

Business tax harmonisation: the new drive for integration

Gordon Brown's strategy on the Lisbon Treaty has weakened his ability to resist measures which could lead to a European tax cartel - a kind of OPEC for politicians

Gordon Brown's credentials as a closet eurosceptic have always been suspect but whatever remained of them they finally perished during the passage of the European Amendment Bill through the Commons. During the debate on the Bill, Brown remained silent about his much-vaunted reservations on the EU's approach to economic issues, its inefficient and inflexible labour markets and the need for market-based reform. Brown's strategy was simply to depict Cameron and his party as rabidly anti-European and to present disagreements over the Treaty as a clash between pro and anti-EU parties.

Successful Stratagem

As part of his drive to get the Bill through the House this stratagem was entirely successful, but it has inevitably left the Government less able to resist pressures for further EU integration. Having denied that the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty would be followed by further integrationist measures - further such steps would be off the agenda for at least a decade, he claimed - Brown is poorly placed to raise his voice against the integrationist measures that are being now vigorously pursued even before the ratification process has been completed. As far as possible, he pretends it isn't happening.

However, as we pointed out in our issue of 7th March, the French

government is energetically promoting measures to harmonise and integrate the armed forces of member states. Hervé Morin, the French defence minister, who is backing plans for the creation of a 60,000 intervention force (comprising troops from Britain, France, Spain, Italy and Poland) has said that defence integration will be at the top of the agenda when France takes over the rotating presidency of the EU in July. French newspapers have reported that the British government is expected to accept the proposals once British ratification is complete.

It is now clear that another top French priority will be the harmonisation of business taxes - a goal which the UK, in common with Ireland and the Baltic states, all of which have relatively low tax rates, have always resisted.

Impact Assessment

The EU Commission is known to have set up a working group with national experts to work on calculations of a corporate tax base acceptable to all countries. According to the *EUobserver* on 8th April Brussels is also awaiting the results of an impact assessment report.

"It has been going on a long time but this is one issue that we are determined to push", Christine Lagarde the French economy minister told reporters following a forum on tax issues organised by the Commission.

Lagarde was also quoted as saying that she and the British Chancellor Alastair Darling *"greatly hope to make significant progress on this matter"*.

Ms Lagarde has since been rebuked by Hans-Gert Pöttering, the President of the EU Parliament for being open and *"undiplomatic"* by giving honest warning of her intentions ahead of the Irish referendum. Dick Roche, the Irish foreign minister described her remarks as *"untimely, unhelpful and inappropriate"*.

The core of the proposal being drawn up by the tax commissioner Laszlo Kovacs is that the profits of businesses operating in more than one EU state should be calculated according to a single EU-wide formulae. Profits would then be reallocated to countries in which the businesses are active, to be taxed at the tax rates of those countries. But he is also considering consolidation measures which could see profits being allocated between countries using indicators such as size of payroll, value of asset base and so-called *"sales factor"* whereby a portion of a company's profits go to the state where the consumer buys the product rather than the state where the firm is based.

Politically Explosive

It is easy to see why the tax harmonisation plans - which have the firm backing of Germany as well as

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: Wine-maker faces fines for 'wrong-shaped bottles' p.2 - Irish referendum: don't knows are multiplying p.2 - Lisbon Treaty: Slovakia is ninth country to sign p.2 - How many of our laws originate in Brussels? p.3 - Doctors' training threatened by European hours limits p.4 - New Zealand shows the way p.4 - EU carbon emissions scheme p.5 - EU president to get jet and palace p.5 - Britain to be excluded from leadership role p.5

Winemaker faces fines for 'wrong-shaped bottles'

An award-winning Wine-maker whose wares are sold at royal palaces is facing a £30,000 bill after European bureaucrats ruled that he was using the wrong-shaped bottles.

Jerry Schooler, who sells 400,000 bottles of fruit wines and mead a year, has been threatened with prosecution over his determination to use traditional measurements.

The proprietor of the Lurgashall Winery in West Sussex, has been told

to halt the sale of beverages such as mead, silver birch wine and bramble liqueur in 75cl and 37.5cl bottles. If he continues to sell them, he could be taken to court under a new EU directive that permits the sale of such products in 70cl, 50cl or 35cl measures only.

The threat from trading standards has concerned Mr Schooler, whose fruit wines and liqueurs have been produced for 24 years and are sold in

establishments such as Hampton Court and the Tower of London.

Mr Schooler now faces costs of about £30,000 to change his production line. "We are going to have to change all our bottling, the labels, machinery, boxes and maybe the corks as well and it is going to cost me thousands to do it", he said. Source: *The Times*, 25th March 2008.

Irish referendum: don't knows are multiplying

Nearly two thirds of Irish voters are undecided about how they will vote in the referendum on the Lisbon Treaty compared to one third two

months ago. The latest poll findings were published in the *Irish Sun* on 15th April. These showed that 60 per cent have not decided how to vote, 12 per

cent will vote no and 28 per cent will vote for the Treaty. The referendum will take place in the second week of June.

Lisbon Treaty: Slovakia is ninth country to sign

On 10th April Slovakia became the ninth European Union country to ratify the Lisbon Treaty. Other EU

member states which have completed the ratification process are Bulgaria, France, Hungary, Malta, Romania,

Slovenia, Austria, and Poland.

Continued from p.1

Drive to harmonise business taxes

France - should be so explosive politically. Business tax rates are significantly higher in France, Germany and Belgium than they are in Britain but almost three times higher than in Ireland which has the lowest corporation tax rate - 12.5 per cent - in the EU. This has been a major factor in attracting the record levels of inward investment that has poured into Ireland in recent years and which in turn has resulted in a rapid increase in national wealth and rising living standards.

"A common corporate tax rate would destroy the Irish economy", Declan Ganley, the president of Libertas, a new group which is opposing the Lisbon Treaty has been widely quoted as saying.

A common corporate tax base would also be bad for Britain, which is gradually losing some of its appeal to foreign investors, as well personally embarrassing to Brown who always maintained that there would be no British concessions in this area. The rates for eight leading economies are given in the table opposite.

Comparative Business Tax Rates

Ireland	12.50%
Netherlands	25.00%
United Kingdom	30.00%
China	33.00%
Belgium	33.99%
France	34.43%
Germany	38.60%
USA	39.50%

Source: *Deloitte and Touche*, 2007

When tax competition between states exists politicians face pressure to keep tax rates competitive in order to discourage investors, entrepreneurs and workers from moving to a lower tax environment. When Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan slashed tax rates 20 years ago tremendous pressure was applied on other states to follow suit in order to stem the flow of jobs and capital to Britain and the US. The result was a reduction in tax rates in almost every country in the world.

The aim of the EU is effectively to

reduce and ultimately to reverse that process in order to create a tax cartel - in effect an OPEC for politicians.

Gordon Brown no doubt wishes that the issue would go away. He cannot publicly cave in on the matter. It is possible that he will pretend that what is being proposed does not amount to harmonisation at all but is simply a means of bringing a measure of clarity and rationalisation to Europe's tax affairs. It is also entirely possible that he will combine with the Irish and with other EU-member states with low business taxes to veto the proposals which are likely to emerge during the second half of this year. But if he does so the pattern of past events suggests that it is virtually inevitable that he will concede sovereignty elsewhere - that indeed is the story of British membership of the European Union. That story also suggests that when France and Germany strongly back an EU proposal which Britain doesn't care for - as they do in the case of business taxes - they get their way in the long term, if not the short.

So, how many laws do originate in Brussels?

Prospect magazine has suggested that less than one in ten of our laws are EU-made but the official figures on which its claim is based demonstrates no such thing

An example of sloppy and biased journalism at its worst can be found in the April edition of the monthly magazine *Prospect*. Its “News and Curiosities” column reports that “one of the most enduring myths about the EU is that it enables meddling technocrats to burden us with pointless rules and regulations”.

Prospect ridicules this obviously absurd and exaggerated claim. In support it cites the “neutral” House of Commons library which, it says, has shown that the proportion of all UK legislation originating in Brussels is less than 10 per cent. Mr Richard

Corbett, the deputy leader of the Labour group in the European Parliament, has made similar claims, citing the same impeccable source.

A telephone call to the House of Commons library reveals that the basis for this claim is *EU Legislation, Standard Note SN/IA/288* written by Vaughne Miller of the Library’s International Affairs Section; this was last updated in 2007.

This, however, shows no such thing. What it does show is that over the previous seven parliamentary sessions the number of statutory instruments laid under the European Communities

Act 1972 represents about nine per cent of the total number of statutory instruments laid before Parliament during this period.

This however is only a relatively small part of the picture.

EU Directives have to be transposed into national law, and in the UK that is often done by means of statutory instruments.

EU Regulations, however, are directly applicable, automatically becoming new laws in the UK. Sometimes it is necessary to amend existing law, but often the EU

Continued on p.4

Year	Commission	Council	Totals	Grand Total
2000	38 directives	43 directives (inc. 18 with EP)	81	1450
	606 regulations	182 regulations (inc.34 with EP)	788	
	557 decisions	24 decisions (inc.4 with EP)	581	
2001	18 directives	45 directives (inc.15 with EP)	63	1496
	600 regulations	152 regulations (inc.3 with EP)	752	
	651 decisions	30 decisions (inc.3 with EP)	681	
2002	44 directives	149 directives (inc.36 with EP)	193	1626
	602 regulations	164 regulations (inc 24 with EP)	766	
	610 decisions	57 decisions (inc.6 with EP)	667	
2003	61 directives	60 directives (inc.8 with EP)	121	1557
	648 regulations	189 regulations (inc. 35 with EP)	837	
	560 decisions	39 decisions (inc.9 with EP)	599	
2004	59 directives	48 directives (inc.31 with EP)	107	1477
	672 regulations	186 regulations (inc.40 with EP)	858	
	468 decisions	44 decisions (inc.4 with EP)	512	
2005	54 directives	62 directives (inc.26 EP)	116	1534
	599 regulations	134 regulations (inc.19 with EP)	733	
	634 decisions	51 decisions (inc.14with EP)	685	
2006	76 directives	101 directives (inc.38 with EP)	177	3255
	1,795 regulations	238 regulations (inc.43with EP)	2,033	
	781 decisions	264 decisions (inc.21 with EP)	1,045	

Doctors' training threatened by European hours limits

Junior doctors fear their training will suffer when European limits on working time are applied next year, according to two separate surveys published by the BMA on 10th April, 2008.

From 1st August 2009, the European Working Time Directive will restrict the time junior doctors can spend in hospital to 48 hours a week. The current limit is 56.

Two in three (64 per cent) junior doctors surveyed by the BMA believed compliance with the 48 hour working week would have a negative overall effect on their training. When asked what concerned them most about the 48 hour limit, a third (33 per cent) said it was the impact on the quality of

training, and a further third (32 per cent) identified its impact on their ability to gain the skills necessary to practise safely.

Mr Ram Moorthy, chairman of the BMA Junior Doctors Committee, said: *"The 48-hour limit is coming, and it will have a massive impact. Our training has to get far better if we're going to continue to produce the best quality of doctors. We need to look at the possibility of lengthening the amount of time it takes to qualify as a consultant"*.

The survey also shows widespread concern that the 48 hour week could, perversely, mean more anti-social working patterns while reducing pay.

Respondents commented that *"Pay will be reduced whilst we work bizarre and complex rotas"* and *"We will end up working extra hours but only be paid for 48"*.

The BMA has published *'The Final Countdown'* - a guidance document advising junior doctors of their rights as their employers rush to change their working patterns.

A second survey - of BMA members at all levels - suggests that junior doctors' fears are shared by the wider medical profession. Over half (57 per cent) did not believe it would be possible to train a doctor adequately in any speciality whilst complying with the limits.

New Zealand shows the way

On 9th April 2008 New Zealand, a country of just over four million people, became the first Western Country to sign a Free Trade Agreement ("FTA") with China.

As a result of this agreement, around a third of all New Zealand goods exports to China will bear no tariffs at all by the year-end. Another third will be tariff-free in five years, with most of

the remainder being tariff-free by 2019. In the other direction, New Zealand tariffs on Chinese imports will disappear by 2016. The agreement covers agricultural and fisheries produce as well as industrial goods, and also provides for limited free movement of labour.

All of which shows that the last thing a country needs to negotiate FTAs with

even huge and powerful counter-parties is the alleged "safety-in-numbers" of belonging to an outfit like the EU. Perhaps the British Prime Minister should ask himself how it is that little New Zealand can do better than Commissioner Mandelson (no stranger to China) and his legions of highly-paid *fonctionnaires* in Brussels.

Continued from p.3

How many laws are made in Brussels?

Parliament does not even see them.

According to the briefing note, in 2006, the EU issued 177 directives but very many more Regulations - 2,033 (see table on p.3.).

In addition there were more than one thousand Decisions; these would also have shaped British policy and legislation.

Mr Miller says that it is impossible to give an accurate answer to the question of how many laws originate in Brussels because such laws might have been introduced by the UK on its own account and because existing EU law might adequately cover all or parts of EU law.

This explanation, which repeats similar intellectual sophistry by the

former Europe minister Denis MacShane, is unconvincing. Complex matters such as legislation can often be measured in different ways and different methods will yield slightly different results - but providing the assumptions behind the calculations are clearly stated there is no reason why meaningful and often revealing data cannot be provided.

Reputable sources in Germany, France and Finland have suggested that the proportion of their laws which began their life in Brussels is around 80 per cent. The German President Roman Herzog has said statistics from the German Ministry of Justice show that the precise figure is 84 per cent. There is no particular reason for

thinking that the figure would be significantly lower in the UK.

In declining to answer the question the House of Commons Library Staff has evidently decided that obfuscation is the better part of valour. However, we are very much indebted to it, for listing the total number of Directives, Regulations, and Decisions passed by the Council and Commission since 1980. A cursory glance at the statistics, the most recent of which are published in the accompanying table (page 3), is sufficient to conclude that *Prospect* has been talking piffle and Mr Corbett owes his constituents an apology for having seriously misled them.

EU carbon emissions scheme 'will destroy £59 billion oil and refining industry'

The EU's scheme to force companies to pay for carbon emission permits previously handed out free threatens to destroy Europe's petrochemical and refining industry.

The warning has come from Jeroen van der Veer, the chief executive of Royal Dutch Shell. Mr van der Veer told *The Times* on 15th April that the EU needed to be careful not to trigger an exodus of European jobs and investment offshore with no net reduction in global emissions.

Speaking in The Hague, he said that the proposals would undermine the competitiveness of a struggling industry and have a cascading impact on Europe's wider economy because of the close links between the region's oil, chemicals and plastics industries, which collectively support nearly two million jobs.

He said: "In the past 20 years the refining industry in Europe has been very difficult.... But if we have additional penalties because we move away from a system of free allocations to a large extent, then in such a marginal industry that is a real

problem".

In January the European Commission announced measures designed to cut EU emissions of CO₂ by 20 per cent of 1990 levels by 2020. One of the cornerstones was a reform of the emissions trading scheme (ETS), which allocates a free, fixed quota of emission permits to heavy industry.

The Commission has proposed that from 2013 oil refineries and airlines, and possibly other sectors, will have to pay for 20 per cent of their emissions permits, rising to 100 per cent by 2020. It hopes to formalise the plan by the end of the year.

Mr van der Veer said that a level playing field for industry was critical if the ETS were to succeed in cutting emissions. He said: "If the regional block is big enough, then that is OK. But it gets very difficult for energy-intensive industries. What will happen if you have to buy auction rights inside EU but not outside?"

He claimed that Europe's oil-refining industry, which employs about 100,000 people directly and represents 18 per cent of global refining capacity, should

be rewarded, not punished, for the progress that it has made to enhance energy efficiency.

"In Europe our industry is already quite efficient", Mr van der Veer said, "and if [it] is more energy-efficient than elsewhere, then you should not drive that industry away. Maybe we need to benchmark EU industry with the outside world. If it is energy-efficient, you should get a lot of free allocations.... You have to start with lots of free allocations to get the system to work. Then, over time, you can tighten the measures". He indicated that the global nature of the oil and chemicals industries would force them towards lower-cost regions. Shell has sold three of its refineries in France because of concerns over profitability.

"The industries are very international", he said. "A lot of our refining is Middle Eastern oil, a lot of which is then exported to the US."

Europe's petrochemicals industry has an annual turnover of 74 billion (£59 billion), according to the European producers' association.

EU President to get jet and palace

The President of the European Union is to be given a personal jet, a palatial official residence and a personal staff of up to 22, under plans being considered in Brussels.

The prospect of a private aircraft raises the possibility that Tony Blair, the current front-runner for the new post, which comes into effect next year, could get the "Blair Force One" he was denied as prime minister.

The terms of the new president were

discussed at a secret "working dinner" held on 10th April between José Manuel Barroso, the European Commission president, and EU ambassadors according to the following day's issue of the *Daily Telegraph*. One attraction of the job will be its clout in terms of the "cabinet" of advisers the new president will be able to assemble. Current proposals suggest an EU presidential team of between 16 and 22 people.

Such a number would be an important measure of the power of the position. In comparison, Mr Barroso presides over a cabinet of 13 people.

Other EU member states, including federalist countries keen to give the post an aura of gravitas - and even statehood - have urged that the new president be granted an official "White House" style residence worthy of his status.

Britain to be excluded from leadership role

"Tony Blair, former head of the British government, will probably never be President of the European Council, despite his talents and his incontestable charisma. It is now given that this post must go to someone from

a member state which is at the heart of the EU - in other words one which applies all the community policies and which has already or will adopt the euro. And that is also true for the President of the Commission. Which

therefore excludes leadership posts for Britain, Sweden, Denmark, Ireland and Poland."

Libération journalist Jean Quatremer on his blog, *Coulisses de Bruxelles*.

LETTERS

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

Better Green than Blue

Dear Sir,
Thinking ahead to the 2009 elections for the EU Parliament, I am presently minded to vote for the Greens. As an alternative to spoiling my ballot paper, or not voting at all.

In the past I have voted UKIP. But while Nigel Farage is a good leader in the sense that he can inspire members to follow him, he then leads them up the garden path.

I read that UKIP will once again be fighting local elections in a neighbouring area, having done zilch to fight the Lisbon Treaty, and I feel that it is time for him to go.

I cannot vote Conservative, because while I am content for Daniel Hannan to be an MEP my vote for him would also be a vote for his federalist colleague James Elles, under the iniquitous closed-list system imposed by Tony Blair on behalf of the EU.

I note that David Cameron has not said that he would change that system, and indeed he has compounded its evils by rigging the selection of the Tory candidates.

I cannot vote Labour or Liberal Democrat, as I know that any patriots in those parties will be excluded from the lists. Nor can I vote BNP, as I strongly object to their idea that loyal fellow citizens should be invited to "go home" because of their skin colour.

So it looks like the Greens. True, some of them are weird people, with weird beliefs; but they have opposed corruption in the EU, and they do talk about democracy.

Better to have Dr Caroline Lucas in the EU Parliament, than a sneaky Tory federalist.

Dr D R COOPER
Berkshire

Post Office Closures

Dear Sir,
In an attempt to justify another round of post office closures, ministers highlight the loss of 4 million weekly customers in the past few years. Which is hardly a surprise, but rather the

natural consequence of the abolition of pension books in 2005.

In 2000 a government report pointed out that about two thirds of benefits were being paid over a post office counter, in excess of £60 billion a year. 18 million recipients were still using post offices, and while the handling charges were below one per cent they totalled £400 million, a third of the annual revenue of the post office network.

Although there had been a gradual drift towards direct payment into bank accounts, many people still found it far more convenient to get cash at their local post office.

So when this government decided that all recipients should be compelled to "migrate" to direct payment, it took that decision knowing perfectly well that this would have a devastating effect on the post offices.

Why? That remains something of a mystery, but here is one plausible theory: because the traditional payment system gave a hidden state subsidy to post offices, and the EU Commission was about to challenge it under Single Market rules on free competition.

MURIEL PARSONS
Berkshire

Good Thing or Bad?

Dear Sir,
In Ian Milne's review of "The Treaty of Lisbon in Perspective" he remarks, "About the only good thing in the Lisbon Treaty is the article on Voluntary Withdrawal from the Union" (article 50 TEU).

Surely, as the Cowgills explain, this is a very bad thing!

Under the existing arrangements we can withdraw overnight, should our elected representatives so decide, through a simple Act of Parliament.

Under Lisbon any nation wishing to withdraw is put into limbo for two years whilst the 'partners' decide what sanctions and humiliations to heap upon the heretic and which assets to plunder.

Far from being a 'good thing' Article 50 TEU is probably the worst trap

being laid by the architects of 'Le Grand Projet'.

BILL WOODHOUSE
Dorset

UKIP: Why Change the Name?

Dear Sir,
As the only political party unambiguously campaigning for British withdrawal from the European Union, I am astonished that there seems to be a move to change the name of the Party by dropping the word 'Party'.

I believe that the name is an immensely important asset and the last thing UKIP should do is to try to change it in any way.

"U.K.I.P" is now listed and defined as a word in the Compact Oxford English Dictionary, such is the extent to which it has become well-known and recognised, particularly since the 2004 Euro elections when a great deal of members' time and effort was expended in the "Say No" campaign. Millions who previously had no idea what "U.K.I.P" was or meant now do know.

Even if it were not a particularly good name in itself, the Party would be foolish to try to change it. The risk of confusing voters, particularly those who have little interest in or knowledge of political matters, might easily fail to realise that U.K.I.P is a political party and not another eurosceptic pressure group.

However, the name is an excellent one. It encapsulates the party's three aims:- **1** independence from the EU, **2** defending the sovereignty and integrity of the entire United Kingdom and, **3** that it is a political party seeking parliamentary and local representation and not a pressure group.

Finally, it has the immense advantage that its initials give an acronym "U.K.I.P" which fortuitously, makes a short, easily pronounced and distinctive word, which has become part of the language - as is shown by its inclusion in the dictionary.

JAMES MAY
Bedfordshire

MEETINGS

**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)

Meeting Space

eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65
Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

**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)

DIARY OF EVENTS

2008

Europe Day **9th May**

Irish Referendum on Lisbon Treaty **12th 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**

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Monday **28th April**, 3.30 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into Intergovernmental Action to Control the Spread of Infectious Diseases* from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control by video-link.

Monday **28th April**, 4.05 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the EU's 20% Renewable Energy Target* from a) Mr Allan Asher, Chief Executive, Energywatch;

b) Ms Nicola Pitts, Head of UK and EU Public Affairs; and Mr Lewis Dale, Regulatory Strategy Manager, National Grid;

c) Sir John Mogg, Chairman, and Mr Steve Smith, Managing Director of Markets, Ofgem.

Tuesday **29th April**, 11.10 am

Evidence will be heard on *Systematics and Taxonomy* from Witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **29th April**, 1.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the case for a British Bill of Rights* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **6th May**, 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on *Waste Reduction* from Mrs Gill Hobbs, Director of Resource Efficiency, Building Research Establishment Ltd (BRE); Mr Andrew Swain, UK Environmental Adviser, Aggregate Industries; and Mr Rainer Zimmann, Associate Director, Arup, other witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **7th May**, 10.45 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into Surveillance and Data Collection* from

a) Professor Dawn Oliver, Professor of Constitutional Law, and Professor Joerg Fedtke, University College London; and b) Hugh Tomlinson QC, Matrix Chambers.

Tuesday **13th May**, 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on *Waste Reduction* from Mrs Joan Ruddock MP, Defra; and Mr Ian Pearson MP, DUS.

Note:

Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning

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 *BMDF*. **£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

euofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£17
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"

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