach quoted in the *Irish Times* on 25th June 2007.

"Don't you understand that no matter what you or anyone else says, the vast majority of the public will see that there has simply been a tweaking of words and that this treaty is fundamentally no different from the original constitution. Why are you and why is our Government afraid of a referendum?" **Kate Hoey MP**, speaking in the House of Commons on 26th June 2007.

"It's essentially the same proposal as

the old Constitution," Commissioner **Margot Wallstrom**, quoted in *Svenska Dagbladet*, 26th June 2007.

"The Franco-German alliance dominates Europe: so far as one can tell they are ruthlessly determined to create a single European state, despite their own public opinion, let alone ours. The emerging, Super Europe, following the political traditions of Napoleon and Bismarck, is bureaucratic by nature, rather than liberal."

"The British do not want to belong to such a single European state; if we are forced to go in, we shall immediately look for an exit." **William Rees-Mogg** writing in *The Times* on 25th June 2007.

"For those like myself who remain

convinced that Britain should stay within the European Union, the referendum is a democratic safeguard. If that safeguard is removed, the demand for Britain to withdraw, without even a referendum, will grow."

David Owen, *The Sunday Times*, 24th June 2007.

"Competition is now just a means not an end in itself. This opens the way to a different jurisprudence, one that favours European champions and brings a true industrial policy." **Nicolas Sarkozy**, President of France, quoted by *Le Monde*, 25th June 2007.

"I have always experienced him [Tony Blair] as maybe the most pro-European politician in the United Kingdom." Austrian Chancellor **Alfred Gusenbauer**.

The Prime Minister's parting gift to the nation

The most controversial parts of the new EU Constitution - for such it will be - are set out below

The Draft IGC Mandate, which runs to 16 pages, is contained as an annex to the Presidency Conclusions of the European Council in Brussels of 21/22nd June and can be found on the EU website. The document is too lengthy and technical to summarise * in its entirety, but a brief summary of those findings which we believe will be of interest and concern to our readers together with a brief commentary is set out below:

■ **Status of the Mandate:** The Mandate will provide "the exclusive basis and framework" of the forthcoming Inter-Governmental Conference.

■ **Treaty Structure:** The constitutional basis of the new European Union State is now to be by means of amendment and the renaming of the two existing treaties, the Treaty on European Union (TEU) and The Treaty Establishing the European Community (TEC).

■ **A European President:** A European President would serve for a period of two and a half years; this arrangement would replace the present six-monthly rotating presidency. Some have suggested that the position should be merged with that of President of the Commission. President Sarkozy has suggested that the job should go to Tony Blair.

■ **Foreign Affairs:** Although Britain balked at the title of Foreign Minister there will be a High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security with the function of foreign minister who will also be vice-president of the Commission. There will also be a European diplomatic service - to be known as the "European External Action Service". A new clause says that the appointment of the High Representative will not affect the responsibilities of member states in

relation to formulating and conducting foreign policy. But the mandate also states: "*The Union's competence in matters of common foreign and security policy shall cover all areas of foreign policy and all questions relating to the Union's security, including the progressive framing of a common defence policy that might lead to a common defence.*"

■ **More law-making powers:** The proposed "Reform treaty" will transfer more power to the EU from member states. It establishes law-making powers over 50 new areas including public health, transport, energy, space, science, tourism and sport. The veto will also go in certain areas of foreign policy.

■ **A self-amending treaty:** The treaty will include mechanisms that will enable the treaty to be changed without the need for fresh treaties and IGCs.

■ **Voting:** The double majority voting system contained in the original constitutional draft is maintained with 55 per cent of member states representing 65 per cent of the EU's population needed for a majority.

■ **Legal personality:** The EU will enjoy full legal personality which means that the EU will be able to sign treaties and to be represented on international organisations, a key requirement for any political entity that aspires to statehood.

■ **European public prosecutor:** The mandate proposes the creation of a European public prosecutor to be created by unanimous vote, something which the UK has always opposed strongly.

■ **Charter of Fundamental Human Rights:** The Government says that it has an opt-out and the charter will not be included in the Treaty,

merely referred to. However, it is not clear how much protection if any the opt-out will provide. Indeed, it is not entirely clear that the relevant wording amounts to an opt-out: this is so curious and its meaning so unclear that it is almost certain to invite legal challenges. Open Europe has quoted one European Judge as saying that the opt-out would have no practical value.

■ **Competition:** Following Sarkozy's success in deleting the words "free and undistorted competition" from the preamble of the document there were frantic telephone calls from Brown to Blair. The result was the insertion of a protocol to the effect that there would be no legal change in relation to competition policy. However, preambles trump protocols. In the past the European Court of Justice has regarded such commitments as defining the EU's goals and has made its decisions accordingly. The CBI as well as numerous legal experts doubt whether Brown's last minute intervention will make much difference.

■ **Enhanced cooperation:** For the first time members who have opted for enhanced cooperation can decide to move to majority voting with no veto for others. Enhanced cooperation would apply to the entire foreign policy field.

■ **Withdrawal clause:** The draft mandate proposes that the new treaty should include the same voluntary exit clause contained in Giscard's original document. In fact member states already have the right to leave.

*A comprehensive outline and analysis of the Draft Mandate can be found on the website of Open Europe (www.openeurope.org.uk).

Is the “Reform Treaty” a done deal?

Ratification of the EU’s ‘new’ constitutional treaty could turn out to be less smooth than many observers suggest

Is Chancellor Merkel’s “Reform Treaty” a done deal? The whole point of the IGC Draft Mandate is to ensure that it is regarded as such. However, it is still possible to imagine scenarios that would damage or undermine her plans.

The most obvious of these would involve rejection of the proposed treaty by Ireland or Denmark, the two countries which are required to hold referendums under their constitutions. Bertie Aherne, the Irish Taoiseach has already said that a referendum is likely soon, but EU membership is popular in Ireland and it is consequently unlikely to repeat its initial rejection of the Nice Treaty. A no-vote is somewhat more likely in Denmark because of its long and proud tradition of self-government. But its Prime Minister has announced that a decision on whether to hold a referendum will not be made until the end of the year. In any event, a no vote would almost certainly result in the Danes being told to vote again. Recent experience suggests that in such circumstances the legalities would be expected to catch up with the politics; the EU would not wait for the

Danes before setting out to achieve the goals described in the mandate. The French and Dutch rejection of the Constitution in 2005 was followed by a process of constitution-creep; it is difficult to believe that a single act of nay-saying by a country of five million would be allowed to long delay matters.

Problems might also arise if any of the 27 governments represented at the June summit are replaced by governments that are unhappy with the deal struck in Brussels and which consequently maintain that they are not bound by its terms. However, there would seem to be no immediate prospect of this happening.

It is somewhat more likely that the process of parliamentary ratification will not proceed as smoothly in all member states as some observers assume.

The situation in France is particularly interesting. If President Sarkozy decides that ratification requires a revision to the French constitution - or the French Constitutional Council decides this for him - a three-fifths majority would be required in the

French Assembly. As a result of the UMP’s poor showing in the second round of the parliamentary elections he does not possess such a majority and would therefore need the support of some opposition MPs. During the election all of the opposition parties backed a referendum.

There are circumstances in which parliamentary ratification in Britain could also prove difficult. A survey of parliamentary opinion carried out by the Democracy Movement has shown that 50 Labour MPs were in favour of a referendum prior to Tony Blair’s decision to call one. It has plans to apply constituency pressures in order to make those MPs stand by their principles and to name and shame those that don’t. As we go to press the Lib-Dems have not yet announced whether they still favour a referendum. If they do, and if Labour’s strongest eurosceptics stick to their guns, ratification of the treaty could be difficult, even impossible.

The likelihood is that the treaty will go through - but we wouldn’t advise anyone to place bets on it.

EU introduces ‘Big Brother road charging scheme’

Without public discussion and with only a tiny number of people being aware of it, the foundations have been laid for a pan-European road pricing scheme.

Legislation that would allow Brussels to determine what technology is used in any charging scheme was contained in a statutory instrument and nodded through in the routine way. Its effect is to make legally binding the Directive on the Interoperability of Electronic Road Toll Systems in the Community adopted in April 2004.

The Transport Secretary Douglas Alexander signed off on Statutory

Instrument 2007 No 58 on 13th January and it was laid before Parliament four days later. Without one motorist in a million being aware of the fact it has been in force legally since 12th February this year.

The Directive sets out three acceptable technologies:

- Tag and beacon technology which involves a smart card on the car windscreen which is read by roadside gantry cameras.
- The installation of the equivalent of a sim card used in mobile telephones which would enable vehicles to be tracked.

■ Satellite tracking with vehicle owners being required to carry a black box.

On 22nd June the *Daily Telegraph* quoted an AA spokesman who described the latter option “as the worst nightmare for those who fear ‘Big Brother’ Tracking”.

“The loss of privacy is our greatest concern. We also suspect that this has been specified so Brussels can argue the case for its expensive Galileo satellite system,” he said.

Details of the legislation can be found on www.opsi.gov.uk/SI/221007.

Blair 'offered to trade top job for euro membership'

Historians of Britain's vexed relations with the EU may well be fascinated by a revelation by Clare Short in a Channel-4 Documentary to mark the departure of Tony Blair from Downing Street.

According to Mrs Short, the former International Development Secretary the then Prime Minister was so desperate to join the euro that he offered Gordon Brown the premiership if he allowed him to take Britain into the single currency.

The offer was made via Mrs Short when she and Mr Blair were on a trip to West Africa. Mrs Short said the visit had taken place in 2001, although the records show that it took place in

February 2002 following the Labour landslide victory of 2001.

"It was an extraordinarily disgraceful offer to make, but there is no doubt that he made it," she said. The programme, entitled *The Rise and Fall of Tony Blair* was broadcast on 24th June.

She said that the Chancellor refused the deal, describing it as "an improper way to do politics". The Prime Minister would only break his word, he told her.

Labour's 2001 Election Manifesto promised: *"We hold to our promise: no membership of the single currency without the consent of the British*

people in a referendum."

Mrs Short's account suggests that Mr Blair wanted Mr Brown to come up with a favourable assessment on the basis of his famous five tests on economic convergence. In June 2003, however, Mr Brown announced that the criteria - which had been set in 1997 - had not been met.

The evidence would seem to suggest that the attitudes of the two men towards the tests were very different. Blair wanted to use the tests as a way of overcoming British resistance to membership of the single currency, whereas the then chancellor either saw them as a way of staying out, or as a means of buying time.

FROM THE LORDS

Call for openness in EU debates

Lord Pearson of Rannoch: *My Lords, if the noble Lord has a little patience, he will hear the kernel of my argument. Former Ministers do not lose their pensions if they fail to uphold the ongoing interests of the country. As I was saying, these noble Lords are proud of their careers in the plush and well-remunerated conclaves of Brussels, but of course they are also - here I exonerate the noble Lord, Lord Hannay, if necessary - already in receipt of a generous EU pension, or are looking forward to one. Few*

people know that EU pensions are unusual in that holders of them can lose them if, in the opinion of the Commission and the Luxembourg court, they

"fail to uphold the interests of the European Communities".

A large and growing number of noble Lords feel that these pensions should therefore be declared in your Lordships' debates, although as far as I know none was declared today, as usual.

Our view is shared by no less a personage than the noble and learned Lord, Lord Woolf, who chairs your Lordships' sub-committee on our declaration of interests. But unusually, and perhaps uniquely, our Privileges Committee itself has just overridden the committee of the noble and learned Lord, Lord Woolf, on grounds which appear to me to be almost wholly spurious. Watch this space.

Source: House of Lords Hansard, 15th June 2007.

67 per cent want powers returned from EU

Sixty seven per cent of voters would like their political party to support a policy of taking back powers from the EU, according to a poll commissioned by ICM for Open Europe. The poll, which was published to coincide with

the EU summit on 21st June showed that 82 per cent of Tories, 59 per cent of Labour and 69 per cent of Lib Dems would like powers returned from Brussels.

A thousand people took part in the

survey which also showed that 74 per cent of people would be less likely to vote for Gordon Brown at a general election if he refuses to hold a referendum on a treaty which gave more powers to the EU.

Summer publishing plans

The next summer double issue of eurofacts (Vol 12 No 20/21) will be published on 27th July 2007.

LETTERS

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

Labour MPs must Keep their Word

Dear Sir,

An Act of Parliament to ratify a new EU treaty not only alters the external relationship between the British state and foreign states, but also the internal constitutional relationship between the British state and its citizens.

The Irish Republic has a codified constitution, which can only be amended by referendum. That is why the Irish government has been compelled to hold a referendum on each of the EU treaties.

At one time Labour politicians were in favour of referendums to settle constitutional questions, for example whether there should be devolved government in Scotland.

But their enthusiasm for letting us have our say began to wane when voters in north east England threw out Prescott's proposal for an elected regional assembly.

Nonetheless, every Labour MP was elected in 2005 on the manifesto promise of a referendum on the new EU treaty, and they must not allow themselves to be bullied into breaking

their word.

Dr D R COOPER
Berkshire

No Opt-out Is Safe

Dear Sir

Much is being said about British opt-outs from the revived EU constitutional treaty, but without making it clear that an opt-out is never seen as a permanent exemption.

On the contrary, in view of the overriding principle of "ever closer union" it is presumed that the most integrationist provisions included in any EU treaty must eventually apply to every member state, without exceptions.

Moreover the decision to partially or completely relinquish a British opt-out rests with the party to the treaty, the British government.

A government may use opt-outs as a temporary expedient to avoid holding a referendum on a treaty. Later the same or another government may decide to abandon those opt-outs, also without any referendum.

No opt-out can ever be regarded as safe. In a recent interview Gordon Brown confirmed that in principle he is

still in favour of joining the euro, dropping the opt-out obtained by John Major to help get the Maastricht Treaty through Parliament.

If we let Labour MPs get away with openly breaking their manifesto promise to hold a referendum on the EU constitutional treaty, why should they feel any need to keep their equivalent promise about holding a referendum on whether we should scrap the pound and join the euro?

MURIEL PARSONS
Berkshire

Tory Dither

Dear Sir,

We have the Conservative Party to thank for referenda not being part of British EU development procedure. Labour has an unanswerable jibe: 1972; Single European Act; Maastricht. By now, unless the Conservative Party becomes the Party of Exit from the EU, its stance on EU matters will just be one of dither, a quality not unknown elsewhere in its stances. We continue to be faced with essentially identical triplets on the EU front.

L. G. HOLT
Kent

A pain in the back - or the neck?

The EU Commission's "Lighten the Load" campaign launched on 6th June seems to have passed many people by. As a service to our readers we are happy to pass on the relevant details.

The campaign is not, as its title might imply, a drive to reduce the volume of regulation; on the contrary it is very likely to result in more regulation. Nor is it intended to reduce the burden of contributions to the EU budget. Rather, its aim is to reduce the incidence of back pain in the work-place.

According to the Commission musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs)

caused by tasks like typing at a keyboard, lifting heavy objects, bad posture account for more than half of job-related illnesses. Nurses and typists as well as manual workers top the list.

The purpose of the campaign, the brain-wave of EU Social Commissioner and former Czech Prime Minister Vladimir Spidla, is to 'increase public awareness' of the problem and to encourage workers not to overdo things.

Is it churlish to point out that if half those off sick at any one time are suffering from back pain, the public is

unlikely to be unaware of it?

In any event, making people aware of the problem is apparently not enough, as a statement from Brussels makes clear:

"The Commission, therefore, considers that a legislative initiative setting out a revised, integrated and more legible EU regulatory framework on musculoskeletal disorders might be appropriate."

Consultation with the EU's "social partners" such as trade unions and health groups will be just the first step in the EU's war on back pain.

MEETINGS

Marlborough Group
01672 515275

Sunday **8th July**, 2.00 pm

Ashley Mote MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

Assembly Room, Marlborough Town Hall, Marlborough
Admission Free

Get Britain Out

(formerly The Anti-Common Market League)
01787 376374

Friday **27th July**, 7.00 pm

“The EU: Is it time to withdraw?”

Gerard Batten MEP, UKIP

Speaker from The European Movement to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

The Counting House pub (upstairs)
50 Cornhill, London EC3V 3PD
(close to Bank Underground Station)
Admission Free

The Freedom Association

(Sussex Branch)
01424 736880

Saturday **15th September**, 6.30 pm

“Battle for Britain”

John Gouriet, *Founding Campaign Director, TFA*

Simon Richards, *Campaign Director, TFA*

PUBLIC MEETING

(The Inaugural Event of Sussex Branch)
The Mistral Bar/Restaurant, The Sackville, De Lar Warr Parade, Bexhill-on-Sea, East Sussex TN40 1LS
Admission £14 (TFA Members £12)
(Includes a buffet super)

FREE - Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

Better off Out Campaign

www.betteroffout.co.uk

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.cibhq.co.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruith.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020 7219 3000

Tuesday **10th July**, 10.40 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The Euro's Progress* from (a) Simon Tilford, Centre for European Reform; and (b) Mr Roger Bootle, Capital Economics.

Wednesday **11th July**, 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The Future of the Common Agricultural Policy* from the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.

Tuesday **10th July**, 11.10 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The Inquiry into Air Travel and Health* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **18th July**, 10.30 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The Future of the Common Agricultural Policy* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **25th July**, 10.30 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The EU Wine Sector* from witnesses to be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

Lib-Dem Party **15-20th September**
Conference
Brighton

Labour Party **23rd-27th September**
Conference
Bournemouth

Conservative Party **30th Sept-3rd Oct**
Conference
Blackpool

UK Independence **5-6th October**
Party Conference
Excel Centre, Docklands
London

2008

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

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

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.

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**

An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

The Bumper Book of Government Waste

by *Matthew Elliott and Lee Rotherham*. **£9.99**

An exposure of the huge levels of waste in Britain and the EU.

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.

Iran The Clash of Ambitions

by *Houchang Nahavandi*. **£16.95**

A history of the people and influences that have formed the Iran of today. It has a history of integrating invaders.

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

Morning/Afternoon Session **£20.00**

Evening Session **£10.00**

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 Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
CIB	020 8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020 8570 5681
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
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

Global Vision www.global-vision.net

Open Europe 0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender	
Labour	020 7783 1000
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

