

Tory policies will not halt transfer of powers

Unexpected events during the conference season are conspiring to give the European issue the salience it has lacked in the past

The season of mists and party conferences turned out to be a rather better one from a eurosceptic point of view than was anticipated. It is good news that there is to be no election; there was always the possibility that despite the best efforts of the *Sun* and *Mail* the referendum issue would get buried in the course of an election campaign. One possible result of an autumn election would have been a Lib-Lab government which would have had no scruples whatever about ignoring the public clamour for its voice to be heard on the issue.

Remarkable Outcome

The remarkable thing is that Gordon Brown's flirtation with an election succeeded in uniting the Tory party and laying the foundations of a highly successful Conservative Party conference at the very moment when David Cameron's critics inside his party had begun to snap and snarl. This is something that no mere Tory could have achieved. Moreover, this is a turn of events that may have assisted the eurosceptic cause. Tory unity may not be at the top of the average eurosceptic's wish-list. But if it now so chooses the party can demand a referendum with far greater authority than hitherto and has an obvious electoral interest in doing so given the sudden political weakness of the Prime Minister and the extraordinarily widespread support for a referendum.

The British public has always been more eurosceptic than the political elites, but Europe has never been at the top of its league table of concerns. Events are now conspiring to give the European issue greater salience.

As far as Conservative party policy towards Europe is concerned Mr Cameron had remarkably little to say in his conference speech and managed to get some facts wrong (see page 5). Mr Hague put the case for a referendum forcefully and also promised that further treaties involving transfers of national sovereignty would be subject to referendums. In as far as this commitment reflects a hardening of attitudes towards the European political project this is to be welcomed. It may also provide eurosceptics with new opportunities to push the Conservatives further in the right direction.

Transfers of Power

However, in giving the impression that under a Tory government the electorate would have no fear of further transfers of powers from Westminster to Brussels Mr Hague was clearly being disingenuous. The proposed treaty is self-amending so that except in the area of defence it will be possible for further such transfers of powers to take place under Article 33 - without the bothersome necessity of getting agreement on new treaties or even of holding inter-governmental conferences. The matter can be

decided on the basis of QMV.

Even if the treaty is *not* ratified transfers of power can continue to take place under the notorious Article 308 of the existing treaty - there have been numerous recent examples of this happening. Mr Hague can say that if the treaty fails a Tory government would use the veto to block further erosions of sovereignty, although in the past member states have shown themselves remarkably reluctant to use the veto. However, it seems more likely than not that the treaty will be ratified. It is consequently not unreasonable to say to Mr Hague: "*You say that European political integration has gone too far - and you imply that this will all stop under a Tory government. If the treaty goes through how do you propose to prevent further losses of sovereignty?*"

Without an adequate answer to this question Mr Hague's assurances to the Conservative Party Conference are bound to appear deeply suspect.

Flagrant Betrayal

Should the Tories be returned to office in 2009 or 2010 - the most likely dates for a general election - the treaty will have been in force for only a short time. So there is another question that must be put to Cameron and Hague: "*If, as you say, the refusal to hold a referendum in line with Labour's manifesto represents one of the most flagrant betrayals of trust in history,*

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: MPs contradict Brown over treaty p.2 - Why integrate with a trading bloc in decline? p.3 - EU membership costs Britain £60bn a year p.4 - EU still lags behind in R&D p.4 - Giscard looks to rise of European consciousness p.4 - BBC bias over the EU: it's getting even worse p.5 - Is Cameron cynical - or ignorant p.5 - Safeguards that leak like a sieve p.6

MPs contradict Brown over treaty

Gordon Brown's hopes of avoiding a referendum on the EU Constitution received a major setback on 9th October with the publication of an explosive report from the European Scrutiny Committee.

Although the committee is dominated by Labour MPs their report flatly contradicts the Prime Minister's repeated contention that the proposed treaty is not constitutional in nature.

It notes that the Government's "red lines" are substantially the same as in the earlier version of the treaty and questions whether the various safeguards for the UK will work. The MPs also state that the Treaty would "change the legal relationship between the EU and national Governments" - particularly by giving the European Court of Justice new powers over criminal law and policing. And it warns that the treaty will make the EU less transparent and democratic.

Key passages from the report include:

■ "Taken as a whole, the Reform Treaty produces a general framework which is substantially equivalent to the Constitutional Treaty" (para 45).

■ "Even with the 'opt-in' provisions on police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, and the Protocol on the Charter, we are not convinced that the same conclusion does not apply to the position of the UK under the Reform Treaty. We look to the Government to make it clear where the changes they have sought and gained at the IGC alter this conclusion in relation to the UK" (para 45).

■ "...we do not consider that references to abandoning a 'constitutional concept' or 'constitutional characteristics' are helpful and consider that they are even likely to be misleading in so far as they

might suggest the Reform Treaty is of lesser significance than the Constitutional Treaty. We believe that the Government must offer evidence if it is to assert that the processes are significantly different" (para 50).

The report also challenges the government's claim that it had secured an inviolable 'opt out' from the Charter of Fundamental Rights. In a statement on 25th June Tony Blair said, "It is absolutely clear that we have an opt-out from both the charter and judicial and home affairs". But the report also includes a letter dated 31st July from the Minister for Europe Jim Murphy which says:

"The UKs specific protocol which the UK secured is not an 'opt-out' from the Charter. Rather, the protocol clarifies the effect that the Charter will have in the UK".

The Committee warns that the European Court of Justice will avoid attempts to limit the impact of the Charter. It then gives a number of examples:

■ "To take a possible example, the Working Time Directive contains provisions limiting the weekly hours of work of a worker to 48 hours per week, but with the possibility of agreements to waive those limits. As Article II-91 of the Charter provides that "every worker has the right to limitation of maximum working hours" we have some concern that following a reference to the ECJ from some member state, the Court might find that, in the light of the Charter, the [UK] derogation from the Directive allowing such waivers has to be interpreted more restrictively than before (i.e. before the Charter had legal effect)" (para 58).

■ "We would be concerned that, following a reference to the ECJ from

some other member states the Court might find that a measure adopted at EU level (such as Council Directive 200/43/EC) had to be given an extended interpretation in light of the wide grounds for prohibiting discrimination under the Charter" (para 59).

On criminal justice and policing the report notes that:

"We are concerned that removing the 'distinction' between the EU and the EC in relation to matters currently dealt with under the third pillar (with the subsequent increase in the powers of the Commission to bring infraction proceedings and those of the ECJ to interpret and apply Union measures) will change the legal relationship between the EU and national Governments in a way that will increase their powers in relation to UK law. We call on the Government to set out the safeguards which they will expect to gain at the IGC to prevent this happening" (para 21).

On future treaty change the report notes that the new "simplified revision procedure", - which would allow the treaties to be incrementally changed in future with no need for any further treaties - would lead to even less transparency and accountability in the way the EU is run.

It also complains that the treaty imposes a legal duty on parliaments "to contribute actively to the good functioning of the Union". It states: "In our view, the imposition of such a legal duty on the parliament of this country is objectionable as a matter of principle and must be resisted".

Continued from p.1

Tory policies won't halt transfer of powers

why don't you promise that within six months of coming to power you will put matters right by giving people a say on the matter." It is difficult to see how the Conservative leadership can

credibly deny such a demand.

As we go to press pressure on Mr Brown to call a referendum is growing, not least because of the House of Commons European Scrutiny

Committee's report on the treaty (see above). Pressure on the Conservative party to face up to the ambiguities and inconsistencies in its position could also yield worthwhile results.

Why integrate with a trading bloc in decline?

The UK has around 40 per cent of its trade with a regional bloc - the EU - in marked long-term decline. Yet “integration” into this bloc is accelerating. Figures from the 2007 Pink Book* and the European Central Bank* indicate that, from a British point of view, the case in favour of EU membership on economic grounds continues to be - at the very least - elusive.

Table 1: UK Trade in Goods & Services with EU-26 in 2006

Direction of Trade	£ billion	Index	No of jobs sustained, mn
UK > EU (exports)	205	100	3.0 (claimed by HMG in UK)
EU > UK (imports)	(243)	(118)	3.6 (implied in EU)
Balance (UK deficit)	(38)	(23)	(0.6)

■ UK trade in goods and services with EU-26 is in heavy deficit. If the British Government claim that “3 million jobs depend on UK membership of the EU” is true, it follows inexorably that in 2006 alone, imports of goods and services from the EU will have displaced (in other words, caused to be exported), net, 600,000 British jobs (Table 1). Worse, these were real jobs in manufacturing and marketing, not jobs handing out fines for smokers or harassing market traders selling bananas in pounds.

■ In 1997 the balance of the UK current account (i.e. on goods, services, income and transfers) with EU-26 was minus £2.4 billion (and in surplus on goods, services and income alone). In 2006, the

balance of the UK current account with EU-26 was minus £35 billion (on trade alone minus £30 billion) - please refer to Table 2.

■ In 2006, out of her 26 EU trading “partners”, the UK was in surplus with only five: Ireland, Luxembourg, Holland, Poland and Sweden.

■ In 2006 the overall UK deficit with the EU accounted for three-quarters of the UK deficit with the whole world of £48 billion.

■ The UK is still the Eurozone’s biggest single export market, absorbing 19.5 per cent of all Eurozone exports in the twelve months to March 2007. The US was the Eurozone’s second biggest

export market, with a 16.2 per cent share.

■ The Eurozone absorbed 86 per cent of all UK exports to EU-26 in 2006, and supplied 84 per cent of EU-26’s exports to the UK.

■ The UK accounts for the Eurozone’s biggest current account surplus worldwide, of 85 billion in the twelve months to March 2007. The Eurozone’s second biggest surplus, of 51 billion, was with the USA.

■ Outside Europe, the UK was in surplus in 2006 with two continents: the Americas, (North and South), and Australasia.

■ Outside Europe, the UK was in deficit in 2006 with two continents, Asia and Africa.

Table 2: UK Current Account Balances in 2006: £ billion

	With World	With EU-26	With World ex-EU
Deficit on Trade in Goods	(84)	(38)	(46)
Deficit on Current Transfers	(12)	(5)	(7)
Surplus on Income	+19	+8	+11
Surplus on Trade in Services	+29	-	+29
Overall Current Account Deficit	(48)	(35)	(13)

Source: UK Balance of Payments: The Pink Book 2007: Office for National Statistics

*www.statistics.gov.uk > Search “Balance of Payments” >

EU membership costs Britain

£60 billion a year

An admirably clear account of the economic costs of belonging to the EU is contained in a pamphlet written by Gerard Batten the UKIP MEP. His conclusions are broadly consistent with the conclusions reached by Ian Milne, the Director of Global Britain and published in *eurofacts* over the last five years.

Copies of Batten's pamphlet which is entitled *How much does the European Union cost Britain?* are to be sent to all MPs with the aim of generating a comprehensive and greatly overdue debate about the economic implications of Britain's membership of the European Union.

A summary of his main findings is set

out below:

- By 2007 Britain will have made contributions to the EC budget of almost £213.6 billion gross or £66.3 billion net.
- By 2013 Britain will have made direct contributions to the EC budget in the region of £299.8 billion gross or £102.2 billion net.
- By 2006 Britain had an accumulated trade deficit with EU member states of £359.5 billion.
- The Common Agricultural Policy costs Britain at least £15.6 billion

per annum.

- The Common Fisheries Policy costs Britain at least £2.5 billion per annum.
- Over-regulation costs Britain at least £26 billion per annum.
- Membership of the European Union costs Britain £60.1 billion per annum gross or £50.6 billion net - that is £5 billion a month gross or £4.2 billion a month net and the equivalent of every man, woman and child in Britain of £1,002 per annum gross or £843 net.

EU still lags behind in R&D

Only three EU companies have made it to the global top ten for investors in research and development, according to an EU report on R&D investment.

The report lists the top 1,000 R&D investors in the EU and compares their research spending with the top 1,000 investors outside the EU.

Together, these 2000 companies represent more than 85 per cent of

corporate R&D spending in the world.

Only three EU companies were able to obtain a place in the top ten R&D investors: car giant DaimlerChrysler (5th) - a traditional European highflyer that spends about 5.2 billion - the pharmaceutical company GlaxoSmithKline (7th) and engineering firm Siemens (8th).

US companies dominate the list - five

in the top ten, and the first four of the top five - with pharmaceutical company Pfizer being the champion on R&D spending.

The increase in corporate investment in research among top firms was only 7.4 per cent for 2006-2007 in the EU, as opposed to 11.1 per cent globally, according to the 2007 EU industrial R&D Investment Scoreboard.

Giscard looks to rise of European consciousness

"This Treaty will not be the end of the work. We still need to put in place an efficient system of governance and to make it understandable for all citizens. Some examples: How to organise the selection and designation procedure for the future President of the European Council? How to make use of education and communication methods to make citizens aware of the competences of member states and those attributed to the Union? On another point, we must also recognise and assert European identity. In taking an unequivocal position on the creation of the political Union and by rigorously defining the identity and the

values of Europe each European must now understand that he belongs to three levels of identity: the local level, the national level and the European level. These three levels are complementary and do not infringe on each other.

"A fundamental element of the future of Europe will be the emergence of a European conscience in each of the citizens... We must have a feeling of belonging to Europe and pride in being European. Which means, as Jean Monnet sensed, that belonging to the European culture is an indispensable cement for the emergence of a real European identity. I think the day will

arrive when, as European citizens travel the world and they are asked where they are from, they will reply: I am European!" He says, "As for future enlargements, we must stop describing them as being the central objective of European construction. Now that Europe is practically reunified, the priority task is to organise it rather than enlarge it. Let's say clearly to our citizens, that in the decades to come, we put the demand for European integration above that of enlargement."

Le blog de Valéry Giscard d'Estaing.

BBC bias over the EU: it's getting even worse

Today coverage of referendum issue was sparse, unfair and inept, survey shows

Conclusive evidence that BBC bias in its coverage of EU affairs has grown significantly worse - despite earlier promises to correct this and to increase the amount of coverage on the subject - is contained in a survey by an independent monitoring company.

The survey covers the output of the *Today* programme, the most influential news programme on radio or television during the 14 weeks from March 19th to June 23rd 2007. This was the crucial period immediately prior to the June EU summit at which the outline and content of the revised EU constitution were agreed. Incredibly, coverage slumped to a record low of 2.7 per cent of available air time during the period.

Opposition Ranks

On 23rd June - the day on which agreement on the Constitution was finally reached - the *Today* programme devoted four times as much time to the Glastonbury rock festival as they did to the case for a referendum. Coverage of the issue amounted to only seven interviews amounting to 22 minutes and 40 seconds over the entire period, even though the story was continually developing and pressure for a referendum among Labour and opposition ranks was steadily growing.

As the survey from Newswatch UK points out UKIP, a main conduit for

views on issues relating to the growth of EU powers was not asked for its views about the rehashed constitutional treaty. On the one occasion when there was a debate about UKIP concerns - relating to whether EU membership produced economic benefits - it says that the UKIP spokesman was treated unfairly.

Only one senior government minister - the then Foreign Secretary, Margaret Beckett - was asked about the treaty. Geoff Hoon, then Europe Minister did not figure at all, and his Conservative counterpart, Mark Francois was given air time on only one occasion. There were no interviews with or mentions of Labour or Liberal Democrats who voiced concerns about the largely unchanged constitutional document. Moreover, while BBC correspondents regularly articulated negative sentiment within the EU about British reservations they seldom mentioned British concerns.

Curiously enough *Today* focussed on Polish objections to the voting weight proposals which, says Newswatch, would have been fine if there had been more coverage overall and if the Polish material had not taken time that could have been used to deal with British concerns.

In the week of the June summit there were 89 minutes of EU coverage or 14.9 per cent of *Today* feature time.

This was considerably higher than the 2.7 per cent average during the survey period - but only half the amount of time devoted to equivalent EU developments - for example the French and Dutch referendums in June 2005 which received 31 per cent of available time.

Newswatch points out that there were only two dedicated interviews on the referendum issue. In each there were elements that breached BBC guidelines. In one instance James Naughtie treated Ruth Lea, the guest who put the case for a referendum, more toughly than Professor Jo Shaw, who argued against one being held.

Insufficient Attention

In 2004 the average length of EU-related features was 4m 58 seconds. This was before the Wilson report which found that the BBC was guilty of "unintentional bias" and devoted insufficient attention to EU matters. But during the period prior to the June summit this had fallen to 2m 25 seconds which according to Newswatch indicates that coverage had become more fragmented.

Overall the authors of the survey say that the case for a referendum on the Constitution was handled "sparsely, unfairly and ineptly".

Is Cameron cynical - or ignorant?

Anyone who hoped that David Cameron's attitude to Britain's membership of the EU would become clearer as the result of the Tory Party Conference would have been disappointed.

In an interview with John Humphrys on the day of his big speech the Conservative leader was pressed to say whether he would call a referendum on the Constitution if the Tories came to power *after* it had been ratified in Parliament by the previous Labour government. Cameron's reply was incomprehensible.

More remarkable was his apparent ignorance about why EU citizens cannot be deported from Britain for gun and knife crime. As the Home Secretary has acknowledged this is primarily because of the EU Citizens Directive (see *eurofacts* for 7th September).

However, in his criticism of the Prime Minister in his conference speech Cameron declared: "... *it was the cynicism of it. He told us things that he knows he can't do: 'British jobs for British workers' is illegal under EU law. 'Deporting people for gun and*

knife crime', you can't do that because of the Human Rights Act. I have to say to our Prime Minister, if you treat people like fools, you don't deserve to run the country let alone win an election".

It might equally be said that if you don't understand the root of problems that you seek to address you don't deserve to run the country let alone win an election. Or is the correct explanation that Mr Cameron was not so much ignorant but that he simply does not like to sound 'anti-EU'?

LETTERS

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

Gratitude for Brown's lack of courage

Dear Sir,

All patriots, and all democrats, must be grateful that Gordon Brown lacked the courage to call an early general election.

He would probably have won, and even if he had a greatly reduced majority he would have achieved his crucial objective - to extricate the Labour and Liberal Democrat MPs from their 2005 manifesto pledge to put the EU Constitution to the people in a referendum.

In effect the general election would have been treated as a substitute for the promised referendum, and Brown (and the EU) would have won it.

As things stand, all the main party MPs are still under the same moral obligation to their constituents - before they were elected, they all pledged that they would not vote to ratify the EU Constitution without our prior consent in a separate referendum.

A fresh election on a new manifesto would have released the Labour and Liberal Democrat MPs from that *inconvenient obligation: merely shuffling the articles of the previous treaty, and calling it by a different name, cannot have that effect.*

Dr D R COOPER
Maidenhead

We are owed a Referendum

Dear Sir,

Because voters in the Netherlands rejected the EU Constitution in 2005, the Dutch Labour Party has decided that there should be no referendum this time round.

Of course, they are not admitting that

this is the true reason.

Like our Labour and Liberal Democrat parties, they are trying to fool the people with weasel words about differences between the new treaty and the old Constitution.

Commenting on this, Danish MEP and treaty expert Jens Peter Bonde wrote: *"I have compared the rejected EU constitution and the new Reform Treaty very carefully and I have not found one important difference in legal obligations. The differences are just in the presentation"*.

Which holds for us, just as much as for the Dutch.

Even Gordon Brown's allegedly new "opt-outs" and "red lines", for what they are worth, are not really new.

They are the same as those negotiated by Tony Blair, and were agreed months before he finally promised that we would have a referendum.

We are still owed that referendum, and we must have it.

MURIEL PARSONS
Berkshire

Why those Europeans won't help Gordon

Dear Sir,

eurofacts may well be right in suggesting that our principal EU partners - and France in particular - assume that at some future moment Britain will inevitably seek a fundamentally different relationship with the European Union and that there is therefore no point in humouring it in the hope of preventing its departure. The evidence for this lies in their patent unwillingness to help Gordon Brown as he battles to win support for the EU constitution.

In this matter his task is far harder than that of any other European Prime

Minister. But as the European Scrutiny Committee has found, the so-called red lines which the British Government was permitted may well turn out to be meaningless and are no different from those in the earlier version of the treaty. The European 'colleagues' have evidently not been remotely sympathetic to Mr Brown's problems and if, as seems possible, he has pleaded with his French counterpart: "Give us a break, Nicolas", it is clear his entreaties have been treated with indifference.

As Brown contends with a slowly swelling tide of anti-EU sentiment in this country, consider European reactions to Brown's campaign to prevent Robert Mugabe attending the Europe-Africa summit planned for December. On 3rd October the *Guardian* reported that our EU partners are not even willing to consider a Foreign Office compromise whereby Brown would attend providing that Zimbabwe were to be represented by one of Mugabe's henchman rather than Mugabe himself.

Forced to choose between Brown's company and that of the Zimbabwean dictator the EU has unhesitatingly chosen the latter. Now, Brown may have his faults - he may not be fun company, he repeats himself, bites his finger nails and displays a regrettable tendency to indulge in double-counting, but these defects surely fade into insignificance beside those of Mugabe.

The fact that the EU has chosen to act in this way tells us something about the 'values' which its spokesmen say they are keen to uphold; they also tell us a great deal about their attitude towards British membership.

JAMES WATT
London

Safeguards that leak like a sieve

"We believe that the red lines will not be sustainable. Looking at the legalities and use of the European Court of Justice, we believe these will be challenged bit by bit and eventually the UK will be in a position where all

of the treaty will eventually apply to the UK. If they can't get these things firmed up, we think they will basically leak like a sieve".

Michael Connarty, chairman of the

European Scrutiny Committee interviewed on the *Today* programme on 9th October following the publication of his committee's report on the EU constitutional treaty (see page 2).

MEETINGS

UK Independence Party

01767 631259

Wednesday **24th October**, 7.30 pm

“Why I changed to UKIP”

David Campbell Bannerman, *Deputy Leader, UKIP*

PUBLIC MEETING

Colmworth Hall, Church Road,
Colmworth, Bedfordshire
(10 miles from Bedford)

Admission Free

Bruges Group

020 7287 4414

Thursday **25th October**, 7.00 pm

“A eurosceptic critique of the FSAP and MIFID”

Professor Tim Congden CBE,
Economist

“Trick or Treaty? The EU marches to statehood”

Professor Kenneth Minogue

PUBLIC MEETING

Foreign Press Association, 11 Carlton
House Terrace, London SW1Y

Admission £10

Payable on the door or in advance
(Includes; wine, orange juice and
mineral water)

Democracy Movement

(Louth Branch)

01507 601699

Friday **26th October**, 7.30 pm

“Referendum Now”

Marc Glendening, *Campaign Director*,
Democracy Movement

Roger Helmer MEP

Lindsay Jenkins, *Author*

Cllr. Andrew Percy, *Campaign Against
Political Correctness*

PUBLIC MEETING

Conoco Room, Northgate, Louth,
Lincolnshire (above Louth Library)

Admission Free

Campaign for an Independent Britain

020 8340 0314

Saturday **27th October**, midday

Rally to demand a referendum on the
EU Reform Treaty

Midday - Opposite Palace Yard, outside
the House of Lords

Speakers to be announced

RALLY

(www.proreferendumrally.co.uk for
further details)

The Freedom Association

0845 833 9626

Saturday **27th October**, 6.00 pm

“Europe or not: the case for a
referendum”

Guest Speaker - **Daniel Hannan MEP**

AUTUMN RECEPTION

County Club, 158 High Street,
Guildford GU1

Admission £20.00 - Members £17.00

(Includes wine)

Gresham College

020 7831 0575

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

Bruges Group

020 7287 4414

Saturday **17th November**,

10.30 am - 6.15 pm

Speakers to include

Christopher Booker, *Journalist and
author*

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, Kings College, The
Strand, London

Admission (Details to be announced)

(Includes, lunch)

The Freedom Association

0845 833 9626

Tuesday **12th February**, 1.00 pm

“Freedom in the City”

Jeffrey Titford MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Function Suite, The Counting
House, 50 Cornhill, London EC3V

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

euofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65

or Email: euofacts@junepress.com

SELECT COMMITTEE

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

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

2008

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

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

2009

Czech Republic takes **1st January**
over EU presidency

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 exposé 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.

The State Of The Union and Other Articles

by *Christopher Luke*. **£4.50**

A thumb-nail sketch of the issues affecting the throne and constitution of the UK. Including the acts of devolution.

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 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.

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.

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 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 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

