

## Who is being cynical about the Constitution?

*The Tory Party should live up to its principles by promising a referendum on the Constitution - even if this has been ratified by Parliament*

Although its leader often appears curiously reluctant to talk about the subject the Conservative party is committed to the case for a referendum on the Constitution. In this regard it is at one with the entire country. As the speech by William Hague on 24th July - his best since returning to the Tory front bench - makes clear, the party leadership is fully aware of the fundamental nature of the change that the ratification of the Reform Treaty will make to our relations with the European Union and the extent to which Labour intentions represent a betrayal of a solemn election promise.

According to Mr Hague, Mr Brown is guilty of "extraordinary cynicism".

*"We have heard a lot this month about trust and consultation," said Mr Hague. "But how can the British people trust Gordon Brown if he begins his time as Prime Minister with the flagrant breach of a solemn manifesto promise? How can they trust him if he won't trust them to let them have their say?... What does Gordon Brown think people will make of his talk of consultation if he won't consult them on a question of fundamental importance to this country's future, on which the overwhelming majority of the British people want their promised say?"*

But although Mr Hague's sentiments are widely shared is he not also being cynical? His words do not commit the Conservative Party to any particular course of action, their primary purpose being to discredit Mr Brown and to exploit the deep differences on the

issue within the Labour party. If there were to be a snap election which, as a result of a catastrophic miscalculation by the Prime Minister, resulted in the formation of a Conservative government with an overall majority the new Tory Prime Minister would be committed to call a referendum on the Constitution within the first months of arriving in office. Given his own statements, as well as those of Mr Hague, it is difficult to see how he could avoid doing so. But now that the Brown 'bounce' in the opinion polls is losing strength few observers believe that the Prime Minister will go to the country any time soon. Were he to be encouraged to do so by a sudden surge in the polls it seems unlikely that in these circumstances the Tories could win an overall majority.

### True Nature

Mr Cameron and Mr Hague can therefore safely continue embarrassing the Prime Minister over his breach of trust, his cynicism and his attempt to disguise the true nature of the Reform Treaty without committing the Conservative party in any significant way. And, if and when the Treaty is ratified, they will be able to point to its practical consequences and say: "I told you so". From the Tory perspective the strategy would appear to be risk-free. Except for the fact that as the months pass it is likely to become increasingly apparent that there is a particular course of action to which Tory words unmistakably point

but which the Tory party is refusing to follow. This would be to make it clear that if Parliament ratifies the treaty during the lifetime of the present government ***an incoming Tory government would give the people the referendum that they so obviously crave within six months of arriving in office, and that it would accept the full implications of a no vote.***

If the consequences of the Treaty are as profound and far reaching as Mr Hague says they are, what reason can there be for declining to give such an undertaking? If it is right for the present Government to trust the people on this shouldn't an incoming Tory government also be prepared to do so?

The Tory opposition has talked publicly of employing pollsters to stage its own 'referendum' which smacks of gimmickry since this would not be a referendum in a meaningful sense. Better then to promise the real thing whatever happens in Parliament.

One obvious advantage of this course of action is that it would add to the mounting pressures on Mr Brown to change his mind on the subject; if he were to do so Mr Cameron would rightly get some of the credit. If he did not 'Europe' would assuredly be an issue at the next general election and the Tory Party would have helped shape the terms of debate in a way that could rebound to its advantage. The readiness of the Tories to trust the people would no longer be merely a rhetorical matter, but would have taken concrete political form. The Tory

**Continued on p.2**

**INSIDE: UK passports may be changed p.2 - Europe proclaims 'the four freedoms' p.3 - How the EU smears our view of reality p.4 - Government 'has rigged decision on Constitution' p.4 - EU postal deregulation p.4 - Even the EP is becoming eurosceptic p.4 - Contrasting views about Turkey p.5**

# UK passport may be changed

The present wording of the UK passport is likely to be changed to take account of the political fact of European citizenship.

The aim is to include a passage from the rejected EU Constitution as part of a wider scheme to greatly expand the role of the EU in providing consular and diplomatic services, as the *Yorkshire Post* reported in an exclusive story on 3rd September. The Foreign Office has since confirmed that although a final decision has not been reached it is considering including Article 20 from the Constitution in all UK passports. This reads: "Every citizen of the Union shall, in the territory of a third country in which the member state of which he is a national is not represented, be entitled to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any member state, on the same conditions as the nationals of that state".

The fate of the solemn and dignified words on the first page of the existing UK passport - "Her Britannic Majesty's Secretary of State Requests and Requires in the Name of Her Majesty all those it may concern to allow the bearer to pass freely without let or hindrance and to afford the bearer such assistance and protection as may be necessary" - is not clear.

An editorial in the *Daily Telegraph* on

10th September bemoaned the change and demanded that the present passport be preserved. There were similar words from the shadow foreign secretary William Hague who said this illustrated the need for a referendum on the Constitution.

It is sad that that wording should be changed but the new formulation is surely apt because it accurately reflects the loss of British sovereignty and the political reality of European citizenship.

More significant than the change of words is the expansion of the EU's involvement in representing member states as described in an EU green paper. Since Britain is much more widely represented abroad in terms of its consular service than any other country, Britain is unlikely to benefit from the proposed changes. To the extent British consular officials will have to treat the problems of other EU nationals as seriously as those of British citizens, the proposed changes are likely to reduce the quality of the service received by the latter.

To date the federalists have been able to ease Britain's absorption into a unitary state because the shell of British institutions - parliament, the monarchy, the courts, and Britain's diplomatic and consular service - have been preserved while the substance of

that sovereignty has been slowly but systematically eroded. Without such subterfuge public antipathy to the European project would have developed into something much stronger, and may still do so.

The proposed change to the wording of the UK passport is merely a reflection of how the realities of power have changed. Preserving the existing wording will not restore British sovereignty by one iota or even slow the process by which it continues to be surrendered any more than it is possible to change the weather by smashing the barometer.

Those who merely fight to preserve the symbols of British sovereignty while doing nothing to preserve its substance are in fact accomplices in the on-process of its destruction. From a eurosceptic viewpoint it is better by far if British subjects are brought face to face with the consequences and implications of what is being lost. Self-deception is always dangerous: the belief that all will be well providing that there is a parliament of sorts at Westminster and that the Foreign Office continues to demand in the name of Her Majesty that foreign governments do not molest us when we go abroad is part of a hugely foolish and harmful pretence.

Continued from p.1

## Who is being cynical about the Constitution?

stance would stand in sharp relief to Labour hypocrisy and deceit.

Mr Cameron has resisted such ideas because in his view they do not sit easily with his strategy of re-branding the Tory party. He recoils from any proposal which suggests that the Party is anti-EU, xenophobic or narrowly concerned with the national interest. But the course described above does not require him to appear to be any of these things. He need not be critical of our EU neighbours. He need not mention the EU's democratic deficit, the millions lost in EU fraud, the impoverishment of the Third World as a result of the CAP, or even the swelling volume of EU regulation. He

need only insist that the public must have their say because of the constitutional character of the Treaty and because they have been promised as much. What is at stake, he would rightly proclaim, is a question of trust between government and people. This was now critically damaged, and could only be restored by means of a referendum.

Of course, a second reason why top Tories are reluctant to deal with the issue has to do with the bitter recollections of their humiliating drubbing at the 1997 election when as leader William Hague tried to make 'Europe' an issue. He did so by asserting - quite misleadingly - that this

would be the last opportunity the people would have to stop Britain's adoption of the euro. Moreover, the rhetoric he employed ('In Europe, but not run by Europe') did not resonate in the country, perhaps because voters could not quite know what it meant. The fact that the issue was dealt with badly then is no reason why it should be avoided now. The political landscape has changed. There is immense political capital to be gained from giving practical form to the sentiments expressed in the rousing conclusion to Mr Hague's 24th July speech: "The answer is simple: trust the people and let them decide".

# Europe proclaims 'the four freedoms' - but the reality is very different

*Three of the freedoms don't really exist and the costs of the fourth are unacceptably high*

**By Anthony Scholefield**

*Oh Freedom, what liberties are committed in thy name!* Daniel George, The Perpetual Pessimist.

Pressed to find something positive to say about the European Union its apologists often refer to the EU's 'four freedoms'. These, they insist, are what the EU is all about. Commission spokesmen frequently make such claims.

The freedoms to which they refer are to the movement of persons, goods, services and capital.

Siim Kallas vice president of the Commission said recently: "*It is with these four fundamental freedoms that the European Union has made so much progress during its existence*".

Article 4 of the failed Constitutional Treaty states that: "*Free movement of persons, services, goods and capital and freedom of establishment shall be guaranteed within and by the Union in accordance with the Constitution*".

## **Fundamental Principle**

In similar vein a Treasury/DTI report of 2007 proclaimed that the 'four freedoms' are the '*fundamental principle of the European Union*'.

Curiously, such claims have almost entirely escaped critical scrutiny, perhaps because freedom is one of those concepts which, like motherhood and apple pie, are difficult to criticise. There have consequently been few if any who have questioned whether the European Union really does embody these freedoms and to what extent their application is unequivocally a good thing.

If it were true that the EU was the embodiment of these principles you would expect that it would be more free than other countries, especially in economic terms. But this is quite obviously not the case. On average EU

countries perform significantly less well than other countries when measured by yardsticks of economic freedom. Britain, which squeezes in at fifth place, is the only EU country to be listed among the front runners in the most authoritative of these - the Index of Economic Freedom - produced annually by the Heritage Foundation and the *Wall Street Journal*. Significantly, the Anglosphere pacesetters - Hong Kong, Singapore, the US and New Zealand are all former British colonies enjoying growth rates considerably higher than those of EU members. Germany is ranked 19th out of 157, France 45th, Italy, 60th and Greece 94th. So much for the EU's claim to blaze the trail of economic freedom.

## **Managerial Philosophy**

The disparity between EU principles and performance is explained partly by history as well as by the managerialist philosophy and self-interest of an unaccountable political elite. The EU was conceived in more protectionist times as a Customs Union. What is meant by 'the free movement of goods and services' is the free movement *within the EU*, with the Commission determining what may and may not move freely within the EU and also determining - by means of quotas and anti-dumping duties - what cannot enter the EU.

Recent illustrations that the EU departs fundamentally from the principle of free trade include the dispute over the imports of clothing from China and the failure of the EU to meet the goals set at the Doha round because of its determination to preserve the CAP.

If there were a genuine free movement of goods and services Britain would be in the position of being able to purchase the products it

needs on world markets at lower prices. Indeed, the concept of free movement of goods within the EU amounts to what Patrick Minford refers to as 'the common manufacturing policy' the objections to which are identical to those which apply to the CAP. But while there is scarcely a single British MP who is prepared to support the CAP the EU policy on manufacturing - which is just as damaging economically - escapes criticism.

It also needs to be borne in mind that even on the EU's own forecasts the EU's share of production is likely to fall by half over the next 30 years so that the 'free movement of goods and services' will take place in a much smaller economic area.

Meanwhile, another trade-distorting monster - the Financial Services Programme - threatens further limits in the free trade of services.

## **More Complex**

The issues relating to the free movement of persons are more complex and more emotive. There are fundamental differences between the movement of people and the movement of goods: trade is a flow, the movement of people a transfer, as the economists at the US National Academy of Science have pointed out in *The New Americans*:

*The goods that were imported in the last decade have long since been consumed and trade leave no 'footprint'. Immigration, however, increases the labour supply permanently.*

*Furthermore trade has no effect on the accumulated wealth or capital of a country. An influx of people has an enormous effect, depressing capital and wealth per capita.*

**Continued on p.4**

# How the EU smears our view of reality

Our normally laser-like take on reality may possibly be obscured at present. It's not that *eurofacts'* perception of the external world has been skewed by europhile propaganda, only that our view from our first floor office window is hindered by a large smear.

This was caused by our window cleaner.

Aren't window cleaners supposed to remove stains rather than cause them? we hear you ask. Indeed they are, but our new high-tech window cleaner doesn't quite seem to grasp this.

The old cleaner, who did understand this, has gone out of business because he could not afford to meet the costs of the provisions of the Working at Height Directive which restricts the use of

ladders and consequently requires the purchase of expensive modern cleaning equipment.

The new cleaner arrived with extendable high pressure hoses and his own supplies of purified water. However, he explained that he could not reach two windows because of their inaccessibility. When he declared the job done we pointed out that several windows appeared to be dirtier than when he had arrived. He instructed his assistant to climb on to an adjacent roof in order to remove the smears with a rag, explaining that there were special provisions in the Directive which allowed him to do this. The smears stubbornly remain, but he assured us that these will disappear after only three or four visits.

The origins of our problem lie in EU Directive 2001/45/EC which lays down safety rules for working with ladders and ropes. This was subsequently gold-plated when it was incorporated into British law by means of an executive instrument laid before Parliament.

Our old window cleaner whistled and told jokes. He charged £15. His politically correct successor appears to know more about the law than about cleaning windows. He charges £30. Sometimes through a small or relatively minor matter it is possible to observe a much larger picture. So it is with the laws which govern the working conditions of window cleaners.

## Government

### 'has rigged decision on Constitution'

*"In practice this is the last time for a referendum. The notion that a decision on this treaty should be by parliament rather than by a referendum is like telling someone to trust a court when the jury is rigged.*

*The Government should stick to*

*Labour's manifesto promise on a referendum and this should be reaffirmed in any future manifesto for a 'snap' election. To do otherwise would either break a commitment to the electorate or be based on a deception: the notion that a new treaty is in any*

*meaningful way different from the previous constitution".*

Gisela Stuart, Labour MP for Birmingham Edgbaston and a member of the Convention on the Future for Europe writing in *The Sunday Times* on 9th September.

Continued from p.3

## Europe's 'four freedoms'

Unless an immigrant brings substantial capital with him or can generate this very quickly he appropriates wealth from natives.

It's not just immigrant workers who need to make use of public services. Students also require accommodation, roads, water supply. Common sense suggests that there are bound to be more EU students wanting to study English than any other language. Even if direct subsidies to EU students are not taken into account, the British taxpayer loses out because while he helps fund students from other parts of the EU, the number of British students wanting to study in, say, Greek or

Danish universities is limited.

Pensioners who move to other parts of the EU also make claims on public services but what distinguishes them from workers and students is that they invariably bring capital with them.

The last decades have seen greater freedom in terms of global capital flows, but it cannot be said that the EU has been the major engine of change even it has applied some pressure on states which have failed to grasp the benefits arising from capital inflows.

How then to assess the EU claim to embody 'the four freedoms'?

Any objective assessment must be that in the case of goods and services

no such freedom exists except in a strictly limited sense and that the EU acts as a barrier to some goods, especially agricultural produce from poor countries. In the case of capital flows the trend has little to do with the EU. Although, unlike Britain many EU countries have introduced 'transitional measures' to prevent the inflow of immigrants from the new EU countries the creation of the European Union has led to the freer movement of persons. However, such freedom carries costs that are only now coming to be recognised - costs which many people may conclude are far too high.

# EU postal deregulation: Is Britain better off?

*In a little noted decision the European Parliament has voted to further delay the full deregulation of postal services*

Postal deregulation is a fact of life: it can no more be avoided than the incoming of the tide and in the long term it promises greater competition, efficiency and innovation. But given the uneven and faltering progress towards full deregulation achieved within in the EU and the conflicting interests and strategies pursued by EU governments it is difficult to calculate whether the British consumer has so far benefited.

The Blair government opened up UK postal services to full competition on 1st January 2006 - three years ahead of the deadline demanded by the 1997 European Union Postal Service Directive. This had the declared aim of ending national monopolies and opening up postal markets to competition.

By speeding up deregulation of the Royal Mail, the government hoped to position the company to take advantage of the huge European postal services market - reckoned to be worth 80 billion euros a year and involving the delivery of 135 billion items.

But Royal Mail says that although in contrast to its days in the public sector it has become profitable, since postal markets were opened up it has lost 40

per cent of the business mail market, which accounts for 90 per cent of its business. This has gone to private sector rivals who are more efficient as the result of new technology.

Meanwhile, countries such as France, Italy, Spain, Greece, Belgium, Hungary and Poland (the so-called 'Southern Group') have opposed rapid liberalisation and continue to protect their national postal services.

Despite the progress towards liberalisation made in Britain, Sweden and Germany, the Southern Group has been effective in demanding a slowing of the liberalisation process which was meant to have been completed by 2009. It went largely unnoticed by the British media but on 11th July, the European Parliament voted by 512 votes to 156 to allow member states to delay full liberalisation until 1st January 2011 or even until 2013 for:

*new member states; countries with "a particularly difficult topography or many islands", such as Greece, and countries "with a small population and a limited geographical size" - i.e. Luxembourg.*

Spokesmen for the Royal Mail and the Communication Workers Union have expressed fears that the delay will

be exploited by countries that cannot realistically claim to meet these criteria and that British companies including the Royal Mail will find themselves facing unfair competition from public providers that continue to enjoy state protection. This despite the fact MEPs also voted on 11th July in favour of a 'reciprocity clause' that would forbid postal operators in countries that maintain a reserved area from entering markets that have already been fully opened. It remains to be seen whether the clause is observed.

It is consequently anyone's bet whether in ten years time the Royal Mail, which currently employs 193,000 people, is a fit, muscular national champion that has adjusted well to political and technological developments or whether it will have been crippled on the sharp edges of change.

Rather more importantly, it remains to be seen whether a decade hence the British consumer will be getting a better postal deal, or whether consumer interests will have been damaged by the EU's failure to live up fully to its declared free-trade principles.

## Even the EP is becoming eurosceptic

The success of eurosceptic candidates at elections to the European Parliament is normally explained away as the result of the electorate's dissatisfaction with national politics. But a study by two German political scientists effectively demolishes this view and concludes that such successes should be taken as an expression of growing discontent with European political integration.

Philip Manow and Holger Doering of the Max Plank Institute for the Study of Societies based their conclusions on pro-EU and contra EU positions of the European Parliament as well as national parliaments since 1979, the year when the EP was first directly

elected by voters.

Writing in the 2007 MPIFG yearbook they say that governments have become gradually more pro-EU over the years while the EP has become more "contra-EU" since the mid-1990s as the result of the success of eurosceptic candidates.

Interpreting the data the researchers say that voters are increasingly using EP elections to express dissatisfaction with the EU and with the pro-European policies of their national governments.

*"Voters have a diffuse feeling that Europe has gone too far and that their national governments have a tendency to accept too much of further European integration,"* said Mr Manow.

The authors predict that the trend is likely to continue in 2009 and at subsequent elections. They also argue that low and falling turn-outs at EP elections are also a protest against EU integration and the fact that centre-left and centre-right governments do not differ much in their pro-EU attitudes.

Extrapolation from existing trends is a risky business but if present trends continue we will presumably arrive at the bizarre situation whereby the EP largely comprises members who don't believe in the political project of which they are part while national politicians display an increasing desperation to surrender to Brussels the remaining vestiges of their power.

# LETTERS

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

## How to back a Referendum

Dear Sir,  
Because the new EU Reform Treaty is virtually the same as the EU Constitution rejected by the French and Dutch people there is a growing demand for a Referendum that Gordon Brown should heed. His initial reaction is to tough it out and to pretend that the two are entirely different - a view not taken by Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, the Constitution's chief drafter or other EU heads of state who state that over 90 per cent is the same.

Dr Bob Spink MP, the new chairman of the cross-party Campaign for an Independent Britain (CIB) has put down a Parliamentary Early Day Motion (EDM 1780) calling for a referendum. Your readers may wish to encourage their MPs to sign this EDM as a matter of urgency. It has been reported that the Labour MP Ian Davidson has told his leader that 120 members of the Parliamentary Labour Party are calling for substantial amendments to the Reform Treaty or a referendum. We live in interesting times.

DAVID OWEN  
Devon

## Ask us First

Dear Sir,  
Through your columns could I draw attention to the setting up of a campaign to press the government into holding a referendum on the Constitution?

France and Holland have already voted and rejected the constitution. We in Britain are now faced with a treaty which is a substitute for the

constitution.

This treaty would finally abolish any meaningful national self-government.

Our campaign is "ASK US FIRST" and its aim is simply to ensure that a referendum is held, not to campaign "for" or "against".

Parliamentary pressure is already mounting on Gordon Brown and the Government. At the last election they promised the British people that no decision would be taken without first reference to the electorate.

"ASK US FIRST" has support in both House of Parliament and I have undertaken to manage the campaign organisation across the country as a volunteer.

A national campaign needs organisers and volunteers in all areas of the country and I appeal to any one with time and energy to spare to contact me now. I can be contacted at e-mail: [philiplockwood65@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:philiplockwood65@yahoo.co.uk).

PHILIP LOCKWOOD  
Cambridgeshire

## Smoke and Mirrors

Dear Sir,

Because it was 'The greatest EU deception of them all' (*eurofacts* 6th July) the choreographed introduction of the EU Constitution to the British public had to be Byzantine in its intricacy. First, self-evidently, the government lied in denying that it was simply the original constitution in all but name. Then followed the inevitable bleating that anyway referenda are alien to a parliamentary democracy. This argument is now, of course, completely void since it was never envisioned that a parliament would be prepared to renounce its power to a foreign body in return for a mere 8.9

per cent vote in its policies. (figure from Lord Pearson's Memorandum of July 2000).

Far more devious were the two other devices used in a scheme of smoke and mirrors. These involved the concept, made infamous on 9/11, of choosing 'a good day for bad/unpalatable news'. This can explain why the PM changeover was massively delayed. The timing had to be scrupulously chosen to ensure that the Blair 'abdication' and the Brown 'coronation' would, with their inevitable wall to wall news coverage, submerge the announcement of the Constitutional Treaty of a few days before.

The policy worked. It ensured a neutered PMQ that week (27th June) where it was a solitary backbencher, Nicholas Winterton, who alone raised the Constitution question, and the House, in its end-of-an-era celebratory mood allowed Blair flippantly to dismiss the powerful accusation in three continental words for 'goodbye'. Similarly, at the BBC John Humphreys, a forensic inquisitor in all other areas, greeted this treasonable Brussels deceit with no more than an amused 'Oh dear' (*Today* 30th June).

Brown, in a flurry of policies, completed this deliberate confusion with references to a British constitution in the hope it would replace that of the EU in the minds of the general public. At the same time, where Prescott had failed, with a quirk of the pen he gave substance to the EU concept of an England of the regions by placing a Minister in charge of each.

C FRANCIS WARREN  
Lancashire

## Contrasting views about Turkey

*"It's great that Turkey has broken through the barrier that says Islam is incompatible with democracy and a secular public realm...My job as a politician is to win the argument that Britain is better off with Turkey in the EU,"* David Milliband, the Foreign Secretary quoted in *The Times* on 6th September 2007.

*"It [Turkey] is not a democracy; it has porous borders with states that aspire to destroy everything Western; it does not in practice afford equal rights to women, homosexuals and ethno-religious minorities; it does not tolerate dissent and political opposition in a manner compatible with liberal democratic traditions; it*

*has an average per capita income so low that it would drive tens of millions of economic migrants to northern Europe and act as a conduit for tens of millions more,"* Professor Anthony Elliott-Kelly of the University of Southampton in a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* on 6th September 2007.

# MEETINGS

**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**

---

**Labour Party**  
**Fringe Meeting Bournemouth**  
**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**  
020 7691 3800

Monday **24th September**, 5.45 pm

“Why we must have a Referendum on the EU Constitution”

**Tony Benn**  
**Kelvin Hopkins MP**  
**John Mills**  
*Chairman: Austin Mitchell MP*

## PUBLIC MEETING

Ottershaw Room, Bournemouth International Hotel, 6 Priory Road, West Cliff, Bournemouth BH2

**Admission Free**

---

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

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*

Tuesday **30th October**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidency; Transformation and Change - Franklin D Roosevelt, President 1933-1943”

**Vernon Bogdanor CBE FBA**, *Gresham Professor of Law*

## PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London

**Admission Free**

## Conservative Party Fringe Meetings Blackpool

**The Freedom Association,  
Forest  
and The Free Society**

Sunday **30th September**, 7-8.30 pm

“Nanny State? No Thanks”  
**Speakers to be announced**

## FUN EVENING

Nielson Room, Trafalgar Suite, Hilton Hotel, North Promenade, Blackpool FY1

**Admission Free**

(Further details [tory@forestonline.org](mailto:tory@forestonline.org))

---

**Conservative Way Forward**  
07729 709779

Monday **1st October**, 12.45-2.00 pm

“Should the Special Relationship drive Britain’s Defence and Foreign Policies?”

**Andrew Roberts**  
**Roger Helmer MP**  
**Gerald Howarth MP**

## PUBLIC MEETING

Room 3, Imperial Hotel, Blackpool

**Admission Free**

---

**The Freedom Association**  
0845 833 9626

Monday **1st October**, 5.30-6.30 pm

“Cool Thinking On Climate Change”

**Roger Helmer MEP**, *Hon Chairman, TFA*  
**Russell Lewis**, *Journalist and Former Director General of the Institute of Economic Affairs*  
**Iain Murray**, *Senior Fellow, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Washington DC*

## PUBLIC MEETING

The Studio, Grand Theatre, Church Street, Blackpool FY1

**Admission Free**

**The Freedom Association**  
0845 833 9626

Tuesday **2nd October**, 1.00-2.30 pm

“Where’s Our Referendum?”

**Michael Ancram MP**, *Former Shadow Foreign Secretary*  
**Philip Davis MP**, *Shipley*  
**Roger Helmer MEP**, *Hon Chairman of TFA*  
**Philip Hollobone MP**, *Kettering*  
**Ivo Strejcek MEP**, *Czech Republic*

## PUBLIC MEETING

Main Stage, Grand Theatre, Church Street, Blackpool FY1

**Admission Free**

---

**UK Independence Party**  
01789 751088

Tuesday **9th October**, 7.30 pm

**Rt Hon the Lord Willoughby de Broke**

## PUBLIC MEETING

Trinity Parish Centre - (opposite Shakespeare’s Church) - Old Town, Stratford-upon-Avon CV37

**Admission Free**

---

## DIARY OF EVENTS

### 2007

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

### 2009

European Parliamentary **June**  
Elections

**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](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"

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: <a href="mailto:globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org">globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org</a>	
Global Vision	<a href="http://www.global-vision.net">www.global-vision.net</a>
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 Gordon Brown 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

