

Why it is improper for Blair to take top EU job

The former Prime Minister's bid to become President of the European Union points to the possibility of a new and more profound form of political corruption

Forget about whether it is proper for Tony Blair to pick up two million a year from an American bank so soon after leaving office. There is a deeper and more serious concern about the latest career moves of this still upwardly mobile ex-PM. This has to do with his evident desire to become the first President of the European Union, an ambition which the French President is eager, even passionate, to promote. "Sarko just loves Tony", one of the French President's aides told *Le Monde* prior to Mr Blair's appearance at the conference of President Sarkozy's centre right UMP.

Mr Blair's ambitions to claim the top job in European politics are evidently not new; speculation that he aspired to the position of EU President were circulating at least two years before he stepped down from office. It is impossible to know when Mr Blair first saw himself in the role, and herein lies part of the difficulty.

Political Integration

During his occupancy of number 10 Mr Blair showed himself to be the most pro-EU prime minister since Edward Heath - despite having entered the Commons on a with-drawalist manifesto. As prime minister he consistently backed the cause of European political integration. If Britain remains stubbornly outside the eurozone it is not for the want of effort by Mr Blair. In signing the St Malo agreement which paved the way for an

autonomous European defence capability he overturned principles that had governed British foreign and security policy for fifty years. He gave further demonstration of his European credentials by agreeing to surrender a substantial chunk of Britain's budget rebate in return for a promise of CAP reform that has turned out to be worthless.

Europe has already showed a little of its gratitude: in 1999 Mr Blair was awarded the Charlemagne Prize for promoting European political unity - previous recipients have included Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman, Alcide de Gasperi, Edward Heath, Jacques Delors and, in 2002, The Euro. The prize carries with it a 'token' cash award.

Lucrative Employment

Of course, Mr Blair would not be the first British ex-minister to have taken up lucrative employment in Brussels and to have contemplated doing so prior to leaving his old job. But to a greater extent than the stream of ex-cabinet ministers and privy councillors - from Tugendhat to Mandelson - who moved swiftly from jobs at Westminster to become EU Commissioners - he is violating a principle which is supposed to inform the conduct of ministers of the Crown.

This is the principle that those who have served the Crown must not take on jobs if to do so would raise the suspicion that their conduct while in

office was influenced by their expectations of future employment.

If it is right that an obscure civil servant at the MoD is to be denied a job with a defence contractor because to do so would raise concerns - however wide of the mark - that his conduct had served the interests of his prospective employer, it is surely right that Mr Blair's conduct should be governed by the same principle.

Outside Appointments

The guidelines of the Advisory Committee on Business Appointments, an independent body that vets job applications from ministers and civil servants, are clear about this matter.

"It is important that when a former Crown servant takes up an outside appointment there should be no cause for any suspicion of impropriety", it states.

The purpose of the guidelines is to counter the suspicion that;

a. the statements and decisions of a serving Minister might be influenced by the hope or expectation of future employment with a particular firm or organisation; or

b. an employer could make improper use of official information to which a former Minister has had access.

In deciding whether it was proper that an ex-Minister should take on a new

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: French ambitions for the EU p.2 - Gordon the hermit p.2 - Brown bullies Portugal over Constitution p.3 - Rural revolution spreads through shires p.3 - Galileo costs go sky high p.3 - "I'm David Cameron - trust me" p.4 - UK could pay more than £400m in EU fines p.4 - Will Brown's devaluation match John Major's p.4 - Hoon cracks whip over Constitution p.4 - Sterling slumps against the euro p.5

Blair should be pressed not take top EU job

position the Committee says that it would be appropriate to ask:

to what extent, if at all, has the former Minister been in a position which could lay him or her open to the suggestion that the appointment was in some way a reward for past favours?

Chaired by the former Northern Ireland Secretary Lord Mayhew of Tysdale, the seven-man Advisory Committee on Business Appointments is the body which provides advice to the Prime Minister, the Foreign Secretary, or other Ministers, if asked, on applications from the most senior Crown servants who wish to take up outside appointments after leaving Crown service.

The Committee also acts as a joint body providing advice directly to former Ministers of the UK Government, the Scottish Parliament and the National Assembly for Wales, about any appointments they wish to take up.

Few men have enjoyed the kind of opportunity to offer advice and make decisions that would impress a future employer as Mr Blair has enjoyed; even if such suspicions are groundless few are as open to the suggestion that their appointment was a reward for past favours.

But the concerns about the propriety of Mr Blair's campaign relate to his future conduct as well as to his conduct while in number 10.

More than most Mr Blair is in a position to call in favours from those in

high positions in public - men and women who owed their career advancement to him. He knows where the bodies are buried and thanks to the intelligence services knows more state secrets than anyone else.

We cannot take for granted that when British interests are in conflict with those of the EU this knowledge will not be used in the interests of the latter. Eurosceptics are bound to be alarmed because they take it for granted that there are fundamental differences of interest between Britain and the EU, but even europhiles would have to agree that there is no automatic identity of interest between the two. When interests clash how would Mr Blair resolve them? On taking office Commissioners sign a declaration of loyalty which over-rides all other commitments. Presumably some similar declaration will be required of the EU's first president.

Few Parallels

The situation in which Britain finds itself as the result of Mr Blair's ambitions has few historical parallels, but it is not unique.

Bertie Ahern, the Irish Prime Minister has been actively promoting his chances of obtaining a top EU job - either that of President of the EU, President of the Commission or High Representative - while still in office.

In what reads unmistakably like a job application he pointed out to the *Irish Times* that he was the longest serving EU prime minister bar one - the Luxembourg leader Jean-Claude

Juncker - and went on to say: "I like Europe, I like dealing with Europe. I have been dealing in the EU Council now continuously - except for a very short period - for 21 years. And I like all of that".

Ireland is likely to be the only country to have a referendum on the Constitution. If the opinion polls suggest an uncertain outcome is it conceivable that Mr Ahern will say and do things that he would not do if not seeking high office? Similarly, are there sins of omission that he might commit in order to get the result that he wants?

Mr Blair is younger and more ambitious than Mr Ahern, an altogether bigger political figure, one who believes that he has quite outgrown national politics. Moreover, the inventor of "sofa-politics" is notoriously careless about observing formal and informal niceties, which is perhaps why it is that he was the first British Prime Minister to be interviewed by the police while in office.

The situation in which Britain and Ireland now find themselves points to the possibility of corruption of a more profound nature than that to which we have been accustomed.

If Mr Blair were to rise to the top job in European politics his successor at number 10 would no doubt say - albeit through gritted teeth - that this was a wonderful appointment for Europe *and* Britain. But can we really be sure of this, and if we can't shouldn't Mr Brown ask Mr Blair to put his country's interests before his own?

French ambitions for the EU

"At the end of the French Presidency, my aim is that [Europe] will have moved forward towards a common immigration policy, a common defence policy, a common energy policy, and a

common environment policy.... The citizens of all of Europe demand protection; they want Europe to protect them, not make them vulnerable.

France will this year, and especially

during the French presidency of the EU, take new initiatives to moralise capitalism."

President Sarkozy quoted in *Le Figaro* 9th January 2008.

Gordon the hermit

Gordon Brown insists that under his leadership Britain is at the centre of the European stage whereas the Conservatives would ensure that Britain was sidelined. This was the

theme of his speech to Business for Europe on 14th January. But it is not quite how outside observers see things. Writing in the *International Herald Tribune* on 15th January that paper's

commentator John Vincour wrote: "A kind of hermit prime minister in Britain barely peers beyond his island and is discounted as a European player of significance".

Brown bullies Portugal over the Constitution

On 9th January the *Times* revealed that Gordon Brown had telephoned the Portuguese Prime Minister Jose Socrates to “insist” that there was no need for a referendum on the Constitution in Portugal. Like Mr Brown, Mr Socrates had promised a popular ballot on the issue during a general election campaign. But following the telephone call by Mr Brown and a similar call from Nicolas Sarkozy, Mr Socrates promptly ruled out a referendum and confirmed that ratification would take place by parliamentary means.

According to the *Times*, the Portuguese decision came as a huge relief to both Downing Street and the Elysee Palace because a decision to hold a referendum would have added to the pressures on the British and French ministers to follow suit. It is not, of course, that the French president

doubts his ability to win a referendum on the Constitution, but that, as he has frankly acknowledged, a decision to call one in France would result in massive pressures on Mr Brown to follow his example and, as he also acknowledged, a British plebiscite could not be won.

Hence the need for the EU’s big powers to gang up on little Portugal.

So it was not Portuguese opinion that worried the French president - most Portuguese are pro-Constitution even if they also say that they would like a vote on the matter - but British opinion and the fear that the whole European project could start to unravel if the British were allowed to have their say.

Announcing the decision which got Brown and Sarkozy off the hook and standing notions of democratic accountability on their heads Mr

Socrates told Portuguese MPs:

“A referendum in Portugal would jeopardise, without any reason to do so, the full legitimacy of the ratification by national parliaments that is taking place in all the other European countries.”

Following Mr Brown’s courageous example Mr Socrates argued that his earlier promises no longer applied because the Lisbon treaty did not create a constitution but instead amended existing treaties. Which only goes to show that acts of political deceit can slip across national boundaries within the EU as easily as asylum seekers. It also goes to show that while Mr Brown may not be prepared to have his photo taken with the other EU leaders he is perfectly willing to do his bit for ‘Europe’ by means of behind-the-scenes skulduggery.

Rural revolution spreads through shires

Nineteen parish polls have now backed the call for a referendum on the EU constitution as popular grass-roots opposition to the Lisbon Treaty gathers strength. More than 500 people took part in the most recent of these - in the village of Crigglesstone in Yorkshire on 20th December when 95 per cent of those participating voted in favour of a national plebiscite. There are currently plans for a further 43 parish polls, most of these in the South West.

Majorities in favour of a referendum have varied from 86 per cent at

Berwick St James, Wiltshire on 13th December to 100 per cent at Fittleton, Wiltshire on 15th November. The overall turnout so far has been 16.8 per cent; support for a referendum has averaged 94.6 per cent with opposition averaging 5.4 per cent.

Under a clause in the 1972 Local Government Act a parish meeting may be called by a parish chairman, two parish councillors or any six local electors.

In addition to the villages named above, parish polls have been held at East Stoke, Dorset; Shaldon, Devon;

Newton and Noss, Devon; Illogan, Cornwall; Loughton, Milton Keynes; Mawgan, Cornwall; Germoe, Cornwall; Polruan, Cornwall; Hatherleigh, Devon; Collingtree, Hants; Mortimer West Ham, Reading; Chumleigh, Devon; Yealmpton, Devon; Rolleston on Dove, Staffs; East Anstey, Devon; and Broughton Astley, Leicestershire.

Readers who would like practical advice about how to organise polls in their own parishes should contact the Campaign Alliance for Referendums in Parishes (tel 01626 830628).

Galileo costs go sky high

The cost of the European Union’s home-grown satellite navigation system, Galileo, is set to sky-rocket, the German magazine *Der Spiegel* has reported.

Instead of costing 3.4 billion euros (5 billion dollars), as budgeted by Brussels, it was bound to cost at least 5 billion euros, and even 10 billion euros

(nearly 15 billion dollars) was possible, the weekly said.

The figures had been drawn up by industry and EU budget experts, only weeks after the 27 governments papered over differences and agreed to go ahead with the controversial project.

Galileo is planned to go into operation in 2013 with 26 satellites

providing a similar service to the US-run Global Positioning System which is available free of charge to end users

Spiegel added that a secret German government study concluded the overall cost would rise by 1.5 billion euros even under optimum conditions. Any delay or unforeseen technical difficulty would only add to the cost.

“I’m David Cameron - trust me”

Evoking the memory of Britain’s most successful peace-time Prime Minister of the 20th century, David Cameron told *The Andrew Marr Show* on 13th January:

“I think Margaret Thatcher showed in recovering the British rebate that if you have a very clear, very straightforward approach in Europe and say, look we want to be in the European Union...but we’re not happy with the status quo and there are some things we want to change, if you’re single-minded about that, then there’s no reason why you cannot achieve your objective.”

Actually, there are lots of reasons

why you cannot achieve your objective - which is why British prime ministers, including Mrs Thatcher on most occasions - have not achieved their stated aims. These have to do with the fundamental principles on which the EU is based, the unaccountable nature of EU institutions, the supremacy of EU law over national law, the self-interest of Europe’s political elites, and the momentum behind the on-going process of European political integration. Looking at the matter in practical terms there is the little matter of how and in what circumstances the 26 other members are going to be prepared to roll over and give Mr Cameron what he demands purely

because of the force of Mr Cameron’s personality and without there being any compelling reason for them to oblige.

If Mr Cameron does have “very clear, very straightforward” ideas about how he can reverse the seemingly endless transfer of national powers to the EU he should tell us what they are. At present there is a strong element of “It’ll be alright on the night” about his attitude to the EU. It has not been alright on the night hitherto, and until such time as he is prepared to think strategically about how Britain’s sovereignty can be restored it won’t be alright in the event of a Tory victory at the general election.

UK could pay more than £400 million in EU fines

The Government has admitted that the final bill for fines from the EU for late payments made through the single farm payments scheme (SPS) and other “disallowances” could be as high as £401 million.

In a written reply to Lord Stoddart of Swindon on 8th January, Lord Rooker, the Minister of State (Lords) for DEFRA, confirmed that it has already paid out some £63 million and set aside a further £7 million to cover fines for late payments in respect of 2005 and 2006. He also told Lord Stoddart that the Government has set aside £348 million in respect of disallowances for

breaches of EU regulations in making payments through the SPS and other CAP schemes in 2005 and 2006.

Lord Stoddart commented: *“The SPS has caused endless misery for farmers because the Government was incapable of administering it properly and made them wait inordinate amounts of time for payments to which they were perfectly entitled. Now we find that not only are there swingeing fines for making so many of the payments late but that many of those that were paid are in breach of EU regulations and will be disallowed. The Government is turning*

incompetence into an art form.

“However, as incompetent as this Government has been, the EU is making things ten times worse by imposing these massive fines. The money has to come from somewhere and this had led to major cuts in DEFRA’s budgets, £200 million in 2007 alone. Major casualties have included vitally important facilities such as flood defences, at a time when they were under particular strain. A dangerous combination of EU greed and governmental incompetence is endangering lives.”

Will Brown’s devaluation match John Major’s?

The day before “White Wednesday” - 16th September 1992 - the pound sterling bought DM 2.78. Following its ejection from the Exchange Rate Mechanism, the pound dropped sharply against the DM. By 30th October 1992 a pound bought DM 2.41, a devaluation of 13.3 per cent, though by the end of the year it had

recovered slightly to DM 2.45, representing a devaluation of “only” 11.8 per cent compared to its parity of 15th September 1992.

In the current devaluation of the pound versus the euro, the pound would have to drop to £1 = 1.28 (from its 6th September 2007 rate of 1.48) to match the 13.3 per cent

devaluation that occurred in the autumn of 1992. The exchange rate on 14th January 2008 was £1 = 1.316, within 3 per cent of £1 = 1.28. By the time you read this, the “Brown Devaluation” may well have matched the much-decried (by Brown amongst others) “Major Devaluation”.

Hoon cracks whip over Constitution

The ratification of the Lisbon Treaty is about to begin - and Labour MPs have been warned that the whipping is likely to be of unprecedented severity.

A letter to them from the Labour Chief Whip Geoff Hoon which was leaked to the *Independent* on 14th

January states: *“As some of you in the House will remember, the then Conservative government in 1992 and 1993 had problems with the Maastricht Treaty Bill. One reason for this was that the debate was spread over many months. The European Reform Treaty*

Bill will be considered by a committee of the whole House throughout February and early March, day after day.

“I wanted to give you advance notice that I will be running a three-line whip for each day it is considered.”

Sterling slumps against the euro

The huge and rising UK trade deficit, the fall-out from Northern Rock and the weakening economy are all contributing to sterling weakness

For four and a half years, from 2003 to summer 2007, the pound-euro exchange rate was pretty stable, at around £1 = 1.46. As recently as 6th September 2007, £1 bought 1.48. Since then it's been downhill: the value of sterling sank against the euro, touching 1.32 on 14th January 2008, a depreciation of 11 per cent in just four months. Why?

One reason seems to be that the financial markets finally woke up to the truly alarming size, and the rate of worsening, of the UK current account deficit (that is to say the trade deficit). That deficit ballooned during 2003, 2004 and 2005, when the UK ran a large and rapidly-increasing deficit with EU-26, off-set somewhat by surpluses with the rest of the world.

In 2006 the deficit with EU-26 fell back from £38 billion to £35 billion* - still pretty bad, accounting for 74 per cent of the overall deficit of £48 billion. Of the £35 billion deficit with the EU, £29 billion was on proper trade, £6 billion on the net UK contribution - her membership fee - to Brussels.

Large Surplus

On her trade with the rest of the world, the UK recorded a deficit of £13 billion. Particularly worrying was the £6 billion drop, to £12 billion, in the UK's "traditional" large trade surplus with the USA.

Given that three-quarters of the UK's trade deficit is with the rest of the EU, and that the UK continues to trade in surplus with the USA, there seems to be some logic in the pound's having devalued more against the euro (by 11 per cent) than against the dollar (by around 2 per cent) between early September and now.

On 20th December 2007 the Office for National Statistics - an agency of HM Treasury - reported that in the third quarter of 2007 alone the UK current account deficit was £20.0 billion, up from £13.7 billion in the

second quarter. In the same report, the ONS revised the whole-year whole-world deficits for both 2005 and 2006 upwards, to £31 billion and £51 billion respectively.

Do deficits of this magnitude matter?

Trade deficits are symptoms of a country's deep-seated economic imbalances and weaknesses, the analysis of which is complex and difficult. So while the current British trade deficit is certainly telling us something, it is less clear what exactly the implications are.

There is no doubt about the effect on British jobs. Just as exports create jobs, so imports destroy jobs. A deficit reflects jobs effectively exported overseas. In the case of the UK, with its colossal and ballooning trade-in-goods deficit, manufacturing jobs are haemorrhaging to Germany, China and elsewhere. Those jobs are "real" jobs, as distinct from the "diversity outreach coordinator" kind of jobs the public sector is so effective at generating.

There is little doubt either about the consequences of a declining manufacturing sector.

Stunning Performance

As well as producing goods, a strong manufacturing sector generates and supports jobs in the service sector: in IT, in insurance, in shipping services, in land transport, in finance and in the activities which help to generate what is by far the biggest single British "export": her receipts of income from overseas investments. (Germany's service sector is currently booming on the back of her stunning manufacturing performance). So while the UK continues to have a surplus on trade in services, that may not last. Manufacturing also stimulates R & D and graduate and post-graduate courses in "hard" subjects like mathematics, physics and chemistry, whose teaching

at secondary and university levels in the UK is in crisis. There are consequences too for the UK's ability to defend herself, since her ability to design, build and maintain equipment for her armed forces is founded on a strong diversified manufacturing base.

So trade deficits do matter. As a proportion of GDP, the 2006 British trade deficit was 3.7 per cent, a percentage only exceeded four times since 1946: in 1974, when it was 4.0 per cent; and in 1988, 1989 and 1990, when the percentages were successively 4.2, 5.1 and 4.0. (It is scant consolation that a number of advanced countries are currently recording higher percentages of trade deficits to GDP: the USA for example, and Spain.) The whole-year deficit in 2007 is likely to be far worse as a proportion of GDP: well above 4 per cent, perhaps even 5 per cent. In the third quarter alone it was already equivalent to 5.7 per cent of GDP.

Property Bubble

Historically, current account deficits of this magnitude, with a lag of two or three years, have presaged UK financial crises. The 1974 current account deficit was followed by the 1976 crisis when the IMF had to bail the country out. The 1988-1990 deficits were followed by the inter-related bursting of the last property bubble, severe recession, high unemployment and high interest rates, culminating in the ejection of the UK from the ERM in 1992. Might the current UK deficits be signalling even more serious trouble ahead?

**www.statistics.gov.uk > Search "Balance of Payments" > "We recommend the following subject categories" > Balance of Payments > "Product results for Balance of Payments" > UK Balance of Payments: The Pink Book > Pink Book 2007.*

LETTERS

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

Evils of Drink Driving

Dear Sir,

The author of the article "New drink-driving plans have their origins in Brussels" (14th December) has obviously never lost a relative killed by a drunken driver.

The theme of the article was that the EU, in proposing to lower the alcohol limit for British drinkers, was acting to the detriment of the British people, or at least alcohol drinkers.

Since the medical profession is agreed that as little as one glass of wine can affect a person's driving ability the EU's efforts to reduce drink-driving are not excessive. I would say that their efforts are insufficient in view of the fact that as many as 10 people a week are killed in Britain by drunken drivers.

In at least one European country the limit of blood alcohol is lower than that proposed by the EU and that country has not ground to a halt.

The British government is gradually persuading people that smoking is harmful and I believe that drunken driving should be similarly regarded.

On a different matter I am tired of contributors complaining that UKIP intervention is harming Tory prospects. One of the aims of UKIP is to divorce Britain from the EU and this will never be achieved by keeping quiet.

J.J.RANDALL

Suffolk

[The purpose of the article was not to defend drunken driving but to point to the fact that pressure for change comes at least partly from outside Britain. Most EU countries have more stringent drink-driving laws than the UK - but several of these also have more drink-related road accidents. In this country the number of such accidents has been falling; it is surely better to find ways of encouraging this trend rather than to impose drastic measures which carry high economic and social costs and which also have the effect of turning those who drive after a single

glass of wine into criminals - Ed.]

The Only Question that Matters

Dear Sir,

In his letter of January 11th, Tom Collins described UKIP as a "major" party.

By now UKIP could have grown into a major party, with a bigger membership than the Liberal Democrats (65,000), and a better organisation for continuous, well-planned, issue-based, grassroots campaigning.

However that has not happened. UKIP remains a minor party, in many places inactive and invisible between elections, and no more than a marginal force in British politics.

I could draw upon both experience and observation to offer many reasons why UKIP has not fulfilled its potential, but there would be no point in doing so. UKIP is where it is, and now the only question which matters is this:

"Over the coming months, what will UKIP, as an organisation, contribute towards stopping the Lisbon Treaty?"

There is a divide between those who believe that the EU project should be resisted at every step, by all available means within the law, and those who calculate that things will have to get much worse before they can start to get better. The latter strategy being that enunciated by the last UKIP leader at a meeting five years ago, when asked why the party was giving a higher priority to fighting local elections than to fighting the EU Constitution.

Dr D R COOPER

Berkshire

Why UKIP Opposed Bail-out

Dear Sir,

Perhaps you will allow me to explain to readers (see Paul Rhodes letter 30th November) that UKIP members voted

against EU interference in the Equitable Life Review because the report produced by the committee (of which I was a member) was deeply flawed technically. Nor did it even begin to cover other serious problems such as the National Provident Institution debacle. It was not a matter of 'party dogma': it would have been totally irrational to support an ad-hoc, non-legal EU committee recommending a British taxpayer's bail-out of failed investments.

GODFREY BLOOM MEP

Selby

Tories oppose EU spending plans

Dear Sir,

Dr D R Cooper, in his letter of 11th January, makes the valid point that almost all the Tory MPs will vote in favour of a Referendum on the EU Reform Treaty when the vote in the House of Commons takes its course.

Currently, and of significance that receives little media attention, is the legislative passage through Parliament of the European Communities (Finance) Bill required to implement the £1.0 billion reduction in Britain's refund agreed by Tony Blair in December 2005, so that the EU Budget can take with effect from 2009.

At the first reading of the Bill on 19th November last year, 312 MPs gave their consent and 216 voted against (92.3 per cent turn out) - I'm given to understand on a three line whip - and 307 Labour MPs voted to approve the additional funding. The Bill received a second reading scheduled on 15th January and moved to its third reading with a majority of 101 when 168 Conservatives voted against (figures from The Public Whip).

Also of interest, 31 Liberal Democrats voted against on the first reading and 37 against on the second reading.

HARRY M RANDALL

Dorchester

MEETINGS

Campaign for an Independent Britain 0116 2874 622

Wednesday **30th January**, 6.00 pm
Dr Bob Spink MP, *Chairman of CIB*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Function Suite, The Counting House, 50 Cornhill, London
Admission £10 payable in advance
(CIB, c/o 38 Market Place, Folkington, Lincs NG34 0SF)

The Democracy Movement (Southeast Sussex Branch) 01424 848064

Thursday **31st January**, 7.30 pm

Bryan Smalley, *Independent Researcher*

Daniel Hannan MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Manor Barn, Bexhill Old Town (junction of High Street with Upper Sea Road and de la Warr Road)
Admission Free

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

Thursday **7th February**, 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

UK Independence Party 01626 831340

Saturday **8th March**, 10.00 am

“Let the People Speak”

Speakers include;

Nigel Farage MEP, **Christopher Gill**, **Marc Glendening**, **Lord Pearson of Rannoch**

SOUTHWEST RALLY

The Great Hall, Exeter University, Exeter, Devon
Admission Free

Hurlingham Club 0207 736 8411

Tuesday **11th March**, 7.30 pm

“Is it in Britain’s best interest to be a member of the European Union?”

For the motion;

Peter Luff, *Chairman of the European Movement*

Denis MacShane MP, *Former Minister for Europe*

Against the motion;

Christopher Booker, *Journalist and author*

Daniel Hannan MEP, *Columnist, Daily Telegraph*

PUBLIC DEBATE

The Hurlingham Club, Putney, London (100yds from Putney Bridge)

Admission £30 (Includes Supper)
{**Tickets from the Hurlingham Club**}

Gresham College 020 7831 0575

Wednesday **16th April**, 6.00 pm

“The British and American Constitutions”

Vernon Bogdanor CBE FBA, *Gresham Professor of Law*

Professor Cristina Rodrigues, *New York University*

PUBLIC MEETING

Royal College of Surgeons of England, 35-43 Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords 020-7219 3000

Tuesday **21st January**, 2.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The EU Reform Treaty* from Angela Eagle MP, Exchequer Secretary, HM Treasury.

Tuesday **29th January**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the Impact of the EU Reform Treaty on the EU Institutions* from the Slovenian Ambassador on the priorities of the Slovenian Presidency.

Tuesday **4th February**, 4.00 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into Intergovernmental Action to Control the Spread of Infectious Diseases* from the Department for Health; Department for International Development; and Foreign & Commonwealth Office.

Thursday **7th February**, 10.10 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into the EU Commission’s Communication on organ donation and transplantation* from Dr Gurch Randhawa, Director, Institute for Health Research, University of Bedfordshire; and Dr Magi Sque and Dr Tracy Long, University of Southampton.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2008

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

European Reform Treaty to be Ratified **December**

2009

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

European Parliamentary Elections **11th June**

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

Thinker Tailor Soldier Spy

by *Harry Beckhough*. **£18.99**
A remarkable book about a soldier, code-breaker, intelligence officer, teacher and political activist.

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.

Lost Illusions: British Foreign Policy

by *Ian Milne*. **£4.00**
Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.

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

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
Nick Clegg MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006