

Referendum: the stakes are high and getting higher

By 2010 - perhaps the most likely date for a general election - it will be obvious that Mr Brown's famous 'red lines' are about as reliable as the Maginot Line

What will be the consequences if the Government remains adamant in its refusal to hold a referendum on the EU Constitution which is subsequently ratified by Parliament? This is the Prime Minister's clear intention and, as matters stand, this would seem to be the most likely course of events.

It is taken for granted that Mr Brown does not want a referendum because he knows that it would be lost. There is, however, another reason for his disinclination to keep his solemn promise to "listen to the people" on an issue about which the people express themselves so emphatically whenever they are allowed to do so. That other reason has to do with the pressure being applied by other EU leaders. They know that if Brown bows to the considerable pressure on him to allow a referendum this would produce demands for referendums elsewhere and the possibility of further no votes.

The Constitution, for such it is in all but name, is the last remaining major building block that must be put in place in order to complete the European project; if this process is impeded now the process of European political integration might rapidly unravel. The stakes are high and becoming higher, both at the domestic and European levels.

Despite Mr Brown's present ratings in the polls and the calamitous performance of the Tories his problems should not be underestimated. The very European leaders who scoff at the British Government's claims of having

achieved major revisions to the treaty text also demand that he must flout the wishes of the British public by refusing to stage a referendum; they are not making life easy for him and evidently have no intention of doing so.

Recent Statements

Mr Brown's own views on Europe (and much else) remain somewhat indistinct. But in politics actions speak louder than words. His appointment of David Milliband, the most pro-EU foreign secretary of recent times and that of Mark Malloch Brown as a foreign minister speak more authoritatively than the cleverly-spun words of a Prime Minister who claims to have renounced spin; they are scarcely the actions of a committed eurosceptic. The appointment of Jim Murphy as Minister for Europe and the tenor of Mr Murphy's recent statements are also revealing. Mr Murphy, a Glaswegian former left-wing president of the National Union of Students who has been described by *The Guardian* as an "eager-beaver party super-loyalist," is strongly pro-EU. Mr Murphy has insisted on an interpretation of the treaty which bears no relation to that of those of other European politicians. Mr Milliband, his boss, has at least conceded in the Commons that the treaty entails a greater transfer of powers than Maastricht which he described as being "smaller" than the present treaty. Mr Murphy denies that the treaty entails any transfer of powers. "We

wouldn't sign up to any treaty that transferred in any significant way, any UK sovereignty to the European Union," he told the *Today* programme on 24th July. In carrying out the Prime Minister's bidding, Mr Murphy is clearly indicating that there will be no change of heart on a referendum unless the pressures become unsustainable.

Mr Brown's present poll ratings, the prospect of worsening economic conditions and the likelihood his errors as chancellor will become ever more apparent in the coming months all suggest that Mr Brown is being sorely tempted to call an early general election. But as a result of his refusal to call a referendum on the Constitution it would be an election in which 'Europe' would be bound to figure prominently. William Hague, the shadow foreign secretary has promised as much. The Tories may not frighten Mr Brown but the findings of a *Daily Mail* survey may do so: this showed that 21 per cent of Labour voters might not support him at a general election because of his refusal to call a referendum and that of these a substantial proportion might consequently consider voting Tory. According to Andrew Neil his reluctance to allow the public to express a view on the issue is souring his cherished relations with the editors of both the *Mail* and the *Sun*.

If he were to call a snap election in these circumstances could a ten point lead in the polls melt away to nothing? We are in uncharted waters. The issue

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: The consequences of flouting democracy p.2 - EU brings back price control p.3 - EFTA countries are so much better off p.3 - Sign up to the Downing Street petition p.3 - Why can't we be more like Switzerland? p.4 - Chindamo controversy casts revealing light on British justice p.5

Referendum: the stakes are getting higher

of 'Europe' has been effectively suppressed by Britain's political elites for decades. Might it now erupt? Mr Brown gives every impression of being more risk-averse than his predecessor and it may well be that the existence of such risks may persuade him to hold off until 2010. Mr Brown prides himself on his ability as a political strategist who plays it long; he may well decide that risks entailed by a snap election outweigh the risks of doing so on this occasion.

However, the risks of playing it long are also formidable and again his prospects of success will depend a great deal upon the European issue.

For the sake of argument we will assume that despite a back-bench revolt by 30-40 Labour MPs the Lib-Dems follow Labour's example of ratting on their election commitment to support a referendum and the Treaty is duly ratified by Parliament later this year. This seems the most likely course of events. But it does not change the fact that most MPs, the media and the country are coming to recognise the fact that the Government has not told the truth about the new Treaty or where it will lead. Mr Brown's reputation as the "listening Prime

Minister" will not long survive this realisation. The honeymoon period will soon be over, the national mood more sour, the public disaffection with politics still greater.

By 2010 it will be obvious that Mr Brown's famous 'red lines' offer about as much protection as the Maginot Line. The protocol excluding Britain from the Charter will almost certainly be facing serious legal challenges and these are likely to succeed. The creation of a European diplomatic service in all but name and the creation of a European High Representative (i.e. foreign minister) to whom it reports and whom Britain must support "actively and unreservedly" will undermine the ability of Britain to run its own foreign policy, as will the fact that Europe will have its own legal personality. A new powerful European Public Prosecutor will be in office and the Government's promise to protect Britain's common law tradition will be shown to be hollow. Meanwhile, we will have to contend with the practical consequences of surrendering our national veto in more than 50 areas and the EU will no doubt be taking advantage of treaty provisions which allow it to pursue further integrationist

measures without the need for bothersome inter-governmental conferences.

These will be the direct consequences of the course on which Mr Brown and his europhile foreign ministers have embarked. To return to the question posed at the beginning of this article, the consequences of refusing a referendum on the Constitution can only be the further alienation of the voters from the political elites, a further erosion of democratic standards, and the further discrediting of politics and politicians. Having followed the path of argument and persuasion - and failed - euroscepticism is likely to become more militant and angry: there are likely to be fewer pamphlets and more demos.

We remain convinced that the smart as well as the patriotic thing for Mr Brown to do is to spike the Tory guns by calling a referendum and halt the on-going emasculation of British democracy thereby. Sadly we can find no reason for thinking that this is what he will do or that the Opposition is capable of rising to the challenge of events at a pivotal moment in British history.

The consequences of flouting democracy

The consequences of treating the electorate in this way in Britain - and in other countries too - are extremely unpalatable. A recent poll found that 75 per cent of all the people in the EU - 83 per cent in the UK - want a referendum on any new treaty. Universal refusal everywhere to allow referendums to be held can only confirm the widely held view that the EU has always been a deeply undemocratic organisation, as indeed is the case. Because its founders distrusted democracy, it was established always to have permanently appointed officials with the real power, and thus with almost no real electoral control over its activities.

The more nakedly the EU flouts democratic procedures, however, the more alienated its constituent electorates become, the less consent it generates and the wider the gap becomes between its political leaders and those they purport to represent. Now, unfortunately, the low democratic standards of the EU are infecting its Member States, including Britain, which has a much longer and better established tradition of democracy, fairness and accountability than many other EU countries. It is hard to believe that, in their heart of hearts, more than a small number of MPs genuinely welcome the contents of what is now called the Amending

Treaty. It is equally hard to believe that any of those who promised a referendum at the last election genuinely believe that the proposals now in front of us are so different that all their election promises about a referendum can be forgotten. If this is the case, there must be a very large number of MPs who feel extremely uncomfortable about the fact that they face the prospect of being dragooned into voting down the referendum which they publicly committed themselves to supporting.

Labour Euro Safeguards Committee Bulletin, July 2007.

EU brings back price control

Legislation to bring down the cost of roaming charges will have unfortunate side effects

Price control went out of fashion in the 1970s as politicians began to grasp that trying to keep prices down by bureaucratic means didn't work and had unintended side-effects. These days it is a truth almost universally acknowledged - even by ex-communist states - that competition is a better means of curbing prices than government controls. But it is not one which is always acknowledged in Brussels.

In June this year the EU adopted a regulation which prevents mobile phone companies from charging their customers more than 49 cents (33p) for making cross-border phone calls inside the EU and 24 cents (14p) for receiving them. The law, which exploited genuine public indignation about roaming charges, came into force at the end of July and continues to be hailed by the Commission as a huge success. Here, at last, was an example of unqualified success for the single market which would have a benign

impact on the lives of ordinary citizens, or so Commission spokesmen claimed.

"At last Europeans can breathe a sigh of relief as the EU Roaming Regulation finally becomes binding law across all Member States," declared Viviane Reding the EU Commissioner for Information, Society and Media who modestly described her legislation as "wonderful".

"In a nutshell, therefore, this regulation gives Europeans the freedom to roam!" she said.

However, industry spokesmen have suggested - not implausibly - that this particular example of price control could result in increased domestic phone charges and impact unfairly on smaller providers, thus discouraging competition.

It is too soon to assess the extent of such side effects but it is becoming clear that Ms Reding's legislation is not doing what it says on the tin.

A study published in Amsterdam by the telecom consultancy company

A&B shows that the new rules are not working effectively or delivering the promised degree of transparency. Specifically, the new regulations do not take account of the widely different charging systems applied by different providers. For example they do not take account of the practice of rounding up of call duration times in half or full minutes that can result in actual charges being a multiple of what they are supposed to be. The only way for a user to find out what his real costs are is by requesting a detailed bill - most providers agree to this but charge for the service.

The Commission continues to insist that the new regulation is a huge success. All of which suggests, that price control can be expected to make a comeback in other areas where prices seem high or unfair - to the ultimate detriment of consumers as well as producers.

EFTA countries are so much better off

On average, the member-countries of EFTA (the European Free Trade Association, comprising Switzerland, Norway and Iceland, which remain outside the EU) are twice as prosperous (measured by GDP per Capita) as those of EU-27, according to a briefing paper from Global Britain.*

The paper also highlights some other interesting facts, including:

- On average, the EFTA countries are 73 per cent more prosperous than those of the EU's Eurozone.
- The United Kingdom is the eighth

most prosperous EU country. On average, EFTA countries are 50 per cent more prosperous than the UK.

- The UK, with 16 per cent of EU-27 GDP and 12 per cent of EU-27 population, has only 8 per cent of the votes in the Council of Ministers, the main decision-making body of the EU.
- The "Big Four" EU countries, Germany, the UK, France and Italy, together account for 65 per cent of EU-27 GDP and 54 per cent of EU-27 population.

■ The "Big Eight" EU countries (the "Big Four" plus Spain, the Netherlands, Belgium and Sweden), together account for 84 per cent of EU-27 GDP and 70 per cent of EU-27 population.

■ The most prosperous countries in the EU are Luxembourg, Ireland, Denmark and Sweden.

■ The least prosperous countries in the EU are Bulgaria, Romania, Latvia and the Slovak Republic.

**Global Britain Briefing Paper No 48*

Sign up to the Downing Street petition

Given the state of public opinion the response to the Downing Street petition demanding a referendum on the EU Constitution - at the time of writing still less than 20,000 people have signed - is deeply disappointing. More than four times this number have signed up to a Number 10 petition demanding that student loans be repaid monthly rather

than yearly, while three times that number have demanded the Hunting and Fishing Act be repealed.

There is one proven means by which readers can maximise support for petitions of this kind. Under the tried and tested "Tupperware principle" you identify ten family members, friends, acquaintances or colleagues who have not so far signed up and ask them to do

two things: (1) add their names to the petition, and, (2) ask them to persuade ten members of their friends, colleagues and acquaintances to do likewise, and so on.

There is still time: the petition does not close until 31st January 2008. Those readers who have still not added their names to the protest can do so by keying into <http://petitions.pm.gov.uk>

Why can't we be more like Switzerland?

The Swiss system of open and direct democracy provides important lessons for those who wish to preserve the project of self-government

By Anthony Scholefield

What is it about Switzerland that enables it to go on resisting the dubious allure of EU membership decade after decade and to show no apparent sign of weakening? As in Britain the issue of EU membership remains a divisive one. As in Britain the political elites are more sympathetic to the European political project than the voters. But as a recent seminar at the Swiss embassy made clear no one believes that there is even a remote prospect of Switzerland joining the EU in the foreseeable future.

The formal position of Switzerland is that the 1992 application, to open talks on accession to the EU, remains frozen following the rejection by the electorate in a referendum of the signed agreement by the Swiss government to join the EEA in 1992. Since then the Swiss government has developed its EU relations by means of two sets of bilateral agreements, both of which have been approved by popular referendum. In 2001 a proposal to commence EU accession negotiations was massively voted down.

Double Majority

The continuous stream of referendums on EU matters put before the Swiss people since 1992 has led to well organised and vociferous opposition, spearheaded by the Swiss Peoples Party (SVP).

There are two notable characteristics of Swiss politics which have enabled the country to resist trends that elsewhere in Europe have proved irresistible.

The first and most important of these is its system of cantonal democracy which has existed largely unchanged since 1848. Under the system major constitutional changes must be approved by a double majority system - that is by a majority of voters and of

cantons. Such changes are also subject to a process of optional referendums which can be called for by 50,000 voters. This has made it all but impossible for ministers to bargain away democratic rights or to "share" sovereignty as has been the case in other European states. The system has also ensured that the Swiss people are now on the alert and opponents of the EU are ready and organised to resist further challenges.

Direct Democracy

Second, the confederal nature of Swiss politics together with the country's traditions of direct democracy requires full disclosure of the economic and political realities. For example, when the Swiss government produced its Europe 2006 Report which made a careful evaluation of the costs of various alternative arrangements to EU membership, this highlighted all the costs of joining the EU. The annual budgetary cost was put at SF 3.4 billion (£1.41 billion). As part of a rigorous cost/benefit study of the type the British government has been studiously avoiding for the last 34 years, the report frankly acknowledged the implications of abandoning the Swiss franc and spoke quite candidly of the '*negative fallout for the economy*' arising from membership of the eurozone. It was equally candid about issues relating to the country's external relations. '*...the purpose of Swiss foreign policy is to defend the national interests, whether material or immaterial*'.

Another attractive aspect of the Swiss political tradition is that while ministers are obliged to bargain firmly for the national interest they are scrupulous about observing agreements with the EU. '*Switzerland is the most punctilious observer of union directives, bar none*,' one pro-

EU academic acknowledged at the seminar referred to above.

Moreover, the recent bilateral agreements arranged with the EU are very different from the slipshod opt-outs negotiated by the British government from recent EU treaties. This is not altogether surprising: they have to be approved by a substantial majority of the population.

Take the free movement of persons. This is subject to the ability of Switzerland to introduce quotas if there is an unsustainable increase in the number of EU workers and is also subject to a referendum in 2009 on whether to maintain the present agreement or not. Moreover, the free movement of persons is subject to caveats about proof of ability of immigrants to support themselves. One could contrast this with the British government's carelessness about admissions of East European labour.

Slush Fund

The decision of the Swiss government to contribute SF 1 billion to the ten new EU states also provides the opportunity for an interesting comparison between the two countries. This sum will be disbursed over five years on specific projects and programmes selected by Switzerland in co-operation with the recipient states. There is consequently no 'Brussels-style' slush fund with its accompanying bureaucratic costs and opportunities for political manipulation. Indeed the Swiss government has publicly taken pride in its non-participation in the EU cohesion programme. Contrast this with the British position. Once its budget contribution is sent to Brussels there is no British control whatever over what the money is spent on.

Despite prudent decision-making and the ever-present necessity of heeding

Continued on p.5

Chindamo controversy casts revealing light on British justice

The controversy over the decision not to deport Learco Chindamo, the killer of headmaster Phillip Lawrence, when he is released on parole next year, casts a profoundly depressing light both upon British politics and justice.

As Home Secretary Jack Straw has acknowledged, the principal reason Chindamo cannot be deported to his native Italy, where he was born to an Italian father and a Filipina mother, is not the Human Rights Act, as many supposed, but a European law. Under the 2004 Citizens Directive, which passed into British law a year ago, no matter how violent or terrible the crime the only possible grounds for deportation are “*a genuine, present and sufficiently serious threat to society’s fundamental interests*” or “*imperative grounds of public security*”. So long as a criminal has lived in this country for five years or more - even if some of this time has been spent behind bars - Britain can never deport a lifer on his release if he is a European citizen. Once released on parole the perpetrators of the worst and most heinous crimes are consequently free to remain in this country for as long as they wish. It is clear that when the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal reached its ruling the Human Rights Act played only a secondary minor role in its thinking.

One of the many disturbing aspects of the controversy arising from the Tribunal’s support for Chindamo’s wish to remain in Britain was its refusal to allow the media to attend the hearing. The Home Office and the Judicial Communications Office subsequently refused to make the Tribunal’s ruling public. Indeed, the matter only came to light when *The Times* discovered that the ruling had been loaded on the Tribunal’s website and blew away the shrouds of secrecy by placing it on its own.

Earlier this year the Prime Minister insisted that all foreign criminals “will be deported”.

Was the secrecy surrounding the Tribunal decision intended to protect the Prime Minister? Or does officialdom instinctively grasp that it is not in its interest to make any disclosure that reflects adversely on Britain’s membership of the European Union?

When the Prime Minister offered the assurance quoted above the Government was fully aware that his words were untrue; if he did not realise this himself it would surely have been pointed out to him soon afterwards. No one will be surprised that he has not taken the opportunity to correct the record on a matter on which public feelings understandably run high; that in itself should be cause for dismay.

Mr Cameron scarcely emerges better from this controversy. His reaction to the Tribunal’s decision was to blame the Human Rights Act and to suggest that it demonstrated how right he was in calling for its repeal. Once he discovered what he should already have known - that its decision was firmly based on European law - his interest rapidly dwindled. Here was a controversy where public feelings were running high, where the Prime Minister had been shown to mislead the public, and where the leader of the Opposition had the opportunity to draw attention to the root cause of the problem and to channel public opinion accordingly. Instead, having got the facts wrong, he compounded his error by wasting the kind of political opportunity that does not come along every day.

In all of this the question of party advantage is obviously of less importance than that of the public interest. But it is striking that whereas the Prime Minister, in as far as it is practically possible, goes out of his way to court the *Daily Mail* readers and Middle England as a matter of political strategy, Mr Cameron, in his desperate desire not to appear rabid or right wing, goes out of his way to offend them. Can both their calculations be right?

Continued from p.4

Why can’t we be more like the Swiss?

public opinion, the use of bilateral agreements, as well as the decision of the Swiss government to ‘EU proof’ its proposed laws so they cohere with those of the EU, have led to what critics call ‘Europeanization’. However, this in turn has led to vigorous populist scrutiny and ever-increasing support for the SVP.

This has been quick to argue that while in some instances it may be sensible to harmonise regulations to fit in with its giant neighbours, this can have harmful effects. First, because EU-Swiss relations are on a

government-to-government basis, this causes centralising tendencies within Switzerland itself.

Second, while signing up to cooperation in a particular area might seem sensible at the time the dynamic nature of EU integration means the Swiss government may be forced to make unpopular decisions subsequently when its giant partner increases the scope of its regulations.

Third, such close ties to the EU must inevitably consign Switzerland to the EU’s demographic, political and economic fate - that of inexorable

relative international decline.

In acknowledging and in resisting these trends as far as it is able to do so Switzerland can be seen as having effectively put itself at the forefront of the present world-wide distrust of the political classes. That it has been able to do this is due to its system of direct democracy and to the deep respect of the Swiss public for its constitution. There are important lessons for Britain here - and indeed for all who continue to believe in self-government.

LETTERS

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

Are they Opt-outs or Opt-ins?

Dear Sir,

According to the Spanish Foreign Minister the substance of the EU "Reform Treaty" is 98 per cent the same as that of the previous Constitution.

"The wrapping has been changed, but not the content", as he put it.

He could have added that for the sceptical British electorate there is a special outer wrapping - a tissue of "red lines" and "opt-outs" - most of which are of dubious legal validity, and all of which are intended to be no more than temporary concessions.

Once Parliament had ratified the treaty, the "red lines" would quickly turn out to have been "red herrings", and the "opt-outs" would gradually turn into "opt-ins".

Remove the double wrapping and apart from its name the new treaty is virtually identical to the constitutional treaty mentioned in the Labour party manifesto for the last general election, with the unqualified pledge: *"We will put it to the British people in a referendum"*.

The Prime Minister should stop insulting our intelligence and demeaning his office with this cheap trickery, and agree to give us the referendum we were promised.

Dr D R COOPER
Berkshire

How We Lost Control

Dear Sir,

A *Times*' article on the new EU constitutional treaty (20th August) notes that *"thanks to opt-outs negotiated by Mr Blair, Britain can ignore justice and home affairs decisions, and will retain full control over its foreign policy"*.

Full control of foreign policy was lost from the day Britain entered the EEC. The European Court of Justice ruled that where an 'internal' policy has been agreed, it should have a common 'external' (i.e. foreign) policy to support it. (ref: Case 22/70). EC 'internal' policies now govern most areas of national life.

The EC has also used creative legislation techniques to gain control

of areas of Justice and Home Affairs. The Citizenship Directive, 2004, would forbid us to ban Rumanian cashpoint fraud gangs from the UK, as mere criminality is not a bar to the entry of 'EU citizens', including outsiders resourceful enough to gain a residence card.

BRIAN MOONEY
London

Origins of the Constitution

Dear Sir,

The origins of this EU Constitution which suddenly is not a constitution go back further than people think.

The first person we have to thank is an Italian communist, Alberto Spinelli, who from his prison cell in 1941 had a vision of a United States of Europe, to be assembled over a long period without openly revealing the end purpose. The peoples of Europe he planned should not be consulted until a "constituent assembly" was ready to draw up a "constitution".

The next originator was Jean Monnet, a brandy salesman, whose idea of a United States of Europe was a new form of supra national government run by technocrats beyond the control of elected governments, elected politicians and certainly electorates.

Begin to ring a bell?

The final mastermind was Paul Henri Spaak, a prime minister of Belgium who thought up a brilliant way to disguise the political purpose of the project. This was to disguise the project as only being concerned with economic matters and cooperation, hence the original "Common Market" under which deceit we joined.

If this "Treaty" is imposed on us these three, venerated by the EU, will have won. We though will finally lose the last of our freedom.

DAVID BROWN
Essex

Shades of Lewis Carroll

Dear Sir,

Graham Allt (letters 27th July) draws attention to the continued existence of the North East Regional Assembly despite its overwhelming rejection in the referendum in November 2004.

Writing in the *Northern Echo* shortly

after the referendum, the then chairman, Bob Gibson, leader of Stockton Council, said he regarded the rejection of an elected assembly as endorsement of the unelected assembly - shades of Lewis Carroll.

He dismissed the suggestion that the assembly has no democratic mandate with consummate arrogance saying, *"I am not interested in that issue. The assembly will carry on the work that it has been doing. That's all I am saying on the issue"*.

PHILIP WARREN
Newcastle upon Tyne

Just a Thought...

Dear Sir,

Mr Barroso's admission of the true nature of the European Union inspired the thought that if the EU is an empire, then there is no nation better equipped to run it than the United Kingdom, which presided over the largest empire in history within living memory. If a few thousand civil servants could run the Raj then Continental Europe should be child's play by comparison, and I am sure our fellow European citizens would welcome the blessings of British-exported ideas of free trade, incorruptible administration, the Common Law, Parliamentary democracy and education, while adopting our uniquely rich language as their mother tongue would present few problems since English is already so widely spoken on the Continent. Moreover, the relative economic, technological, political, military and cultural ascendancy of the Anglosphere, its brighter potential plus the fact that India may well be best placed to succeed the USA (itself Britain's successor) as a global superpower serve to illustrate the wisdom of importing Anglo-Saxon models. Every empire requires a figurehead to inspire loyalty: who better than Queen Elizabeth II, daughter of the last King-Emperor and head of state of 16 Commonwealth countries? If the BBC is serious about making amends for its recent traducing of Her Majesty it could do worse than squaring this with its enthusiasm for the European project.

N. J. BATTEN
Warwickshire

MEETINGS

Democracy Movement
(Southeast Sussex Branch)
01424 848964

Tuesday **11th September**, 7.30 pm

Roger Helmer MEP
Lynn Riley, *British Declaration of Independence*

PUBLIC MEETING
Lansdowne Hotel, King Edward's
Parade, Eastbourne, East Sussex
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)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **18th September**, 6.00 pm

"The Nature of the American
Presidency"

Vernon Bogdanor CBE. FBA,
Gresham Professor of Law

Tuesday **25th September**, 6.00 pm

"The Reform Club: Architecture and the
birth of popular government"

Peter Marsh, *Honorary Professor,
University of Birmingham, with
architect Paul Vonberg*

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

Marlborough Research Group
01672 515275

Sunday **23rd September**, 2.00 pm

"The EU story or A really fine mess
they've gotten us into"

Greg Lance-Watkins, *A researcher on
EU operations for the past twelve years.*

PUBLIC MEETING
Marlborough Town Hall, Marlborough,
Wiltshire
Admission Free

Conservative Party Fringe Meeting Blackpool

Freedom Association
0845 833 9626

Tuesday **2nd October**, 1.00 pm

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING
Grand Theatre, 33 Church Street,
Blackpool
Admission Free

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.

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

Events Web Diary
www.junepress.com

Should you be organising a meeting
on the EU please send full details,
(even proposed meetings) to be
included in **Events** Web Page on
the June Press Web Site.
Send to to info@junepress.com

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **9th October**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into
the Economic Impact of Immigration* from
witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **10th October**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into
FRONTEX - the European External
Borders Agency* from witnesses to be
confirmed.

Thursday **18th October**, 10.00 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into
the European Commission's proposed
replacement Timeshare Directive* from Mr
Gareth Thomas MP, Minister of State,
Department for Business, Enterprise and
Regulatory Reform.

Thursday **25th October**, 10.00 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into
the European Commission's proposed
replacement Timeshare Directive* from
Prof Geraint Howells; and Dr Christian W.
Twigg-Flesner.

*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 Party **5-6th October**
Conference
London

UK Parliamentary **8th October**
Recess Ends

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*. **£11.99**

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 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.

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**

An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

A Life of Mayhem Money and Unintentional Treason

by *J Brian Heywood*. **£9.99**

This novel clearly shows how easy it is for good intentions to be used by anyone with ambitions for a world government.

The Missing Heart of Europe

Does Britain hold the key to the future of the Continent?

by *Thomas Kremer*. **£11.99**

Can nation states flourish? A European businessman's view of the impact of divergent national cultures.

The General Rule

A Guide to Customary

Weights and Measures

by *Vivian Linacre*. **£12.99**

The author reflects the needs for imperial units in every day usage.

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.

Warning: Immigration Can Seriously Damage Your Wealth

by *Anthony Scholefield*. **£6.00**

Scholefield argues that while immigration increases a nation's GDP it must inevitably reduce wage levels per capita income.

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.

Videos

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

euofacts

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 *euofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....
to *euofacts*: **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 7603 7796
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	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
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

