

Euroscepticism is not dead, it is about to become fiercer

It is time for eurosceptic groups to raise their game and to hold the Tories to such promises of renegotiation as there have been, not to quit the field

Thanks to the hypocrisy and dishonesty of the Lib-Dems it looks almost inevitable that the Lords will ratify the Lisbon Treaty on Wednesday 11th June prior to a yes vote in the Irish referendum the following day. There is consequently no escaping the fact that in its central objective of forcing the British Government to keep its word on a referendum eurosceptics have failed. For the time being euroscepticism lacks credible goals as well as a coherent strategy to advance its long term objective of withdrawal from the political structures of the EU; the failure is a significant one.

Life Support Machine

Writing on his blog Richard North went as far as to announce the death of euroscepticism and even contemplated abandoning his role of eurosceptic blogger-in-chief:

“Euroscepticism is dead. It is not official yet, and the putative corpse is still breathing. If it was a human being, it would be on life support, showing no brain activity. The relatives would be gathering round, discussing when to switch off the machine and whether any of its organs could be suitable for donation”.

The irony is that euroscepticism, although still lacking political direction, is more pervasive in this country than it has ever been, while europhiles, although victorious, cannot help recognise that their fragile

triumph was only possible by betrayal and subterfuge and will never be widely celebrated.

More optimistic observers than North have suggested that while Treaty ratification may have marked the high-tide of Euro-federalism it also signalled a turning point. Writing in the *Daily Telegraph* on 26th May Ambrose Evans Pritchard commented:

“We are witnessing Europe’s Prague Spring ... the moment the EU loses its legitimacy. Yes, the system endures. The tribes acquiesce. But the idealism is draining away. Can anyone really claim that the Lisbon Treaty is rooted in the democratic assent of the French, Dutch, British, Danes, Swedes, Finns, Poles, and Czechs?”

Degree of Legitimacy

Evans Pritchard is right to point to the loss of legitimacy but the comparison with the Prague Spring is surely inapposite. The Prague Spring proved to some people the possibility of communism with a human face; the Soviet winter which took the form of military invasion followed by the suppression of free speech and assembly proved the contrary. At that moment Soviet communism lost whatever degree of legitimacy it possessed in the eyes of those who had hitherto deceived themselves about its true nature.

Is it optimistic to suppose we are at or near such a similar turning point in the public perception of the EU? Once the

treaty comes into force in January the architects of the European project will have no need to show restraint or inhibition. New vigour will be injected into the plans to step up the integration and harmonisation of Europe’s military forces with the aim of creating a European army; this will provide a golden opportunity for the Tories to make life still more difficult for the Prime Minister. Pressure on those countries with low business taxes such as Britain and more particularly, Ireland, will be stepped up, proving beyond any shadow of a doubt that the Irish voters were conned. The Foreign Office will have no reason to pretend that the new offices of the European external service are anything other than embassies (see *Letters*). The Commission will be more brazen in its promotion of further measures of integration; proposals that could not previously even be mentioned ahead of Treaty ratification will be brought out into the open with scant regard for Gordon Brown’s promises that there would be no more transfer of powers for a decade.

Clandestine Selection

Presiding over all of this will be a newly chosen head of European government whose clandestine selection will have been as far removed from democratic practise as could be imagined (so much so that even Giscard d’Estaing, the supreme

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: EU directive could lead to power blackouts p.2 - EP elections: could there be a date switch? p.2 - Europe ‘lying to world’s poorest countries’ p.3 - Soaring bill for EU immigration p.3 - Why Lord Wallace deserves the same punishment as Gypsy Nell p.4 - EU moves against eurosceptics in EP p.4 - Madhouse world of Brussels p.5 - MEPs block expenses transparency p.5

EU directive could lead to power blackouts

A quarter of Britain's electricity generating capacity could be lost and the country could suffer severe energy shortages as a result of a proposed EU directive, according to the Association of Electricity Producers.

The Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) tightens existing limits on the emissions of oxides of sulphur and nitrogen.

The Association has written to the Business Secretary John Hutton urging him to oppose the Directive which according to its director, David Porter, would threaten the future of the coal-fired power stations by creating "an un-bridgable generation gap" in the UK, which is currently struggling to

bring new generation on line to replace plants slated for decommissioning.

The Association says that to comply with the new limits would cost the industry £2.8 billion and that suppliers who could not recover the cost of installing the equipment would have to close.

"This is a scary example of bad regulation. Something that looks appealing to a bureaucrat threatens to have huge unintended consequences," Mr Porter told the *Independent* on 21st May.

The Association has taken its case to Defra and begun lobbying the European parliament

The purpose of the Directive is to incorporate six existing environmental

directives into one. In its existing form it would remove the flexibility written into the current regime as set out in the Large Combustion Plants Directive (LPCD) which came into force on 1st January this year.

The owners of coal-fired plants have invested billions in recent years, basing their plans on LPCD, the parameters of which provide for flexible emission targets. These allow coal-fired plants to be phased out gradually and to be used at times of maximum demand as "peaking plants" up until 2020.

The IED removes all flexibility, presenting companies with the choice of installing extremely expensive oxide reduction equipment by 2015 or closing down.

EP elections: could there be a date switch?

Given Gordon Brown's dire poll ratings it seems inevitable that the General Election will not come until 2010 - in which case Labour will still be in office when the elections to the European Parliament take place on 11th June 2009, irrespective of whether Mr Brown is still prime minister.

It is widely assumed that British local council elections will take place on the same day. This is because the two sets of elections were held simultaneously last time around in order to increase the humiliatingly low turn-out (24 per cent) at the 1999 EP elections. That stratagem worked: turnout increased to 37 per cent, although UKIP enjoyed its finest hour by beating the Lib-Dems into third place and claiming 17 per cent of the vote.

However, the assumption that the council and EP elections will again be held together is open to doubt.

The Government will no doubt wish

to do everything in its power to limit the political carnage that is almost universally expected among Labour candidates.

Rightly or wrongly, most analysts are forecasting that UKIP will steal fewer Tory votes and consequently poll less well than in 2004 and that this will contribute to the scale of the Tory successes.

All that being so Labour strategists may well conclude that any credible damage limitation exercise must involve recommending that a different date should be found for the local elections since Labour candidates would have nothing to gain by linking the two elections in the voters' minds. The strategists will naturally be more concerned about saving Mr Brown's political neck than boosting the legitimacy of the EP elections.

This might not suit Mr Cameron (although presently the only

uncertainty relates to the size of his expected triumph) but it might suit eurosceptics. In such circumstances the turnout at the EP election would probably slump to its 1999 levels or below; those with the greatest motivation to turn up and vote would be eurosceptics. Whether they choose to vote Tory or UKIP will depend very considerably on the pledges contained in the Conservative manifesto - and, having subjected them to the closest possible analysis and heard what Mr Cameron and Mr Hague have to say, the credibility that eurosceptics attach to them.

In its present mood of euphoria the Conservative leadership seems to believe that it can safely ignore 'Europe'; the EP elections might remind them that Europe is not an issue that is going to go away.

Continued from p.1

Euroscepticism is not dead

architect of the Lisbon Treaty, warned on 23rd May: "If nothing is done, and it looks as though that will be the case, then this will be the worst appointed leader in the world. There will be nothing to be proud of".

In Britain, where the government, as it stares into a political abyss, will be less willing than formerly to accept

responsibility for problems that originate in Brussels and may indeed doubt the wisdom of holding the June 2009 local and European elections on the same day for fear that the expected culling of Labour councillors will be even bloodier as a result. The legitimacy of rule from Brussels will be widely questioned.

The public mood will be eurosceptic,

almost certainly more strongly eurosceptic than it has been. This will be the moment for eurosceptic groups to raise their game and not to leave the field, to hold the Tories to such promises of renegotiation as there have been, to devise new strategies to push the Tories further and to redouble their efforts. Euroscepticism is not dead, it is about to become angrier.

Europe 'lying to world's poorest countries'

Much of what is described as 'development aid' is intended to further the interests of donor countries while the total value of aid has been inflated

Like the rest of us governments can be careless about living up to promises to help those in need. Once the cause of concern slips from public consciousness the pressure on government to match its rhetoric with appropriate action diminishes with the passing of time. What is truly astounding, however, is the extent to which the EU is failing to live up to its repeated promises to provide greater aid to the Third World, especially Africa.

According a study produced by prominent NGOs including Oxfam International, Actionaid and Care International the EU risks international opprobrium by falling a massive 50 billion euros short of its promised target to help the poorest nations by the end of the present decade.

Shortcomings in Delivery

Part of the problem is due to shortcomings in delivery, but the real cause of the disparity between what the EU says it will do to help and what it actually does, reflects a cynical desire to grossly exaggerate the scale of its largesse. It is also clear that much that is included as aid is not aid at all.

France, Germany, Greece and Austria are singled out as the countries with the clearest tendency last year of inflating the figures. Once non-aid items are deducted from the figures it is clear that each of these countries is significantly failing to give on the promised scale, says the report, which is entitled *Hold the Applause! EU governments risk breaking aid promises*. This urges the EU to "come clean" about the record of EU development aid and the failure to live

up to what has been pledged.

One method of exaggerating the scale of what is being done, it says, is to include in the figures the cancellation of debts of poor countries which it is clear will never be paid. EU members are also chalking up as aid spending money spent on refugees' and students' education.

According to the report non-aid items account for nearly one third of Europe's reported Official Development Assistance amounting to 13.5 billion.

Domestic Interests

"Poverty reduction does not always seem to be the main objective of European aid", explained Justin Kilkullen, President of the NGO confederation CONCORD. "Security, geopolitical alliances and domestic interests often take precedence."

Despite repeated EU promises to increase aid to Africa, dramatically aid volumes to that continent have remained static since 2004.

"If European governments do not improve current performance, poor countries will have received 50 billion less from Europe by 2010 than they have been promised", said Lucy Hayes of Eurodad, which is described as a European network on debt and development and which was one of the NGOs involved in the preparation of the report.

The authors also criticise the way in which aid is delivered. All EU countries, except Britain and Ireland, continue to tie a proportion of their aid to their own goods and services, decreasing the value of aid by up to an

estimated 30 per cent.

Although the report does not say so there may be another factor at work. Three of the four countries singled out for criticism - France, Germany and Greece - are major recipients of funds from the CAP and strong opponents of genuine reform. Pointing to development funds which they dispense is one way of deflecting criticism that the CAP inflicts huge and unjustifiable damage on poor nations - hence the motive to exaggerate the figures.

Economic Development

Aid programmes designed to bring about economic development (as opposed to those which are intended to respond to humanitarian disasters) have been subjected to some trenchant criticism from those who have argued that such aid politicises and undermines economic development. The critics argue that the removal of Western barriers to trade are a more effective way of reducing poverty. Such criticism does not of course justify in any way the cynical exaggeration of what is being done or the inclusion in the aid figures of public spending designed to serve the interests of the donors rather than the poor. After all, those responsible claim to believe in the efficacy of aid and have even promised to entirely eliminate poverty by this means. In any league table of cynical political promises the pledge to 'win the war' against poverty by hikes in the aid budgets of rich countries (which somehow never occur) should be at the top.

Soaring bill for EU immigration

According to *The Express* on 21st May, 168,000 migrants from the EU accession states are now claiming benefits in the UK, at an annual cost of £190 million - up from £100 million last year.

Why Lord Wallace deserves the same punishment as Gypsy Nell

In seeking to distract attention from this party's extraordinary acrobatics over the Lisbon Treaty, Lord Wallace of Saltaire, deputy leader of the Lib-Dems in the Lords recently poured scorn and ridicule on those who have pointed to the more egregious examples of EU intervention in our lives.

Among those singled out for ridicule was *eurofacts*.

Lord Wallace told his fellow peers during the passage of the European Union Amendment Bill through the Lords on 20th May:

"We spent several days listening to tales such as that the European gendarmerie is designed to operate on the shores of the United Kingdom to suppress honest British citizens or the suggestion that the xenophobic dimension of the treaty is intended to stop British citizens criticising Brussels, let alone burning the European flag. I am very sorry that we have not heard the story I came across in eurofacts the other day: that there is a new directive that will inhibit the rights of spiritualist workers to operate within the European Union by subjecting them to the test of whether

their work as mediums achieves the results they claim."

Hansard does not record whether noble members of the Upper House had to grip their sides in order to suppress their mirth. But Lord Wallace will be interested to learn that on 23rd May the *Times* legal editor Frances Gibb came to similar conclusions about the possible implications of the EU Commercial Practices Directive which has led in turn to the new Consumer Protection Regulations in the UK.

Gibb quotes a spokesman for the London law firm of Harbottle and Lewis who said that tarot card readers could find themselves in difficulty as a result of the regulations and that those claiming to predict the future, contact the dead or heal by laying-on hands would have to display appropriate disclaimers.

The Spiritual Workers Association has expressed fears that its members may face penalties as the result of the legislation.

It is true that tabloid newspapers over-simplify the results of EU intervention in our lives, often

suggesting that this will take a direct form when its preference is to take over and control national institutions in order to achieve its aims. But who are the bigger chumps - the tabloid simplifiers - or those, like Lord Wallace, who give the impression that Britain's EU membership entails no significant threat to the way in which we choose to organise our lives?

Lord Wallace has predicted to his fellow peers and the country that his party will initiate a major debate about the value of EU membership later this year. We frankly doubt whether this will happen and whether the Lib-Dems are capable of it. If Gypsy Nell is to face sanctions by claiming to know the future without the appropriate disclaimers, why not Lord Wallace?

Advice to voters: Beware of Lib-Dem peers, irrespective of whether they are not tall and dark, who promise a 'genuine' debate about the value of Britain's place in Europe, who prattle on about giving power to the people and the need for 'participation' but when an historic opportunity to give people a say comes along cynically snuff it out.

EU moves against eurosceptics in EP

According to Bruno Waterfield, the *Daily Telegraph's* man in Brussels, plans to eliminate Eurosceptics as an organised opposition within the European Parliament are expected to be agreed by a majority of MEPs this summer.

The European Union assembly's political establishment is said to be pushing through changes that will silence dissidents by changing the rules allowing Euro-MPs to form political groupings.

Richard Corbett, a British Labour MEP and a fervent europhile, is leading the charge to cut the number of party political tendencies in the Parliament next year, a move that would dissolve UKIP's pan-European

Eurosceptic "Independence and Democracy" grouping.

Under the rule change, the largest and most pro-EU groups would tighten their grip on the Parliament's political agenda and strengthen their control of EU funding.

"It would prevent single issue politicians from being given undue support from the public purse", claimed Mr Corbett.

Mr Corbett's proposals will also give the President of the Parliament sweeping powers to approve or reject parliamentary questions.

Current rules allow 20 MEPs from a fifth of the EU's member states to form groupings, giving them a say in the Parliament's administration and power

structure.

Under the changes, the threshold would become 30 MEPs from one quarter of the EU's member states.

The Liberal Democrats, Greens, the Far Left, Eurosceptics and other groupings have vowed to oppose the plans during a vote scheduled for 9th July. Andrew Duff, leader of Britain's Liberal Democrat Euro-MPs and a committed EU Federalist, has opposed the silencing of UKIP on the basis of democratic principle.

But the proposals are expected to be passed with the backing of the Parliament's centre-Left and Right groupings, which account for 64 per cent of MEPs, including British Conservative and Labour deputies.

In the madhouse world of Brussels few decisions are quite as crazy as this

The taxpayer is paying almost the entire cost of producing a commodity which the EU says is responsible for the deaths of millions

In the mad-house world of EU policy-making, decisions which contradict one another are as commonplace as Brussels restaurants serving *moules frites*, but few are quite as absurd as that taken by the European Parliament to extend the tobacco subsidy.

Through the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP), the EU provides about one billion euros per year (1 per cent of the EU budget) to European farmers to grow tobacco, much of which is destined for cigarettes in the developing world.

In 2002, as part of the “reform” of the CAP and as a result of health concerns it was agreed to cut the link between EU payments and tobacco production although it was also agreed tobacco growers would not be disqualified from other subsidies if they continued to grow tobacco.

But on 20th May following a period of intense lobbying the EP agreed to continue the subsidy at least for a further two years.

There is no shortage of tobacco on world markets, but EU farmers are currently paid £5,250 a hectare to grow tobacco while those producing wheat, of which there is a pronounced shortage, receive £240 a hectare.

MEPs in favour of the extension argued not only that it helped “hard pressed” tobacco farmers, mostly in Italy, Spain and Greece, but also advanced the bizarre claim that since a

small part of the EU tobacco fund - now to be raised to six per cent - helped pay for health education and other anti-smoking measures this would assist the drive to eliminate smoking. The decision also contradicts specific EU treaty obligations to promote health.

EU health ministers say that last year smoking killed half a million people in the EU and around a million in Europe as a whole. In the UK alone the NHS spends £1.5bn a year treating people with smoking-related diseases and the government spends around £30m on anti-smoking education campaigns - part of it paid for, of course, from the swingeing taxes paid by smokers.

Biggest Importer

Tobacco subsidies were originally intended to encourage farmers to grow commercially-valued varieties of tobacco rather than low grade tobacco for which there was little demand in Europe and thereby to reduce imports. There has reportedly been some improvement in the quality of the European tobacco crop - but the policy has failed to adapt production to demand or to reduce imports: the EU remains the world’s highest importer of raw tobacco.

Like other aspects of the CAP, the tobacco subsidy is deeply damaging to the interests of many poor Third World

producers such as those in Malawi and Zimbabwe who receive little or no public support. By contrast the degree of support enjoyed by EU tobacco farmers is huge. Recent press reports have suggested that 75 per cent of the farmers’ income comes in the form of hand-outs from Brussels, but EU data suggests that the true figure may be even higher.

A 2003 Commission document entitled “*Tobacco regime. Extended impact assessment*”, stated “... another interesting conclusion can be drawn from the ratio between the balance of current subsidies and taxes and the net value added: for the year 2000, this indicator, which measures the dependence of the agricultural revenues on public support, is equal to 98 per cent for tobacco producers of the three considered countries [Italy, Spain and Greece], by far the highest value compared to other agricultural sectors”.(Page 16/17)

In other words the taxpayer is footing almost the entire bill for producing a product which Europeans don’t want (nearly all of our tobacco coming from outside Europe) and which EU governments say is killing millions. All this as the result of a policy that is not achieving its stated economic objectives, which contradicts solemn treaty obligations and which further impoverishes some of the poorest farmers in the world.

MEPs block expenses transparency reforms in secret meeting

MEPs have blocked moves to force them to account for how they spend their expenses. British Liberal Democrat MEP Diana Wallis complained that the proposals were scrapped by senior MEPs in a closed-door meeting without warning. Parliamentary sources said that the

leaders of the two biggest political groupings, the centre-right European People’s Party and the left-wing Socialists, had lobbied for changes just hours before the crunch meeting. Both are dominated by German MEPs implacably opposed to sweeping

reform.

“It was chaotic. It is no way to run even a local parish council. There were hand-written notes in Italian being exchanged in the meeting”, said Mrs Wallis.

She also said that there was no definitive draft of the conclusions.

LETTERS

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

Towards a European Army

Dear Sir,

In a little-reported speech on 6th May, Germany's Foreign Minister Steinmeier, called for greater efforts to create a common EU army.

To be clear, ultimately this would not be a force assembled from contingents of national armies, as with the existing Eurocorps. It would be a fully integrated EU standing army, financed and controlled by Brussels, and recruiting its personnel directly from across the EU.

As with any federal army, it could be available not only for common defence against external enemies, and for projection of military power around the globe, but also for deployment anywhere within the EU in support of the civil power.

Provisions in the Lisbon Treaty would take the EU some steps closer to the eventual goal of a common army, although there is a natural reluctance to emphasise this until the treaty has been safely ratified. Even so, those steps would be no more than part of a gradual process of military integration.

Nonetheless, it is difficult to see how any country which wished to be "at the heart of Europe" could insist on remaining outside a project of such central importance.

MURIEL PARSONS
Berkshire

Slavish Adherence to EU

Dear Sir,

Your correspondents rightly point out that the mess the British government has got into over Post Office closures stems from an EU directive.

But a major part of the problem is the slavish manner in which British ministers and civil servants have interpreted the directive in question. Other European countries, notably France and Italy, subject to the same directive, have taken a robust attitude towards Brussels, interpreted the legislation as they see fit and successfully managed their own national postal networks, in the case of Italy even expanding them.

If our officials adopt a similar stance

we could save or even boost our Post Office network. Or we might go the whole hog, derogate ourselves unilaterally from the relevant directive and bring in the Australian postal service to show how to make the Royal Mail a prosperous venture that - as it should do - really serves the people of this country.

CLIVE LINTON
Rutland

EU Embassies

Dear Sir,

In *eurofacts* last issue (23rd May) the article on who gets control of the post-Lisbon EU diplomatic service quotes a Foreign Office spokesman intoning that "*the UK opposes and will argue against naming the (new services offices) embassies*".

Odd, that, because as the Foreign Office knows perfectly well, the EU's heads of delegation in foreign parts have been calling themselves ambassadors (including on their official stationery) for years. Perhaps William Hague or Mark Francois (the latter being the Conservative shadow Europe minister) should ask their opposite numbers to confirm that this is indeed the case.

ARCHIBALD GEORGE
Northumberland

UKIP the Only Option

Dear Sir,

David Owen (*letters* 23rd May) gave the figures from the London Mayoral and assembly elections and stated these figures: "*prove the near impossibility of fringe parties breaking the mould of British politics*".

Yes, for those of us involved with UKIP it is frustrating when we struggle to get good election results, especially after we put in many hours of our time campaigning as we did recently in the Crewe & Nantwich by-election. But for those of us who are true to our country, our freedom and democracy - what other option is there?

We ask: what point would it serve if we did join the Conservative Party? Sadly the Conservative Party is pro-EU even though the majority of its activists

are anti-EU. Along with 100 per cent of UKIP activists, 70 to 80 per cent of Conservative members would rejoice if Britain were to withdraw from the EU but David Cameron won't take us out - he is not the answer. Sadly, he will not stop the Lisbon Treaty and if elected to Number 10 Downing Street he will be in no position to re-negotiate this dreadful treaty as he will have no leverage. So, what option is there for those Conservatives, Labour, and the few Liberal Democrats who are serious about our campaign?

In my opinion there can be but one option, to leave those other pro-EU parties and join UKIP en-masse. The effect of such a move would be dramatic. Not only would UKIP be filled with people who would campaign hard for freedom from the EU, the Conservatives, and to a lesser degree the other parties, would lose many of their campaigners and their financial input. This would place UKIP in a position to out-perform all of them. By staying with a pro-EU party in the hope that one day it will become the leopard that changes its spots is living in self-denial. The agony will be drawn-out and the end result will be the loss of our country. We are in a do or die situation - stay with the Tories and die - or join UKIP and fight.

DEREK BENNETT
West Midlands

UKIP's Strength

Dear Sir,

David Owen makes the usual mistake of labelling UKIP as a single issue party. Its main policy is, of course, to withdraw from the European Union. Once that has been achieved UKIP has a whole range of policies outlined in its Manifesto. The other three main parties can only clutch at policies which they believe the EU will approve. Any policies NOT approved by the EU are non-starters. It really doesn't matter who is in government, Labour, Tory or Lib-Dem - they all owe allegiance to the EU. Only UKIP states that withdrawal is its main policy, not its ONLY policy.

TOM COLLINS
Essex

MEETINGS

Marlborough Group
01672 515275

Sunday **15th June**, 2.00 pm

“Critical walk-through the Lisbon Treaty”
Plus Question & Answer session

Ashley Mote MEP, Independent
PUBLIC MEETING

Assembly Room of the Marlborough Town Hall, Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **18th June**, 7.00 pm

“Repealing the Lisbon Treaty and Independence from the EU”

Gerald Frost, Editor of eurofacts
Lord Willoughby de Broke, UKIP
representative in the House of Lords

PUBLIC MEETING

Foreign Press Association, 11 Carlton Terrace, London SW1Y 5AT
Admission £10 (On door or in advance)
(Includes, wine, juice, water and nibbles)

The Freedom Association
0845 833 9626

Saturday **19th July**, 6.00 pm

Nigel Hastilow, Author
John Midgley, Campaign Against Political Correctness

ANNUAL SUMMER PARTY
Stanway House, Stanway, Cheltenham, Glos GL54
Admission £25 (Members £22.50)

Get Britain Out
01787 376374

Wednesday **23rd July**, 7.00 pm

“No Accountability, No Democracy? - The EU Connection”

Philip Hollobone MP, Conservative

PUBLIC MEETING

Westminster Arms (Upstairs), 9 Storeys Gate, London SW1
Admission Free

USFULL WEB SITES

Better off Out Campaign

www.betteroffout.co.uk

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.cibhq.co.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

I Want a Referendum

www.iwantareferendum.com

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **10th June**, 3.35 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Economic Affairs* from witnesses to be announced.

Tuesday **10th June**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Priorities of the French Presidency of the EU* from the French Ambassador.

Tuesday **10th June**, 5.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Annual Policy Strategy for 2009* from Jim Murphy MP, Minister for Europe.

Wednesday **11th June**, 3.05 pm
Evidence will be taken on *The euro* from Kitty Ussher MP, Economic Secretary, HM Treasury.

Thursday **12th June**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *Current Developments in European Foreign Policy: the EU and Burma* from Professor Mary Kaldor, London School of Economics.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2008

Irish Referendum **12th June**
on Lisbon Treaty

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

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

Liberal Democrats **13-17th Sept**
Party Conference
Bournemouth

Labour **20-24th Sept**
Party Conference
Manchester Central

Conservative **28th Sept - 1st Oct**
Party Conference
Birmingham

European Reform **December**
Treaty to be Ratified

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 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	0116 2874 622
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