

## Into orbit flies a herd of pigs with golden trotters

*Tens of millions in British taxpayers' money is being spent on a wholly unnecessary project which the Government is powerless to vary or scrap*

Is the EU's Galileo project as absurd, expensive, grandiose and unnecessary as we have repeatedly suggested in these columns? Gwyneth Dunwoody, the chairman of the House of Commons Transport Select Committee is not noted for her eurosceptic views but is evidently of the same opinion:

*"This is not one pig flying in orbit, this is a herd of pigs with gold trotters, platinum tails and diamond eyes! And we ought to be asking ourselves, 'where is our common sense?' Are we really saying we're so frightened of the Americans that we must fling gold bars at something that we don't even know is going to work?"*

### Actual Costs

Mrs Dunwoody was speaking on BBC radio following the publication of her committee's scathing report on the project which describes Galileo as "a textbook example of how not to carry out major infrastructure projects". It quotes official estimates which put the cost of building and running Galileo over 25 years at £10 billion - of which Britain is required to contribute 17 per cent (£1.7 billion) but says that since actual costs have exceeded estimated costs at every stage of the development, the final bill could be significantly higher. It urges that all other major EU projects be reappraised to ensure that the "Galileo fiasco" is not repeated elsewhere.

Mrs Dunwoody's committee frankly

acknowledges that it has been unable to identify an ideal solution to the "fine mess" the EU has gotten into over the programme, which is now more than five years behind schedule.

Calling for a much belated cost benefit analysis which would include an evaluation of the "zero option" of scrapping the programme the report states: "It is imperative that the Government have the political courage to bring reason and cold economic prudence to the table in Brussels - even if that means advocating that a flagship programme such as Galileo be scrapped".

Courage is in short supply in Downing Street these days and it would take a large amount of the stuff to block a programme to which the French President and German Chancellor remain strongly and publicly committed. Moreover, the political reality is that there is no direct means by which the British government can stop it. In the Council of Transport Ministers decisions to proceed with or to change the project will be taken by qualified majority voting.

### Controversial Proposals

The fate of controversial proposals to reopen the EU's current Financial Perspective in order to divert funds to Galileo from the agriculture and administration funds - which Britain opposes - are likely to be decided at a meeting of EcoFin. But again the

decision will be by qualified majority voting.

Members of Mrs Dunwoody's committee suggest that the matter is serious enough for Britain to oppose the scheme by the only way open to it - that is by threatening to hold up progress on other EU projects unless it gets its way. Horse-trading of this kind is not exactly unknown in Brussels. But there could be difficulty in identifying a project which is sufficiently important from the German and French point of view to provide a bargaining chip and where Britain has the ability and will to carry out its threat.

The present political reality would seem to be that the Galileo project is likely to survive - at least until it hits the next set of financial buffers, or the project collapses for technical reasons. Such disasters have occurred in the past without the European project being derailed, although the members of Mrs Dunwoody's committee acknowledge the damage that could be done to the EU in terms of adverse public reaction.

### Far Reaching

Nevertheless, the implications of proceeding with the project are more far-reaching than Mrs Dunwoody's committee suggests.

Galileo is not just "a major infrastructure project" which is how the committee describes it. It is a

**Continued on p.2**

**INSIDE: Mandelson to claim new anti-dumping powers p.2 - Sarkozy pines for European military power p.2 - EU used dirty tricks and bullying in trade talks with poorest countries p.3 - Why EU reform remains a dream p.3 - Welcome to Miliband's confused post-modern political world p.4 - Railway companies and golfers are the latest beneficiaries of the CAP p.5 - Is this a Tory commitment that can be trusted? p.5**

# Mandelson to claim new anti-dumping powers

**P**eter Mandelson, the Trade Commissioner may become more powerful as a result of a year-long review of the EU trade defence instruments.

According to papers leaked to the *Financial Times* on 15th November the Commission is to recommend that it be given the power to start its own anti-dumping actions. In the past the Commission has had to wait for complaints from companies before taking action. Brussels sources allege that many companies have been frightened of making such complaints for fear of retaliation.

The leaked papers seen by the

*Financial Times* suggest that the proposal has strong backing from some EU governments as the EU trade deficit with China increases by an estimated £9.7 million an hour.

*"The ex-officio initiation of investigations would reduce the retaliation problem"*, the document claims. According to this twelve member states have called for stronger anti-dumping measures with two against.

The names of those supporting the proposal have not been given. But they are likely to include all of the southern European states which are heavily dependent on large manufacturing

sectors that are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with cheap Chinese and Vietnamese products. Britain and Sweden are among those northern European states which have stressed the value of low-priced imports to the consumer and the retail sector.

Duties were imposed on Chinese and Vietnamese shoes for two years in 2006 while this summer saw a dispute over energy efficient lightbulbs.

In recent months Mr Mandelson has sounded anti-Chinese and has backed calls to China to devalue its "artificially cheap currency".

## MEPs condemn Frattini over migrant crime

**F**rancisco Frattini, the European Union Commissioner for Justice, Freedom and Security has been roundly condemned by the European Parliament for supporting Italian government measures to expel hundreds of Romanians from Italy following a crime wave for which Romanian gypsies are widely held to be responsible.

The recent murder of a woman allegedly by a Romanian of Roma origin led to new powers being given to local authorities to expel citizens of EU origin - although this clearly contradicts EU law. Around 1,000 Romanians have arrived in Italy since it joined the EU last January.

Mr Frattini suggested that the police could go into the nomad camps which have sprung up outside many Italian

cities and immediately arrest and expel anyone who could not provide an address.

A resolution passed by MEPs on 15th November *"emphatically reaffirms the need to combat every form of racism and xenophobia and all forms of discrimination based on nationality and ethnic origin"*.

## Sarkozy pines for European military power

*"How can Europe be independent and have influence in the world if it is itself unable to guarantee its own security."*  
President Sarkozy of France addressing the European Parliament in Strasbourg on 13th November 2007.

Continued from p.1

## Into orbit fly pigs with golden trotters

project with military as well as civilian uses and, if it is to be funded at all, it should logically be at least partly funded from defence budgets.

Commercial users will have no incentive to use the system since the existing American GPS system is available to all free of charge. The claims that it would be possible to bring in major private funding by means of private-public partnership were consequently always unrealistic given the impossibility of identifying a potential income stream from the private customers - hence collapse of plans for a PPP. Some public sector

customers - police forces and customs departments, for example - may be coerced into using Galileo instead of GPS, but the financial bottom line is that the huge cost of the system will be borne by taxpayers.

The clearer these realities become the more obvious it is that the only credible rationale is a military one reflecting the French desire to reduce dependency on the United States and to build a counter-veiling military force in the world. The British government is in a state of denial about this, insisting that the scheme will not be used for military purposes - despite

French and Commission statements to the contrary - and that defence remains a matter for national governments. The truth is that huge sums of British taxpayers money are being spent on a project which Britain is powerless to alter or stop and which runs counter to our declared foreign and security policy goals. Still more disturbing is the fact that important decisions with implications for British defence are being taken by those outside this country despite constant ministerial assurances that this would never happen.

# EU 'used dirty tricks and bullying in trade talks with poorest countries'

The interim agreement struck on 14th October between East African states and the EU to replace preferential tariffs was the result of behind the scenes bullying and coercion by European trade negotiators, according to several non-governmental organisations which have closely followed the course of negotiations.

The deal, which is in the form of an interim Framework Agreement on the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) covers market access, development and fisheries.

Under the accord East African States Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda will enjoy duty free and quota free access to the EU for all products except sugar and rice from 1st January. In return East African states will have to remove tariffs on imports from the EU.

Critics of the accord say that the East African states may be forced to liberalise trade in goods and services far too quickly and in such a way that

imports from the EU will grow rapidly while the increase in exports to Europe from East Africa will grow at a significantly lower pace. The result will be a growing trade deficit, a drop in output and job losses.

A further concern arises from the fact that tariffs account for a negligible proportion of income in European countries - but in Africa are a major source of income which means that these will have to be replaced by other taxes.

ACP countries also complain that the EU will not agree formal aid within the EPAs but the EU has nevertheless made future aid payments conditional on agreement on key EU negotiating objectives.

A spokesperson for Accord International said that the dirty tricks used by the EU would undermine the development of East Africa.

"East African countries stand to lose 162.5 million dollars every year", she said.

Another NGO said that dirty tricks

had included the banning of civil society organisations from the talks, threats to hike tariffs as well as the linkage of progress in the talks to aid issues.

The talks on economic relations with the East African states form part of a wider discussion with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries.

Commenting on the way in which these have been conducted on the EU side *Guardian*, columnist Madeleine Bunting commented on 19th October:

*"One of the biggest economic trading blocs in the world, on which the fortunes of many of these 76 countries are entirely dependent through both aid and trade, and here it is behaving like a bully-boy in the playground. But its bad behaviour is all behind closed doors; the arm-twisting is behind the bike shed, to play out the metaphor. International trade is such a complex subject and public attention so fleeting and rare that the EU is gambling on getting away with it"*

## Why EU reform remains a dream

*"If Europe is to be an efficient corporate economy, let alone a vibrant market one... we would have to reform the entire institutional and legal structure of the EU and to re-write the existing European treaties. We would have to replace regulatory harmonization with the principle of 'mutual recognition' of national standards. We would have to transform the present cartel of governments into a market of governments in which European nations compete with each other by offering different mixes of tax and regulation to attract investment and talent. And since the existing policies admirably suit the interests of Europe's bureaucratic ruling class, we would have to bring in political reforms to make the EU and its institutions more democratic, liberal*

*and flexible.*

*At present there is little chance of such policies being adopted. In fact, the recent European Council showed that we were moving in precisely the opposite direction: An attentive diplomat noticed that several key words had disappeared from the previously circulated draft of a 'mandate' for a new European treaty. It no longer promised the 'free and undistorted competition' of earlier drafts. Nicholas Sarkozy, the newly-elected French president, had quietly approached Angela Merkel (wearing her hat as holder of the six-monthly rotating European Council presidency) and persuaded her to drop the offending phrase. Tony Blair, Gordon Brown, and others, having failed to get the phrase re-inserted, now argue that*

*it is a meaningless concession that is contradicted by other provisions of the proposed treaty. But the fact that Sarkozy got his way - in company with the German Chancellor - is not meaningless.*

*It was a symbolic victory of Maastricht over Rome - and of French etatism over Anglo-Saxon liberalism. It will influence the judiciary's interpretation of the constitutional 'reform treaty' in the direction of greater regulation and less competition. And it will therefore have major consequences for policy over time.*

Extract from a lecture given by John O'Sullivan to the Centre for Economic and Political Studies in Prague on 7th October 2007.

*The Christmas double issue of eurofacts - Vol 13 No 5/6  
will be published on 14th December 2007.*

# Welcome to David Miliband's confused post-modern political world

*Progress in establishing a new relationship with Europe can only begin when front bench politicians candidly acknowledge the nature of the European project*

It is surely odd that 35 years after joining 'Europe' our political leaders are unable to say what kind of entity we belong to. For several decades, despite its obvious aspirations to statehood ministers used to pretend that the EU was an association of independent cooperating states. These days they prefer to say nothing at all on the subject although the government immediately disassociated itself from Mr Barroso when he described it as an empire. When pressed, Ministers routinely deny that 'Europe' is or will be a super-state or a superpower, although Tony Blair once suggested that it could become a major power without necessarily becoming a super-state.

Certainly, it is difficult to see how 'Europe' could be the first of these things - a superpower - without possessing the trappings and identity of a state, super or otherwise. In any event, no one seems more confused about the matter than the British.

The new Foreign Secretary is rumoured to be intelligent and full of fresh thinking. It was not unreasonable to suppose that in his first major speech on European affairs Mr Miliband might possibly throw some light on the subject.

*"The EU will never be a superpower, but could be a model power of regional cooperation"*, he said on 15th November at the College of Europe at Bruges.

## Moral Superiority

For good measure the word "model" was repeated several times. But a model what? Is the only point of the EU to provide instruction to the world on the processes of political cooperation? It was clear from the elevated tone of the speech, however, that Mr Miliband was thinking in terms of Europe as a moral exemplar as much as a political blueprint. He evidently wants Europe to be admired and

emulated because of its innate moral superiority.

Mr Miliband cannot be faulted for a lack of ambition. After all, this is a political enterprise which decade after decade has spent half its income on a form of agricultural support that plunges the world's poorest people into deeper misery. It is one in which decision-making is not only undemocratic but incapable of being made so. And it is one which ruthlessly crushes individuals who expose corruption within the Brussels machine. When it comes to ethics the EU is not in pole position.

Nor does there seem to be much chance that others will flock to emulate Europe's evolving political institutions. It is possible to think of many peoples currently struggling to create *nation states* - it is still the way most people choose to organize their political affairs. But since the collapse of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia the fashion for top-down multi-national federal states has quite gone out of fashion. Only the EU bucks the trend.

## Defence Integration

There was much else in the Miliband speech that was bound to grate on eurosceptic sensibilities, not least the call for greater EU defence integration - a cause close to the heart of President Sarkozy if not of Mr Brown who evidently cut out some passages that he thought wouldn't appeal to the voters.

However, wouldn't a common European defence take us still closer to the creation of the state Mr Miliband says Europe will never be? Of course: a defence capability is one of the defining characteristics of a state. But then we should not forget that, as the *Times* has recently reminded us, Mr Miliband is our '*first post-modern Foreign Secretary*'. When it comes to politics we are not precisely sure what post-modernism amounts to. In the arts it is generally taken to imply an

attitude which acknowledges that meaning, consistency, as well as form and structure, are no longer important but which suggests that we shouldn't mind very much. Such an attitude is consistent with the tone of Miliband's speech, but viewed from more traditional perspectives it is difficult to admire the Foreign Secretary's words.

The British once admired straight-talking and straight-thinking in contrast to more oblique and complex continental patterns of discourse. No more.

Mr Sarkozy at least acknowledges he doesn't want a referendum because if this were to be held he would lose it. Mr Miliband, like Mr Brown, pretends that we won't have one because of the 'non-constitutional nature' of the treaty. Sarkozy concedes that the treaty is virtually unaltered. Brown and Miliband deny this despite the mountains of evidence to the contrary

## Monstrously Expensive

This British reluctance to call things by their proper names and to acknowledge their real purpose extends across the spectrum of EU policy. In the case of the monstrously expensive Galileo project (see page 1) the British ministers pretend that it is an infrastructure project like Cross-rail, while the French acknowledge its military potential and its indispensability in providing a counterweight to the US.

At the heart of the problem lies the British refusal to acknowledge the nature of the European project itself; progress towards the goal of getting a fundamentally different relationship with 'Europe' can only commence when front bench politicians finally start to talk candidly about such matters. Mr Miliband's speech suggests that this will not be any time soon.

# Railway companies and golfers are the latest beneficiaries of the CAP

*The yearly ritual whereby the auditors refuse to sign off on the EU accounts is becoming more elaborate as the main players try to outwit one another*

The refusal of the European Court of Auditors to sign off on the EU's annual accounts has become an annual ritual. Perhaps it will come to be remembered long after the European Union has imploded: it could serve as an apt reminder of the human propensity for greed and folly.

Events now follow a traditional pattern.

First the president of the Court, Herbert Veldrine, announces that the Court is again unable to approve the accounts. Commission spokesmen then suggest that the fault really lies with member states. Member states blame the Commission. After they have had time to digest the auditors' report a swelling number of eurosceptic critics make estimates about the scale of fraud and waste that has occurred over the previous 12 months on the basis of the auditors' figures.

Six months later MEPs "discharge" the previous years accounts although they have little idea where much of the money has gone, thus paving the way for the next year's budget.

You might think that the process has become so repetitive that there is a danger that spectator interest will suffer. But for aficionados, at least, the process is becoming more fascinating as the principal players in the drama anticipate one another's moves and try to outwit them.

This year - the 13th successive occasion on which the Court refused to sign off on the accounts - did not disappoint.

Anticipating that the Commission

would put the blame on member states, the auditors pre-empted such claims by making plain that the Commission could not shrug off its duties in this way since it bears the final responsibility for upholding the principles of sound financial management. The report states: "*Regardless of the method of implementation applied the Commission bears the ultimate responsibility for the legality and regularity of the transactions underlying the accounts of the European Communities (Article 274)*".

However, even before the release of the auditors' report the Commission's spin machine had been in action with the aim of putting a somewhat more rosy gloss on matters than was justified by the facts. But again the auditors were alive to what it was up to and headed it off: "*...in significant parts of the EU budget, the Directors General give a more positive account of the legality and regularity of EU spending than is consistent with the Court's audit*". Two nil to the auditors.

Nor are the main findings of the auditors necessarily boring or predictable. For example this year's report reveals that following the introduction of the single payment scheme of farm subsidies (based on the amount of land owned rather than on production volumes) the beneficiaries not only include non-farmers but those who have *never* farmed.

*"Among the new beneficiaries are railway companies in the UK, horse riding or breeding clubs in Germany*

*and Sweden and golf or leisure clubs and city councils in Denmark and the UK"*, it states.

Other points in the report which stand out:

- 15 billion euros out of the 49.8 billion euros spent on agriculture was not subject to proper checks.
- In the case of agri-environmental measures in seven out of eight cases the farmers audited had not met their commitments.
- Despite numerous previous warnings Greece had still failed to introduce financial controls - which means that the 850 million paid to Greek farmers was paid under "unsatisfactory conditions".
- The Court tested 177 interim payments from the Structural Fund, and found only 31 per cent free from error. (Monitoring of payments in Scotland and Merseyside were "ineffective in their control systems" and predominantly "unsatisfactory".
- Problems were also identified in the auditing of projects relating to the EU's internal policies, foreign policy action and schemes in the pre-accession countries.
- In nine of the eleven external aid projects which were audited, procedures were not followed. In three, money was spent ineligibly; in four receipts were not kept.

## Is this a Tory commitment that can be trusted?

*"If we don't succeed in forcing a referendum in this House and if we fail to win in another place [the Lords] and if all EU member states implement the treaty and if an election is held later in this Parliament, which is a lot of ifs ... then we would be in a situation where*

*we had a new treaty in force that lacked democratic legitimacy in this country and in our view gave the EU too much power over our national policies.*

*"This would not be acceptable to a Conservative government and we*

*would not let matters rest there"*.

William Hague, the shadow Foreign Secretary during a foreign policy debate in the House of Commons, 12th November 2007.

# LETTERS

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

## **Fight-back Began 40 Years Ago**

Dear Sir,

I enjoyed your leading article on the Lisbon Treaty, "Was it an historic turning point?" (*eurofacts* 2nd November), which is well written, until I reached the final paragraph, wherein it states: "... it was a moment when the euro-sceptics began a belated but historic fight-back to halt the trend of the previous decades and to recover what has been lost".

I should like to point out to the author, who is not identified, that efforts to 'fight-back' against the EU juggernaut have been going on for many decades. I, myself, first spoke out against British membership of the Common Market, as it was then called, in the early 1960s and, when I entered the House of Commons, I opposed the European Communities Act in 1971-72 and all the amending treaties. My opposition to the EU has continued in the House of Lords. I am certainly not alone as other politicians including the late Lord Shore of Stepney and various campaign groups have also fought hard to alert the public to the threat from the EU.

Many public protests have been held in London and elsewhere in the country, not least the 10,000 who marched to Trafalgar Square a few years ago and the various rallies in defence of the pound, outside the Bank of England, at which I spoke, as did many others.

It is far from true for the author to suggest that the Lisbon Treaty has triggered a 'fight-back' against the EU, as if it has only just begun. In reality, it began more than 40 years ago!

LORD STODDART OF SWINDON  
London

## **False Assumption**

Dear Sir,

Dr Cooper's belief that Labour and Lib-Dem candidates are defeating Conservatives because UKIP has put up a diversionary candidate is predicated on the assumption that UKIP voters would, in the absence of a candidate of their own, vote Tory. I

doubt if this is true. I have not voted Tory since the Maastricht Treaty was bulldozed through the House, and Cameron's rapid retreat on the issue of Tory membership of the federalist European People's Party is a recent example of why UKIP so deeply distrusts the Conservatives. Has any serious statistical research been done to determine whether, in the absence of UKIP candidates, Tory votes are proportionately higher than in constituencies with a UKIP presence? My own assumption is that it is the proportion of abstentions that would increase.

ANNE GLYN-JONES  
Devon

## **Tories are Part of the Problem**

Dear Sir,

I find the letter from your correspondent, Diana Coad (Letters 16th November) rather arrogant. Until the Conservative Party gets out of this mindset that it is somehow owed votes, it will get nowhere. In a democracy every single vote is up for grabs and it is the perfect right of any Party or candidate to contest for them all.

Sooner or later, the electorate is going to wake up to the fact that it makes not one jot of difference whether a Tory, Labour or Liberal Democrat candidate is elected. All three Parties believe that Britain should be a member of the European Union ad infinitum, end of story. Only nine Tory MPs have signed the Better Off Out pledge, which surely proves my point. Electing the odd extra Tory who dresses him or herself in EU-sceptic clothes is not going to change anything. Far better to vote for a Party you believe in than for the one you dislike the least, which is about all the appeal the Conservative Party has to offer.

On Europe (the EU), the Conservative Party has been an abject failure for decades and despite all the pleadings of its apologists, there is no sign of change. Tory MEPs voted en masse in favour of enlargement of the EU and helped to open the door to the mass immigration problem we now face from Eastern Europe. One even

performed the role of rapporteur in the European Parliament for the application of Bulgaria and has the unmitigated gall to publicly complain about immigration! I worked out for myself that the Tories were never going to cut the mustard fifteen years ago and gave my vote to UKIP instead. I've seen nothing to change my mind since then. In fact, I've become ever more certain that I made the right decision. The Conservative Party is part of the problem, definitely not the solution.

STUART GULLEFORD  
Essex

## **UKIP Competence**

Dear Sir,

Correspondents have debated the practice of UKIP fielding candidates against Eurosceptic Conservative candidates at election times (most recently *eurofacts* 16th November). I question UKIP's management competence for another reason. Readers will recall that about five years ago Equitable Life almost went to the wall. The Treasury and later the FSA failed to fulfil their obligation to check Equitable's audited accounts. Equitable's reserves could not meet their contractual obligations. All With Profits Funds were reduced by 25 per cent and MVA's were applied to any policy holder who transferred out of Equitable. Predictably the Government rejected any/all claims for compensation and the matter went to the European Parliament. After 17 months and many public hearings the European Parliament voted in favour of a report that recommended compensation. UKIP MEP's voted against this recommendation. It may be that UKIP vote against all such reports and recommendations on principle. However when their Party dogma overrides the interests of their own constituents and British pensioners in general, then their judgement and competence must be in question. I have asked UKIP for an explanation. None has been forthcoming.

PAUL RHODES  
London

# MEETINGS

**UK Independence Party**  
01736 756236

Sunday **2nd December**, 2.00 pm

**Nigel Farage MEP**  
**Malcolm Wood**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Lakeview Country Club, Lanivet, nr  
Bodmin, Cornwall  
**Admission Free**

**UK Independence Party**  
01722 744814

Tuesday **4th December**, 7.30 pm

**Nigel Farage MEP**  
**Marc Glendening**, *Campaign Director,*  
*Democracy Movement*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Salisbury Guildhall, Salisbury,  
Wiltshire  
**Admission Free**

**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 gov-  
ernment.

**Rodney Barker**, *Gresham Professor of*  
*Rhetoric*

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

## DIARY OF EVENTS

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

UK Parliamentary **18th December**  
Recess Starts

**2008**  
Slovenia takes over **1st January**  
EU presidency

UK Parliamentary **7th January**  
Recess Ends

**The Democracy Movement**  
(Surrey North and Spelthorne Branch)  
01372 465379

Thursday **7th February 2008**, 8.00 pm

“EU - Give us a Referendum”

**Marc Glendening**, *Campaign Director,*  
*Democracy Movement*  
**Daniel Hannan MEP**, *Columnist,* Daily  
Telegraph

PUBLIC MEETING  
Claygate Village Hall, Claygate, Surrey  
**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**

## SELECT COMMITTEE

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Thursday **6th December**, 10.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into*  
*the Commission's Communication on*  
*organ donation and transplantation* from  
Sir Liam Donaldson, Chief Medical  
Officer, Department of Health.

Thursday **13th December**, 10.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into*  
*the Commission's Communication on*  
*organ donation and transplantation* from  
Mr Chris Rudge, Managing and  
Transplant Director, UK Transplant; and  
Mrs Triona Norman, Transplantation  
Policy Lead, Department of Health; and  
Gareth Jones, Director of Scientific  
Development and Bioethics Division,  
Department of Health.

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

## USFUL WEB SITES

**Better off Out Campaign**

[www.betteroffout.co.uk](http://www.betteroffout.co.uk)

**British Declaration of Independence**

[www.bdicampaign.org](http://www.bdicampaign.org)

**British Weights & Measures Assoc.**

[www.bwmaOnline.com](http://www.bwmaOnline.com)

**Bruges Group**

[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

**Campaign Against Euro-Federalism**

[www.caef.org.uk](http://www.caef.org.uk)

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**

[www.cibhq.co.uk](http://www.cibhq.co.uk)

**Democracy Movement**

[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)

**EU Observer**

[www.euobserver.com](http://www.euobserver.com)

**EU Truth**

[www.eutruth.org.uk](http://www.eutruth.org.uk)

**European Commission (London)**

[www.cec.org.uk](http://www.cec.org.uk)

**European Foundation**

[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)

**European No Campaign**

[www.europeannocampaign.com](http://www.europeannocampaign.com)

**Foreign Affairs**

[www.foreignaffairs.org](http://www.foreignaffairs.org)

**Freedom Association**

[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)

**Global Britain**

[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

**Global Vision**

[www.global-vision.net](http://www.global-vision.net)

**June Press (Publications)**

[www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)

**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**

[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)

**New Alliance**

[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)

**Open Europe**

[www.openeurope.org.uk](http://www.openeurope.org.uk)

**Regional Assemblies**

[www.regionalassemblies.co.uk](http://www.regionalassemblies.co.uk)

**Speak Out Campaign**

[www.speakout.co.uk](http://www.speakout.co.uk)

**Sovereignty**

[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)

**Statewatch**

[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)

**The People's "No" Campaign**

[www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk](http://www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk)

**United Kingdom Independence Party**

[www.ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org)

**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.

**Scared To Death**

by *Christopher Booker*

& *Richard North*. **Hdbk £16.95**

This latest book by the famous duo explores the tricks used to extend EU power and control.

**Gordon Is A Moron**

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£9.99**

Analysis of Brown's Chancellorship.

**The Problems for Post-Communist Countries in the Context of the EU**

by *CRCE*. **£11.95**

Papers from the 2006 colloquium in Bled.

**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 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.

**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.

**Allegations**

Selected works by Alexander Litvinenko

*Edited by Pavel Stroilov*. **£12.95**

Translated from Russian with an introduction by Vladimir Bukovsky.

**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](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**

## euofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

**RATES**

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£16
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

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

I enclose my payment of £.....  
to *euofacts*: **PO Box 119  
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA**

Name .....

Address .....

.....

Postcode .....

Date .....

*Please print clearly in capital letters*

FOR "EU"

<b>European Commission</b>	<b>020 7973 1992</b>
European Movement	020 7940 5252
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020 7735 4000</b>

AGAINST "EU"

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403 741736</b>
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
<b>CIB</b>	<b>020 8340 0314</b>
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>0845 833 9626</b>
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
<b>New Alliance</b>	<b>020 7386 1837</b>
Save Britain's Fish	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

**Congress for Democracy 01372 453678**

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

<b>Bruges Group</b>	<b>020 7287 4414</b>
Global Britain	
Email: <a href="mailto:globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org">globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org</a>	
<b>Global Vision</b>	<b>www.global-vision.net</b>
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>020 7222 9000</b>
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
<b>English Democrats</b>	<b>01277 896000</b>
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
<b>Green Party</b>	<b>020 7272 4474</b>
Richard Mallender	
<b>Labour</b>	<b>020 7783 1000</b>
Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP	
<b>Liberal</b>	<b>01562 68361</b>
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	<b>020 7222 7999</b>
Dr Vincent Cable MP	
<b>New Britain Party</b>	<b>020 7247 2524</b>
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
<b>UK Independence Party</b>	<b>01626 830630</b>
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

