

Bishops and the European Union: the cash nexus

Although the Church of England has benefited from EU funding Bishops have a duty to remind Parliamentarians of their duty to keep their promises

It was famously said of the Church of England that it would be prepared to surrender thirty eight of its thirty nine articles rather than give up one thirty-ninth of its income. Things have not changed: the Church has benefited from the EU gravy train and it cannot be taken for granted that it will put principle before its economic interests if to do so would risk alienating so useful a source of income as the European Union. This matters because the outcome of the vote on the Lisbon Treaty in the Lords could well be influenced by how the 26 Lords Spiritual vote is used when it comes to the committee stage of the Bill later this month.

Commons Fiasco

As we go to press, there are signs that a few of the more independent-minded Lib-Dem peers may support the amendment in favour of a referendum which the Tories will propose. It also seems likely that Nick Clegg will seek to avoid the fiasco which occurred in the Commons when he issued a three-line whip to MPs to abstain on the Tory amendment. As readers will recall this instruction was defied by almost a quarter of the parliamentary party and led to the resignation of two members of his front bench team.

One Lib-Dem peer - Lord Falkland - told the *Daily Telegraph* on 31st March:

"I will be voting for a referendum and, if I am brave enough to withstand

the glares of my colleagues, I will speak in the debate. When you give an undertaking, as we clearly did in our election manifesto, you cannot have it both ways. A manifesto commitment should be sacrosanct."

Meanwhile, two former Tory Chancellors - Lawson and Lamont - have put themselves at the head of the Lords campaign to win a referendum. In the words of Lord Lamont they will be seeking to turn the Salisbury convention on its head by persuading the Lords to enforce an election manifesto commitment. They are likely to be listened to with respect and to limit the influence of 'the three Hs' - Hurd, Heseltine, and Howe.

Deeply Unsatisfactory

The Tory position on what exactly an incoming Conservative government would *do* if it came to power *after* treaty ratification remains deeply unsatisfactory. But on the battle for a referendum the Tory leadership in the Lords appears to mean serious business, not least because it is undoubtedly in the party's interests to inflict what would be a hugely humiliating defeat for the Government.

In his analysis of parliamentary arithmetic in *eurofacts* on 7th March Lord Willoughby de Broke described the position of the Bishops as 'uncertain'. It could, however, be crucial to the outcome of the vote which is likely to take place when the Bill reaches the Committee stage on

22nd April.

In an authoritative and carefully researched letter to *eurofacts* (p.6) Bryan Smalley points out that the Church of England's organisation *Christianity and the Future of Europe* has received substantial grants from the EU. In addition Bishops Durham Wakefield and Hereford have thrown their support behind the EU-sponsored programme of regionalisation.

On 28th March this year the keynote message from the plenary session of the Bishops' Conference of the European Community (COMECE) was that "the aims and meaning" of the European project remained 'unanswered' and a COMECE spokesman said that the meeting had given Bishops the opportunity to reflect on the 'fundamental question' of how EU support might be mobilised and turned into concrete goals.

Sovereign Powers

Support for measures which would transfer sovereign powers to a foreign jurisdiction, as the Lisbon Treaty seeks to do, quite clearly breaches Article 37 of the Church's 39 Articles, but the Church has always been flexible about doctrinal matters, especially when money has been involved. Accusations of doctrinal inconsistency are unlikely to cut much ice.

All this being so the chances of signing up the Bishops for the Tory

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: Lisbon: Could the Irish say no? p.2 - Review of "The Treaty of Lisbon in Perspective" p.3 - **There's only one Nicolas Sarkozy p.4** - Norwegians still reject EU p.4 - **Brown devaluation against the euro gathers momentum p.5** - Whistleblower to reveal more MEPs' secrets p.5 - **Lisbon Treaty completes 'EU tool box' p.5** -

Lisbon: Could the Irish say no?

Although the day has still not been fixed, Bertie Ahern, Irish Prime Minister, has told the Dail, the Irish lower house, that the referendum on the Lisbon Treaty will take place in the second week of June. Opinion polls suggest as many as one third of voters have not yet made up their mind and a number of pro-EU commentators have warned of the possibility of a repetition of the 2001 referendum when Irish voters rejected the Nice Treaty.

The country's business, media and political mainstream remain almost uniformly pro-EU, but in a recent bulletin the (pro-EU) Centre for European Reform identifies a lengthy list of what it describes as 'bad omens' which could result in a no vote. These include:

- The current investigation into the financial affairs of the Prime Minister is currently bringing popular disillusion with the ruling Fianna Fáil party to a head at a time

of global economic uncertainty, rows over public sector pay and falling house prices.

- The pro-EU alliance that was successful during the second referendum on the Nice Treaty has been wound up.
- Talk of EU tax harmonisation, which threatens Ireland's low corporate taxes, is sapping business support for the Treaty.
- A new pressure group Libertas is running an energetic door-to-door campaign arguing that the passarelle clause will allow the EU to acquire new powers without future referendums. The Libertas slogan: why vote away your right to vote.
- The Treaty contains no grand project, like the euro or enlargement, that might endear it to the public.
- There is evidence of rising public dissatisfaction with immigration

from the EU - Ireland is now the fastest growing EU country in population terms.

- The previously pro-EU consensus in the media is being weakened by the growing influence of the eurosceptic British press.
- Politicians may be reluctant to warn of the dire consequences that flow from a no vote because voters know that the French and Dutch rejected the Constitution without long term adverse consequences for either country.

As the CER Bulletin notes, in the end, voters are likely to vote according to their view of whether the EU is a positive force. Ireland, which has one of the highest per capita incomes in Europe has done well from the CAP and the EU structural fund, but there is growing awareness that as a result of enlargement it will not do so well in the future.

Continued from p.2

Bishops and the EU: the cash nexus

amendment look slim. But there is an argument which should carry weight with senior churchmen and ought to be put to them.

The argument runs as follows. The broad tradition of the Church is that it should not involve itself in party politics or seek to shape or formulate policy, but that it should nevertheless seek to exert a moral and spiritual influence on the climate in which political decisions are made. The Bishops are supposed to be custodians of ethical and spiritual values and the Church consequently has a corresponding duty to oppose measures which have a toxic effect upon the public policy process. Unless this role is recognised by the Church there is no case for the continuing inclusion of Bishops in the Upper House.

In a debate on the role of Bishops in the Lords which took place in the Upper House on 4th June 1996 the Bishop of Chichester advanced just

such an argument:

"Many temporal peers have expressed the view that this House would be poorer without the distinctive moral and spiritual contribution of the Bishops. There is a truly Christian atmosphere here...I hope that whatever changes take place, that is not lost. In the way in which it behaves the House sets an example of right conduct to the nation: of proper relationships and behaviour to one another."

The keeping of a solemn and unequivocal manifesto commitment is a moral matter: failure to honour such a promise constitutes a fundamental breach of trust with the electorate; it provides an unmistakable example of bad conduct and of a relationship which ought to be sacrosanct but which has been cynically betrayed. The Bishops have a responsibility to say this.

They should be sufficiently worldly to grasp the purpose behind the change of name of the treaty cover and not

absolve the Liberal, Democratic and Conservative parliamentarians of the responsibility of keeping their word on so fundamental an issue. They may also recognise a duty to warn of the bitterness and dissatisfaction with the political process that such a betrayal involves and the growth of political extremism to which is likely to lead. A rise in the support of the BNP in the May council elections is likely to be just one of the consequences that this profound betrayal of trust will produce.

It is not necessary for the Bishops to express a view about the desirability of the Lisbon Treaty or indeed to express a view about the European project; there are good reasons for suggesting they should not. But the Bishops have a unique responsibility to remind those holding public office that they should keep their word and of reminding them of the dangers which will surely follow if they do not do so. If the Bishops fail in this regard they too will be guilty of betraying a trust which has been bestowed upon them.

Finally, a book that will enable the ordinary citizens of this country to fight back

By Ian Milne

It is difficult to find superlatives that adequately describe this book. The task of analysing the “Lisbon” Treaty and tracing the origin of its articles back through the failed Constitution and all the previous treaties to the Treaty of Rome is monumental: and the work is indeed a monument to the extraordinary diligence, forensic skills and perspicacity of the authors, the father-and-son team of Anthony and Andrew Cowgill.

The book is also remarkable for the simplicity and clarity of its language, coupled with the impeccable neutrality of its standpoint: neither pro-“European” nor sceptical: just describing the treaties as they are. No wonder that even europhile New Labour ministers have used previous publications in this series in debates in Parliament, in preference to the limp offerings of the Foreign Office, whose brief, faithfully discharged, is to make “Europe” as incomprehensible as possible.

In explaining how the Constitution rejected by French and Dutch voters in 2005 metamorphosed into the Lisbon Treaty, the Cowgill's reproduce the following unequivocal quotes from Valery Giscard d'Estaing:

I have given myself the task of comparing the new Lisbon treaty with the Constitution on the “nine essential points” published on this blog. To my surprise and in truth, to my great satisfaction, these nine points are repeated word for word in the new project. There is not a single comma that has changed. (VGE's blog, 23rd November 2007)

Giscard's nine points are:

- Legal personality.
- The fixed presidency for the period of two and a half years, as opposed to the current system of six-monthly rotating presidencies among the Member States.
- Creation of the role of the Union Minister for Foreign Affairs,

The Treaty of Lisbon in Perspective

Detailed analysis and review together with the full text of the Treaty as signed in Lisbon in December 2007

By Anthony and Andrew Cowgill

British Management Data
Foundation Pbk 446 pp

Available from *The June Press*
Price £27.50 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 978 0 9558262 0 7

renamed the “High Representative for the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy”.

- Definition and separation of competences.
- The legislative procedure for the ordinary and special legislative procedures.
- Role of the national parliaments under the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.
- Number of commissioners to be reduced to two thirds of the number of Member States.
- Confirmation of the Commission's sole right to initiate legislation.
- Definition of the voting procedures for qualified majority voting.

About the only good thing in the Lisbon Treaty is the article on *Voluntary Withdrawal from the Union* (Article 50 TEU). The Cowgill's comments on this (page xiii) deserve to be widely-read:

Any Member State may decide to withdraw from the Union and the process of withdrawal would be expected to take up to two years. Before the Treaty comes into force, Member States are in theory able to

withdraw under the terms of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 27th January 1980.

The new provisions appear to make the process of withdrawing from the Union a difficult process and would involve a complicated combination of national law, European law and international law, together with a lengthy negotiation period. The process of withdrawal would itself need a Treaty to define the terms of both the separation and the new relationship.

Under the terms of the Article, which is not changed from the draft Constitution, the Council is able to act by qualified majority on the conditions of the agreement with the Member State leaving the Union. There are no provisions laid down on how the negotiations for withdrawal would take place and over what period, or what the nature of the relationship would be after withdrawal. In addition, there are no provisions for withdrawal from the Single Currency in the Article.

Their comments on another crucial area, the Charter of Fundamental Rights, are also pertinent:

There are concerns over the structure of the Charter, in that it has some contradictions and uncertainties, in particular the potential conflict between individual rights and the common good, which would need to be decided by the national and European courts. For example, the right to strike is included in Article 28 and this could lead to the (European) Court of Justice overruling the UK's industrial legislation. The impact of the Charter will only be properly assessed when test cases are brought before the Court of Justice.

The authors then point out that the Court of Justice has already begun to refer to the Charter in its judgements, even though the Charter does not yet have legal effect. They list eight cases where this has already happened.

And, in a section on the British

There's only one Nicolas Sarkozy

It is a truth universally acknowledged that a political leader who is flagging in the polls is apt to remind the world of his passionate interest in soccer by having his photo taken with a famous player or manager. It therefore came as no surprise that the Prime Minister and the French President should have chosen to stage part of the Anglo-French summit at the Emirates Football stadium. The following is an extract of a conversation which took place between Arsenal football manager Arsene Wenger and two political leaders who are flagging in the polls:

President Sarkozy: Arsene, my dear compatriot, may I congratulate you on your huge contribution in promoting understanding between the British and French peoples and for breaking down traditional Anglo-Saxon suspicions of continental Europe and its ways?

Wenger: Monsieur le President, you are most kind. But honesty requires me to acknowledge that is not how matters are viewed in White Hart Lane! Admiration for what I may have

achieved does not extend far beyond London N5.

President Sarkozy: But you have imported into Britain players of genius - Henry, Pires, Petit, Anelka - symbols of French flair and creativity. And in doing so you have transformed the British game of soccer. If only I could achieve as much in the political field!

Wenger: Mais, oui, Monsieur le President, but then you have much less promising human material with which to work!

The Prime Minister: Unkind, Arsene, unkind. But I would like to add my own praise for your unique achievements, and, as a passionate soccer fan, to ask a question: What is your preferred playing formation?

Wenger: I do not like to be tied to rigid formulae, but I must admit to harbouring a certain respect for the 4-2-4 system.

President Sarkozy: As a mere fan, I hesitate to contradict do you, but I

think you will find that 4-3-5 has certain advantages

The Prime Minister: But that would require a team of 13 players! Football is a game played between teams of 11 players.

President Sarkozy: My dear Gordon, I yield to no one in my admiration for the British sense of fair play and the British respect for the rules. To no one! But respect for the rules must be interpreted in a way that allows a role for the creative imagination. Think of the CAP for instance and the infinite variety of purposes to which it has been put. So don't be so literal. Just imagine what could be accomplished with a football team possessing two goalkeepers instead of one and an additional striker!

Wenger: Truly, there is only one Nicolas Sarkozy. But why is it that political leaders only show an interest in soccer when they are behind in the opinion polls?

Norwegians still reject EU

Most Norwegians would still vote "no" if asked whether their country should finally join the European Union. A new public opinion poll indicates that 54.3 per cent of Norwegians are opposed to EU membership. That level of opposition has been fairly steady for the past few months, reports the newspaper *Nationen* on 18th March 2008.

The poll was conducted by research firm Sentio for *Nationen* and *Klassekampen* (both of which have been editorially anti-EU for years) and *DagenMagazinet*.

The poll showed 35.1 per cent of Norwegians favour EU membership, while 11 per cent are undecided. That's the portion of the population that would provide the swing vote if a new

referendum on EU membership were to be held.

There are no signs of that happening, however. The current centre-left government, which contains parties that disagree themselves on EU membership, has no plans to take up the issue any time soon. Norwegians have turned down EU membership twice.

Continued from p.3

A book that will enable citizens to fight back

government's famous "Red Lines", they observe:

Ultimately, the red lines have to be tested in the Court of Justice.

Readers of *eurofacts* will be able to guess how that "Court" will rule when

the time comes.

The Lisbon Treaty, if ratified, will be the true Constitution of the United Kingdom. For 99.9 per cent of British citizens it will be utterly incomprehensible. That is its whole point. The legal profession must be

salivating at the prospect of yet more highly-paid fees "earned" in guiding ordinary mortals through the Treaty's dense undergrowth. The Cowgill's' extraordinary achievement is to have produced an analysis which will enable citizens of this country to fight back.

Brown devaluation against euro gathers momentum

But sterling remains in lock-step with the US dollar

Eurofacts (p.5, 25th January 2008) warned of turbulence ahead for the British economy. On 17th March 2008 the pound sunk sharply to £1 = 1.27, representing a 14.3 per cent devaluation compared with the value on 6th September 2007 of £1 = 1.48. In percentage terms the Brown devaluation of sterling against the euro has now exceeded the Major devaluation of 1992/3, of the pound versus the Deutschmark, following sterling's exit from the ERM.

Many europhile politicians and

journalists, and businessmen whose businesses depend on parroting the government line, continue to assert that British prosperity relies principally on UK trade with "Europe" (and thus that any change in the UK - EU relationship is unthinkable). However, the interesting thing about sterling's behaviour over the last few months is that the pound has remained in lock-step with the US dollar. On the day of its latest plunge against the euro, 17th March 2008, the pound bought precisely \$2.00, more or less where it has been for the last year

or so, as the table shows.

This extremely close coupling of sterling/dollar continues to reflect the reality - so uncomfortable for Europhiles - that despite 35 years of EU political "integration" the British economy is still overwhelmingly integrated with the world outside the EU, in particular with the official and non-official members of the global dollar zone.

As we went to press, one pound bought 1.267 and \$1.975.

Pound, Dollar & Euro Average Exchange Rates									
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
£ buys \$	1.62	1.52	1.44	1.50	1.63	1.83	1.82	1.84	2.00
£ buys	1.52	1.64	1.61	1.59	1.45	1.47	1.46	1.47	1.46
buys \$	1.07	0.92	0.90	0.95	1.13	1.24	1.24	1.26	1.37

Source: ECB Monthly Bulletins, January 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007

Whistleblower to reveal more MEPs' secrets

Just when it looked as if MEPs might finally have been shamed into accepting reforms to the system under which they claim expenses, fresh revelations about the extent of abuses has come to light.

On 26th March members of the EP's budget control committee passed sweeping changes which would make it more difficult to employ family members. This followed an audit which showed widespread abuses. Details of findings, however, were kept from the public.

But on the same day as the committee backed the proposed reforms, Paul van

Buitenen, the former Commission whistleblower who is now a Dutch MEP said on his website he had been contacted by MEPs' assistants and former assistants alleging further irregularities.

In a letter to members of the budget control committee Mr Buitenen said the allegations included the faking of MEPs details of address in order to boost allowances, faked signatures in order to qualify for the attendance allowance and the invention of meetings to create attendance lists. He also alleged that kickback payments were made to MEPs by service

providers.

"The whole system is rotten", he said.

Mr Buitenen said that he was still compiling the information which had been passed to him before submitting this to the President of the EU Parliament Hans-Gert Pöttering.

Meanwhile, a number of observers expressed doubt about whether the proposed reforms will ever be adopted.

"I can not see turkeys voting for Christmas. Many very powerful MEPs with the best networking skills will do everything to stop this", one EU official told the *Daily Telegraph* on 27th March.

Lisbon Treaty completes 'EU tool box'

"If the Treaty of Lisbon is ratified and implemented, and devolution to Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland continues apace, in fifteen to twenty years time, this House of Commons will have only two functions - one will be to raise taxes, and the other will be to authorise war..."

"My fundamental misgiving of the

Lisbon Treaty is that in terms of checks and balances, it has completed the tool box, with the exception of defence and taxation, so that if the EU wishes to do something in any member state, it can use one tool or another, whether it's legislation, or whether it's court cases, you name it - it can now do it. Because it is either shared competence, or it is

by co-decision, it can always do it now... We are making fewer and fewer decisions that matter... I can't tell my constituents where the buck stops."

Gisela Stuart speaking at a meeting of the Fabian Society in London on 31st March 2008.

LETTERS

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

Without Fear the EU would collapse

Dear Sir,

Your article, "Life After the EU" (7th March), assumes that Britain must join some trading block, like EFTA or EEA, after quitting. Britain is the only developed nation to have introduced free trade. Our trading power derives from one of the largest import markets in the world. Fear has made us believe that exports from Britain can be barred from the trading blocks. Fear has made us believe that the EU is a protective blanket under which we must snuggle while Mr Mandelson negotiates our fortune with big players.

Trade is a reciprocal process like breathing in and breathing out; imports and exports are inter-dependent. Traders engaged in exporting to Britain know that in order for that to continue, exports for producers in Britain have to be admitted.

The fear that three million jobs in Britain depend on the EU is a facile notion. If that be the case at least three million residents in the EU depend on exports to Britain. Are they going to remain silent while Mandelson blocks exports from Britain?

Remove the fear that has acted from the start as the cement holding the EU together and it will collapse in a heap of rubble.

MALCOLM HILL
London

A Single Phone Number?

Dear Sir,

Surely the most interesting quotation from your account of Kissinger's interview with *Der Spiegel* was:

Spiegel: 'Thirty years ago you asked for one phone number that could be used to call Europe.'

Kissinger: 'And it happened.'

One wonders what that telephone

number is and where it is located?
ANTHONY SCHOLEFIELD
London

Bishops and the EU

Dear Sir,

In Lord Willoughby de Broke's excellent analysis of the Members of the House of Lords' position regarding the EU Constitution (Reform Treaty) he explains why so many will oppose a referendum because their pensions and salaries derive from the EU, and that a good number have reneged on their oath of loyalty to the Sovereign in favour of an oath of loyalty to the EU. I may be able to help him on his comment: '*The position of the Bishops is unclear*'.

In 1998 the Labour Government launched 'the Democratic Renewable Debate' and in the same year enacted the Regional Development Agencies Act (1998). The Act brought about the establishment of Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) in each of the English Regions.

With the encouragement of the RDAs, those supporting regionalisation held meetings called Constitutional Conventions. Their aim was to convince people living within a region that they believed in a regional identity.

The Church of England took a leading role in this process. Chairmen of Constitutional Conventions were the Bishop of Durham (North East); the Bishop of Liverpool (North West); the Bishop of Birmingham (West Midlands); the Bishop of Exeter (South West) and the Bishop of St. Albans (Eastern).

As a practising member of the Church of England I assumed that the Bishops naively thought that the EU was a vehicle for bringing people together - 'come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven' - rather than its true aim, as Mr Barroso recently admitted, of creating an empire.

In 1996, the newsletter of the Church

of England's organisation '*Christianity and the Future of Europe*' reported that it had received in the previous four years, annual grants of between ECU 5,000 - 9,000 from the Secretariat General of the EU, plus a grant of ECU 20,000 from the EU's 'Soul for Europe' programme. Less charitable people than myself concluded that the Church's participation was for financial gain.

On 21st March 2001 the House of Lords discussed the possibility of introducing English Devolution to match that already established in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The debate was initiated by the Bishop of Durham, with the Bishops of Wakefield and Hereford also present in support. It must be remembered that Bishops have sworn an oath of allegiance to the Sovereign and that Article 37 of the 39 Articles governing the Church of England states that: '*The sovereign has the chief power in the realm of England and his (or her) other possessions. The supreme government of all in this realm, whatever their station, whether ecclesiastical and civil, and in all matters, belongs to him (her) and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction*'.

The Bishops' support for the EU continues to this day. On 28th February this year (2008) the keynote message to emerge from the plenary assembly of the Commission of the Bishops' Conference of the European Community (COMECE) was that the 'aims and meaning' of the European project remain unanswered. A COMECE spokesman said the plenary had given Bishops the chance to reflect on the "fundamental" question of how citizens' support for the EU can be mobilised and how this might be "translated" into 'concrete' goals.

It is clear that the Bishops' support for the EU is treasonable and unless they see the light fairly soon and start 'treading the narrow way', it is most likely that they will oppose a referendum.

BRYAN SMALLEY
Hertfordshire

MEETINGS

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 Rodriques, *New York University*

PUBLIC MEETING

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

Followed by a Seminar on;

Thursday **17th April** 1.00 - 3.00 pm
(For attendees from lecture on 16th)

SEMINAR - Reservations required
Barnard's Hall Inn Hall, London
[Refreshments available afterwards]

**Campaign for an
English Parliament**
07779 338343

Saturday **26th April**, 10.30 am

“The future of England”

An open one-day conference on the
future of England post-devolution

Speakers include:

Ed Abrams, *English Democratic Party*
Professor Hugo de Burgh, *Professor of Journalism, University of Westminster*

Frank Field MP, *Labour, Birkenhead*
Simon Lee, *Department of Politics & International Studies, Hull University*
Bob Peedle MBE, *Royal Society of St George*

Canon Kenyon Wright CBE,
Executive Chair, Scottish Constitutional Convention

ONE DAY CONFERENCE

Conway Hall, 25 Red Lion Square,
Holborn, London WC1R 4RL

Admission Free

(Tickets from CEP, Rea Bank, Weir Road, Hanwood, Shrewsbury SY5 8LA)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **29th April**, 12.30 pm

“Countering Extremism and the Politics of ‘Engagement’”

This conference will survey the range of government responses to extremism and terrorism.

Professor Gwen Griffith-Dickson,
Director, The Lokahi Foundation and Fellow of Gresham College

PUBLIC MEETING

Allen & Overy, 40 Bank Street,
Docklands

Admission Free
(Reservations required)

**British Weights and Measures
Association**
020 8922 0089

Saturday **17th May**, 2.00 pm

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

(AGM in morning)
The Victory Services Club, 63 Seymour Street, London W2 2HF
(near Marble Arch)

Admission Free

The Runnymede Project
01746 769103

Friday/Sunday **16-18th May**

“The last throw of the dice?”

Agenda:

1. How did we get here?
2. What can we look forward to?
3. Setting a road map
4. A New Constitution

CONFERENCE MEETING

Barnes Close, Bromsgrove,
Worcestershire

Admission Free

(Further details - Frank Taylor, 11 Andrew Evans House, Innage Lane, Bridgnorth, Shropshire WV16 4HQ)

FREE

Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

euofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65
or Email: euofacts@junepress.com

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Wednesday **26th April**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the Common Fisheries Policy* from Sam Lambourn, North Western Waters Regional Advisory Councils (RACs).

Tuesday **29th April**, 11.10 am
Evidence will be heard on *Systematics and Taxonomy* from Witnesses to be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2008

Commonwealth Day **14th April**

Europe Day **9th May**

Irish Referendum on Lisbon Treaty **June**

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

UKIP National Conference Bournemouth **5/6th September**

European Reform Treaty to be Ratified **December**

2009

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

European Parliamentary Elections **11th June**

Thinker Tailor Soldier Spy

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

The Treaty of Lisbon in Perspective

by *Anthony & Andrew Cowgill* **£27.50**
Detailed analysis and review together with the full text of the Treaty as signed in Lisbon in December 2007.

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.

A New Dawn for Britain

by *Graham Booth*. **£5.00**
A collection of poems, poking fun at politics, nature and miscellany.

Gordon Is A Moron

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£9.99**
Analysis of Brown's Chancellorship.

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.

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.

The Principles of British Foreign Policy

by *Philip Vander Elst*. **£4.00**
Should British Foreign Policy reflect any political principles or should it merely be shaped by current conceptions of national self-interest, which may change?

Dead In The Water

by *Tom Wise MEP*. **£3.00**
How the Common Fisheries Policy destroys lives, economies and environments. Tom Wise is a UKIP MEP for the Eastern Counties.

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**

FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE

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	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006