

The Lisbon Treaty: was it an historic turning point?

Was Thursday 18th October 2007 the day on which Britain ceased to be an independent sovereign state? Or will historians writing a decade hence pick some other date?

In accordance with the strategy laid down by the EU's founding father Jean Monnet, the transfer of powers from member states to the institutions of European government has been gradual. A case can be made for saying that previous EU treaties transferred equal or greater powers from member states to the European institutions, but that is to miss the main point. From Rome to Lisbon the EU treaties can be seen as staging posts on the route to a unitary European state. Historians may nevertheless conclude that 18th October - "Black Thursday" as it may come to be known - was an important turning point. This was the moment when the pretence that national independence could be preserved in the context of a wider political union become not merely a fraud but an obvious one. At that moment, with ratification of the treaty in sight, all the main building blocks of the new European state - commission, parliament, supreme court, and constitution - were finally in place. It was at this point that the claim that sovereignty was being pooled rather than surrendered and that British independence consequently remained intact was at last exposed as nonsense and therefore became counter-productive as a means of assuaging public concerns. This is the point at

which we have now arrived.

Britain's involvement in the European project began with the lie that there would be no essential transfer of sovereignty, a deception upon which a whole series of lesser deceptions have subsequently been

personality, abolishes the national veto in 61 areas, creates a foreign minister and diplomatic service in all but name as well as a permanent presidency while providing the means by which further powers can be transferred to Brussels. In two respects the treaty is worse than Giscard's original document: it is less honest in that it seeks to conceal its own scope and purpose and it is almost entirely unintelligible (see page 2).

Does Mr Brown believe in the provisions of the treaty to whose defence he must now devote considerable political resources? The question is academic. As Daniel Hannan has written, whatever he thinks of it Brown is too establishment-minded, too risk-averse, too lacking in conviction and courage either to perform a historic *volte face* or to run the risk of running a campaign which he might lose.

The British are traditionally slow to recognise challenges to their essential national interest, but they are currently taking such tardiness to new limits. Indeed the present national obtuseness is of such an order that even mild-mannered eurosceptics, the kind who are not demonstrably swivel-eyed or prone to foam-flecked

denunciations of all things European, are driven to despair. Why is the air not thicker with denunciations of the Treaty? Why is not Trafalgar Square full of those angrily protesting against so obvious a betrayal of trust?

And yet it is still just possible that

Continued on p.2

Treaty Timetable	
13-14 December 2007	The treaty to be signed by heads of government
February 2008	Ratification process begins in the House of Commons
March 2008	Ratification process begins in the House of Lords
June 2008	Likely date for Royal Assent
December 2008	Expected completion date for ratification
1st January 2009	The new EU treaty comes into force
11th June 2009	Elections to the European Parliament
Spring 2010	Last possible date for a General Election

constructed. It is entirely in keeping with the history of British membership of the EU that the Government's position on the Lisbon Treaty should be based on a lie of almost equal magnitude - the lie that the Treaty is not of a constitutional character, even though it gives the EU legal

Lisbon: was it an historic turning point?

“Black Thursday” could turn out to be a very different kind of turning point.

To begin with, ratification may not turn out to be as painless as Mr Brown’s allies suggest. By allowing a lengthy period for Parliamentary ratification the Prime Minister believes he can open up divisions within the Conservative Party of the kind that emerged during the parliamentary battles over Maastricht. He is surely deluded. Treaty ratification is bound to be a bigger problem for an incumbent government than for the opposition. And unlike Mr Brown, Mr Major never promised a referendum. The more the public learn of the Lisbon Treaty the less they will like it. In the past the British public, although inclined to euroscepticism, has put other matters - crime, immigration and economic well-being, for example - higher up its list of concerns than ‘Europe’. A line by line examination of the treaty will demonstrate the inextricable link between those concerns and membership of the Union. More than any eurosceptic pamphlet, it will demonstrate the extent to which in these areas membership of the European Union either prevents or inhibits the Government from following policies based on the national interest. For the first time a majority may come to grasp the

enormity of what is at stake and begin to understand that ‘Europe’ is not just something which happens ‘over there’. Further courageous and principled defiance by eurosceptics within the Labour Party such as those that can be expected from Gisela Stuart and Kate Hoey will make Mr Brown’s task more difficult, even though they are bound to be subject to blood-curdling threats from the Labour Whips’ office. The government is bound to be scarred and battered in the process but defeat in the House of Commons remains an outside prospect - unless, of course, a newly elected leader of the Lib-Dems recognises that the biggest blow it can strike against the Labour government is to honour its manifesto promise to support the demand for a referendum.

Mr Brown is also likely to face difficulties in getting the legislation through the Lords; threats by the Upper House to turn back legislation seldom materialise but a group of highly motivated and extremely knowledgeable eurosceptic peers have it within their power to add to the government’s acute public relations problems

Already the referendum issue is acting as a recruiting sergeant for the eurosceptic cause; this is becoming more vocal and self-confident, angrier and more determined. Tens of

thousands have signed on-line petitions in favour of a plebiscite, while plans for the Westminster rally held on 27th October demonstrate a growing level of cooperation between eurosceptic groups. Ratification of the Treaty will not of itself dissipate the head of steam now being built up; indeed it could have exactly the opposite effect

A new pressure group - Global Vision - is already exploiting the referendum issue to argue for a new relationship with Europe. Its architects posit the possibility of achieving this without withdrawal from the EU. We frankly doubt whether this is remotely possible. But we welcome a debate on how its objectives might be most effectively achieved because it is at least 25 years overdue. Meanwhile, the Conservative Party can be seen inching its way to a more robust policy under the impact of events.

Our conclusion is that historians *may* conclude that “Black Thursday” was the day when Britain finally abandoned its long tradition of self-government, but it is also possible they might conclude that it was the moment when the eurosceptics began a belated but historic fight-back to halt the trend of the previous decades and to recover what had been lost. It is up to us.

Why the Treaty was *meant* to be unreadable

The Lisbon Treaty which EU Prime Ministers signed up to on 18th October is not unintelligible by accident but design.

Explaining the background to the present text Giuliano Amato, the former Italian Prime Minister and one of the principle architects of the rejected Constitution on which the text has been faithfully based, made this clear in a speech in London on 16th July:

‘They [EU leaders] decided that the document should be unreadable. If it is unreadable, it is not constitutional, that was the sort of perception. Should you succeed in understanding it at first sight there might be some reason for a

referendum, because it would mean that there is something new’.

The document has been rendered unintelligible through the ingenious ruse of turning the proposals contained in Giscard’s original constitution into amendments to the existing treaties; these can consequently only be understood if they are placed in the context of a consolidated version. But when Jens-Peter Bonde, the Danish eurosceptic MEP recently pressed the Commission to produce such a thing he was told that the Inter Governmental Conference had decided that an official consolidated text, which is expected to run to around 3,000 pages, would only be published *after* the treaty had been

ratified.

There could be no clearer evidence that Europe’s political leaders do not want ordinary citizens to read or understand the treaty until it is too late to do anything about it.

In Britain the Government PR machine has been used to stress the allegedly modest nature of the changes compared to those previous treaties. But it is worth pointing out that Lisbon will result in the loss of a greater number of national vetos - 61 in all - than was the case with any previous treaty. The Treaty of Rome listed 38 areas for qualified majority voting, the Single European Act 12, Maastricht 30, the Amsterdam treaty 24 and the Nice treaty 46.

EU immigration plans rest on a huge fallacy

Immigration is no fix to the problem of an ageing society because of the simple truth that immigrants age too

By Anthony Scholefield

On 23rd October, the EU Commissioner for Justice, Franco Frattini issued a Directive on the admission of skilled migrant workers to the EU which is likely to have lasting and widespread implications. The Directive reflects the Commission's belief that immigration provides an essential key to solving the problems which arise from the falling birth-rates in nearly all EU countries. A detailed analysis of the Directive will appear in a subsequent issue, but enough is known about the Frattini approach to be fearful about its consequences since it is evident the assumptions on which it is based are fatally flawed. Overall, these are likely to be far more damaging than the problems which the Directive is intended to solve.

Frattini's speech at Lisbon on 13th September which sets out the core elements of his thinking is so much at variance with economic logic that it should be termed the 'flat-earth theory of replacement migration'. Frattini declared:

"In spite of the recent enlargement, which has pushed the EU's total population up to some 490 million, the number of people living in the EU is set to decline in the next few decades. By 2050 a third of them will be over 65 years of age. Labour and skill shortages are already noticeable in a number of sectors and they will tend to increase. Eurostat's long-term demographic projections indicate that the total population is expected to decline by 2025 and the working age population by 2011".

He makes three related points:

- *Solutions to compensate for the negative impact of demographic ageing on the labour market can be found in the context of the Lisbon Strategy".*
- *Migrants are a crucial part of the EU's comprehensive strategy".*
- *The aim of the proposal for a Directive on the admission of highly skilled migrants is therefore to put*

forward more attractive entry and residency conditions for highly skilled migrant workers to come to Europe".

In passing it is worth pointing out, that Frattini understands there is no decline in the working population at present: he is keen to bring in migrants before this occurs. However, it is clear he has a very shaky grasp of economics since, like the British government, he believes that migration will fill skill shortages. It is true that individual workers from Eastern and Central Europe have recently been filling vacancies which British workers have been unwilling or unable to fill. The problem is, of course that migrant workers not only contribute to supply but also to demand and consequently shift 'skill-shortages' elsewhere in the economy or increase imports.

Useful Advocates

The idea of replacement migration - that is that Britain and the EU need immigrant workers to compensate for an ageing society - has rightly been described by Anthony Browne, Director of the Policy Exchange think-tank, as 'one of the most widespread and comforting self-delusions since humanity believed the sun went round the earth. It is the triumph of wishful thinking ... over elementary demographics: immigrants are no fix for an ageing society because they age too'. George Borjas, the distinguished American demographer is among those who have noted the tendency of many of those taking part in the immigration debate to treat myths as established truths even when their falsehood has been amply demonstrated. He refers to "the resilience of some factoids in the immigration debate ..." adding, "driving a stake through the heart of these factoids will not annihilate them (they are much too useful to advocates)".

The reality is that immigration offers an immense area for bureaucratic and

legal expansion of the EU's activities. It was hardly likely therefore that EU officials would pass up such promising opportunities for self-aggrandisement.

However, it is clear Frattini's proposals have the support of the vast majority of MEPs.

Martin Schulz, Leader of the Socialists, declared "Europe is a land of immigration and it will be for many years to come". Lily Grubner, an Italian Socialist and rapporteur on legal migration, said "Our economies will not be able to survive without immigrant workers. By 2050 one third of the 490 million Europeans will be aged over 65".

Gruber's report demanded: "Politicians at both EU and member-states' level must be able to act by going beyond purely electoral considerations and must adopt a comprehensive, integrated approach to immigration policy and emphasise the responsibility of the media in the dissemination of an accurate image of immigration and in countering stereotypes." Stereotypes indeed!

Any serious discussion of the issue should begin with some basic questions. Is the EU population ageing? Is this a new phenomenon? Can the workforce support an increasing number of pensioners? What is the effect of replacement migration? Why have nearly all authoritative bodies rejected the idea of replacement migration?

It is true the population of the EU is ageing and will continue to age, but this is hardly a new discovery since it has been going on since the middle of the nineteenth century.

Consider the rise in the number of those living beyond 65 years of age.

Broadly speaking the percentage of over 65s in the total population doubled in France between 1901 and 2005 and nearly trebled in the UK. During this period there was no requirement for immigration to fill 'skill gaps'. The economy and society adjusted to the change. The rate of

Continued on p.4

EU immigration plans rest on a huge fallacy

change is forecast to be slightly greater over the period 2005 to 2050. The change means that some of the economy's extra growth is diverted to increasing the amount transferred to the over 65 non-workers as it was between 1901 and 2005.

The statistics show that the great surge in the number of over 60s in western countries has already taken place and that Western societies and economies have adjusted to this fact (see Table 1).

Of course, all countries must age at some point as life-expectancy increases. Otherwise we would end up with the constant-fertility scenario as portrayed by the UN study 'World population in 2300' where the world population is ten thousand times what it is now (134 trillion) and in some countries the population of human beings must stand on each others' shoulders.

In fact, countries as diverse as China, Turkey and Bangladesh are all ageing faster than the UK although from a lower age level. None of them are planning 'blue cards' to attract 'highly skilled' immigrants.

So the conclusion is that if the EU is ageing, much of the ageing has taken place and has already been adjusted to.

The support ratio (of working age to over 65s) has already dropped dramatically and in the UK is now 4.09:1. Without immigration, the support ratio in the UK is projected to be 2.36:1 by 2050.

Is this a problem? What are the solutions? Can replacement migration help?

If no over-65s worked, there would plainly be a greater burden on workers. In the same way, Britain would have a smaller burden today if it still had the ratio of pensioners to workers as it did in 1901.

However, there are plenty of other ways to improve the ratio of workers to pensioners. One source is to encourage the over 65s to carry on working.

Then there are problems arising from the 5 million of unemployed and non-workers and social security claimants in the UK. The pernicious effect of the welfare state has encouraged the idea

	1936	2005*	2050*
Japan	7.4%	26.2%	42.3%
Italy	10.9%	25.2%	42.3%
USA	9.1%	16.7%	26.9%
Germany	11.9%	24.8%	38.1%
France	14.7%	26.8%	32.7%
UK	12.9%	21.4%	34.0%
* UN estimates			

that the current workforce will be supported in retirement by a future workforce whereas accurate inter-generational accounting would make the current workforce provide for its own pensions in its working lifetime. Such a state of affairs led to the tremendous savings of pre-welfare state Britain and to the current Far-East economies. In Europe the attitude of the population has been aptly described by Mark Steyn: "It's not my problem. Call me when I get back from the beach".

Almost all reputable authorities have pointed out that replacement migration

	France	Germany	UK
1851	6.7%	-	-
1901	8.5%	-	5.5%
1950	11.4%	9.7%	10.7%
1974	13.2%	-	-
2005	16.4%	16.7%	16.1%
2025*	21.2%	24.6%	21.9%
2050*	26.7%	31.0%	27.3%
*Forecasts			

will not work because immigrants also age. Chris Shaw, the government actuary, writing in *Population Trends* in Spring 2001, states:

"Despite much recent attention being focused on migration, it is clear that this is not a long term solution to the 'problem' of population ageing."

"The single reason why even large

constant migration flows would not prevent support ratios from falling in the long term is that migrants grow old as well. Although a steady large flow of migrants would continue to boost the working age population, before long it would also start adding to the retirement-age population and a four-to-one (say) potential support ratio would not be maintained."

Anthony Browne in his book "Do we need Mass Immigration?" points out: "The UN calculates that to keep the UK dependency ratio at 4.09:1 (as in 2000) the UK would need to have 59,775,000 immigrants by 2050, increasing the population to 136 million. At the end of that period, immigration would need to be running at 2.2 million a year, and still growing exponentially. To carry out this strategy of replacement migration, the UK would thus need to import another 130 million by 2100, doubling the population to about a quarter of a billion!" And so on, ad infinitum.

As for the EU, the UN has calculated that to maintain the present ratio of pensioners to the working population, it would need to import 674 million migrants by 2050. Nor is that a solution because the 674 million would in turn retire and need further migrants to support them.

The many organisations which have looked at and rejected replacement migration include the Home Office. This has stated:

"The impact of immigration in mitigating population ageing is widely acknowledged to be small because migrants also age. For a substantial effect, net inflows of migrants would not only need to occur on an annual basis, but would have to rise continuously."

Despite this and other findings, debate about the link between changing demography and a migration 'fix' refuses to go away.

Of course, even Frattini admits migration is only part of the solution - a partial 'fix'. His twenty million immigrants will be three per cent of the 674 million that the UN calculates are needed to maintain the support ratio

Continued on p.5

Boring for the European Union

Stylistic changes in the composition of EU press releases may reflect the growing arrogance and power of the Commission

A defining characteristic of the EU press release is that it contains no real news and performs no useful purpose other than as a possible aid to insomnia. Headlines are evidently chosen to *dampen* rather than to arouse curiosity (“*Waste: Commission opens infringement case against Bulgaria over inadequate waste infrastructure in Sofia*”, is one of the catchier headlines of the last few weeks).

As a guide to the interplay of political forces within the Commission the turgid statements that emerge from the EU press office may hold some interest for Brussels insiders. But such interpretations require the kind of finely honed analytical skills displayed by Kremlinologists when deciphering the proclamations of the Soviet Politburo during the Cold War. Sadly, such skills are seldom possessed by the news editors of British newspapers, still less their readers.

Recent research by Maria Lindholm, a Swedish economist, casts some interesting light on the editorial processes through which EU press releases pass, even if she brings a

touching naivety to her task. In tones of mild indignation she reports that EU press releases “*serve political as well as informative purposes*” and that they are often used to justify the existence of the Commission. Sometimes, she says, “*references to national governments are deleted while references to the Commission are inserted*”. Surely not!

She also reports that EU press releases are longer as well as less readable than those of national governments - last year the EU produced 1,920 of them (i.e. an average of more than five a day).

A PR man working for a commercial company may be called on to knock up half a dozen press releases before his coffee break, but Ms Lindholm reveals that the average EU press release takes days to produce and goes through multiple drafts. And it is not just readers who fail to understand the leaden prose in which they are couched: it seems that even their authors have this problem.

“*One particular press release*

involving two commissioners saw 15 drafts and caused chaos because different groups of people were seeing different texts” she reports, adding: “*The drafting of this text was not transparent for those directly involved.*”

Miss Lindholm may not win plaudits for the penetrating quality of her investigative research, but she deserves praise for noting a revealing stylistic change. In previous years press releases made considerable use of the conditional mood with terms such as “*could*” and “*should*” appearing frequently. Nowadays EU spokesman use the conditional mood lest often.

“*Does [the Commission] want to look more confident or was this an unconscious decision?*” she asks.

The probable explanation is that the decision was an unconscious one reflecting the growing power and arrogance of an unaccountable elite. If Commission press releases switch to the imperative mood this will presumably signal that the European project is nearing its completion date.

Sound advice from a Labour patriot

“There is no doubt in my mind that Mr Brown has opened himself up to charges of hypocrisy by forcing this treaty through and, coming so soon after his dithering over whether to hold a General Election, he has made himself even more vulnerable. I am not

sure he realises quite how damaging this could be, not just to his own reputation but to the Labour Government... The overwhelming majority of the people of the United Kingdom demand a referendum. If Gordon Brown refuses, his failure to

keep his promise will haunt him throughout the rest of his time as Prime Minister. Think again, Gordon, and do the right thing.”

Kate Hoey writing in the *Mail on Sunday* on 21st October.

Continued from p.4

EU immigration policy based on a huge fallacy

and would change the UK support ratio from a projected 2.36:1 in 2050 to 2.43:1 - a tiny change. Replacement migration is regarded with contempt by every expert and has the ability to entail massive cultural and social costs throughout the EU. But it has one great advantage for the Frattinis and Grubners - it is all part of Europeanisation. Or to use Mr Frattini's words:

“*If managed well, immigration is one*

area where our citizens will clearly see the added value of a European approach”.

More sensibly, the UK government actuary states: “*measures such as raising the workforce participation ratio or discouraging early retirement are likely to remain a more practical tool for increasing the working population*”. He also states: “*A long term TFR [Total Fertility Ratio] of 2.0 children per woman would produce*

much the same support ratio at 2100 as would annual net migration of half a million people a year (to the UK) but with a total population of 75 million rather than 120 million”.

There are, of course, important policy implications to be drawn for the UK in the ageing of the EU workforce but these are to do with the re-orienting of British trade away from the EU rather than participating in the dangerous ‘fixes’ of the eurocrats.

LETTERS

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

Enoch's Wisdom

Dear Sir,

I gather from the TV news that all is smiles in Lisbon which does not bode any good for us. If Cameron keeps his word and keeps on badgering Brown, helped by the Trade Unions, we might get somewhere.

I was privileged to hear Enoch Powell shortly before he died. He was very frail and in poor health, but his mind was as sharp as ever. In answer to a question from the floor which wanted to know was there anything we could do to extricate ourselves from the quagmire of the EU, his reply was quite simple - "All you need to do is let the European Union know that the United Kingdom does not recognise any court or law-making body superior to our own".

Once that was established, he said, everything else would click into place.

In such circumstances I anticipate that we would be asked to leave the EU. That would, of course, force us to accept the dire consequences of following Norway and Switzerland - a fate I could well live with.

DAVID HALLETT

Kent

A Transnational Conspiracy

Dear Sir,

Watching Gordon Brown hobnob with his EU colleagues brought to mind the words of another Scot, the pioneer economist Adam Smith:

"People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public."

The Lisbon summit is just the latest episode in a long-running transnational conspiracy of professional politicians - all owing their positions to the operation of national democratic systems, but all intent on stripping hard-won democratic power from their

own peoples.

MURIEL PARSONS

Berkshire

EU "Citizenship" Renunciation

Dear Sir,

I wholeheartedly support Mr D. Bennett's renunciation of so-called EU "Citizenship" (*eurofacts* 5th October).

However, I strongly disagree with his proposed petition to the Prime Minister requesting the right to renounce EU "Citizenship". His request wrongly suggests that Mr Brown has the power to grant or to refuse such a renunciation.

Neither Mr Brown nor anyone else has the power to impose EU or any other "citizenship" upon me, against my will and without consulting me.

That is why on 21st April 2005 I executed a carefully-worded deed, ending with the following clause: 'I therefore HEREBY RENOUNCE any European Union citizenship which has been imposed upon me without my consent by the said government or its predecessors'.

THOMAS H. PARES

Norfolk

UKIP backing for Huhne?

Dear Sir

Now that the Lib Dem leadership contest is underway, perhaps the strategic masterminds running UKIP should announce which candidate they would prefer to win.

Normally this is a simple matter of rooting for the most eurofanatic candidate. How much better, they said, if Kenneth Clarke took control of all the resources of the Conservative party, and employed them on behalf of the EU.

But in this case there is little to choose between Nick Clegg and Chris Huhne, so maybe they should plump for Huhne on the purely sentimental basis that they helped to get him

elected.

(Huhne majority over Conservative candidate in Eastleigh, 568; anti-EU votes wasted on no-hope UKIP candidate, 1669).

And no doubt next time they would help to get him re-elected, and so escape his just desserts for not only brazenly renegeing on his personal manifesto pledge of a referendum on the EU Constitution, but also instructing the other 62 Lib Dem MPs to follow him through the Commons lobby to swing the vote in the Government's favour.

Various adjectives could be used to describe UKIP's practice of putting up general election candidates wherever possible, even if they are little more than paper candidates, without any regard for the likely practical consequences.

The kindest might be "misguided, indiscriminate and counter-productive", but as an ex-UKIP member, founding branch chairman and parliamentary candidate I suggest that "stupid, selfish and unpatriotic" would be much closer to the mark.

Dr D R COOPER

Berkshire

Vanishing Red Lines

Dear Sir,

In case any *eurofacts* readers have failed to grasp how tenuous our "red lines" are, let me quote European President Jose Barroso on Radio 4's *Today* programme 20th October.

He was adamant that Brown had secured all he wanted when signing the Lisbon Treaty. When it was put to him that the European Court could change all that he said, "*The red lines are secure for the time being*".

No doubt all your readers are as surprised as I was by such a remark.

JOSE O'WARE

Middlesex

MEETINGS

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Saturday **17th November**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

Speakers to include

Gerard Batten MEP, UKIP

Christopher Booker, Journalist and Author

Bernard Connolly, Financial Market Economist and Author

Roger Helmer MEP, Conservative

Martin Howe QC, Specialist in EU law and Author

Bill Jamieson, Executive Editor of The Scotsman and Author

Ruth Lea, Director of Centre for Policy Studies and Global Vision, Economist

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, Kings College, The Strand, London

Admission £20 Payable in advance or on the door

(Includes; lunch, wine, tea, coffee and refreshments)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Monday **10th December**, 6.00 pm

“Do Governments and Societies need Enemies?”

The ways in which enemies are described and portrayed, and the extent to which this functions to sustain social cohesion and justify the powers of government.

Rodney Barker, Gresham Professor of Rhetoric

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

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

USFUL WEB SITES

Better off Out Campaign

www.betteroffout.co.uk

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.cibhq.co.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

SELECT COMMITTEE

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **13th November**, 10.40 am

Evidence will be heard on *The Euro's Progress* from Treasury officials.

Tuesday **13th November**, 3.40 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the Economic Impact of Immigration* from a) Mr Brendan Barber, General Secretary, TUC, and Mr Jack Dromey, Deputy General Secretary TGWU; and from b) Dr Stephen Drinkwater, University of Surrey, and Dr Bridget Anderson, Oxford University.

Wednesday **14th November**, 11.45 am

Evidence will be heard by the Constitutional Committee from the Information Commissioner.

Tuesday **20th November**, 10.40 am

Evidence will be heard on *Solvency II* from Peter Vipond, Association of British Insurers.

Tuesday **20th November**, 11.10 am

Evidence will be heard on *Science and Technology* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Note:

Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

European Reform **13-14th December**
Treaty to be Signed

2008

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

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

European Reform **December**
Treaty to be Ratified

2009

Czech Republic takes **1st January**
over 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 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
Dr Vincent Cable MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

