

Fund tax cuts by slashing spending on the EU!

The case for heading rapidly for the EU exit door is growing stronger as the financial and economic storm clouds grow darker

As we go to press there is widespread speculation that the Government will introduce huge tax increases in a bid to stave off the worst effects of the looming recession. Among commentators there is disagreement about whether these should be funded through corresponding reductions in public spending, as the Tories maintain, or whether off-setting cuts will fail to provide a stimulus on account of their being self-balancing.

This latter view appears to be that of the Government. But even if the package now being assembled contains elements of both funded and unfunded tax cuts it is evident that there is going to be a great deal of debt to be paid off in the future and that part of this huge burden is likely to be borne by our children and possibly even our grandchildren. At some stage reductions in public spending will be necessary in order to limit the scope of tax increases.

National Interest

Always anxious to play its part *eurofacts* is keen to point to the obvious truth that a genuinely eurosceptic government will find it easier to find cuts than a europhile one for the simple reason that many EU programmes are hugely expensive, unnecessary - at least when judged from the perspective of the British national interest - as well as unpopular with the voter.

Who would lament the passing of

Regional Development Agencies and with them what remains of the notion of a Europe of the regions? Apart from John Prescott, almost no one. The RDAs in which £15 billion of taxpayers' money has so far been spent are a byword for excess and inefficiency. They should follow Regional Assemblies on to the scrap heap of history. The Taxpayers Alliance has calculated that their 2009-10 budget of £2.19 billion would be sufficient to finance a four pence reduction in the Small Business Rate or Corporation Tax.

Behind Schedule

Buckets of taxpayers money are currently being poured in to the EU's Galileo global positioning system programme. This is behind schedule, massively over-budget and entirely unnecessary since we can use the American GPS system free of charge. No commercial partner has been found as was originally intended to be the case. Britain is expected to pour £1.7 billion into the project. The late Gwyneth Dunwoody, Chairman of the Commons Transport Select Committee, said of Galileo:

"This is not one pig flying in orbit, this is a herd of pigs with gold trotters, platinum tails and diamond eyes".

There is a complex thicket of contractual and political obstacles to straightforward withdrawal from the project. However, doubts about its spiralling costs and equally widespread

doubts about its technical viability mean a decision to threaten to suspend payments until such concerns were adequately addressed could well be sufficient to kill off the project.

Of course really big cuts in EU-related spending can only be achieved as a result of withdrawal or by decisions that would, at the very least, signal Britain's intention to depart at an early stage.

A statement from the British government to the effect that on economic and moral grounds Britain was no longer prepared to go on funding the CAP (to which Britain contributed over £6 billion gross in 2007) would fall into this category. In this country it would be met with universal joy and approbation while signalling unambiguously that Britain had finally found the resolve to place its relationship with Continental Europe on a different footing. Britain's standing in the emerging economies of the third world - to which this country will increasingly have to look for export opportunities (see p.4) - would be greatly enhanced.

Net Contribution

The most immediate and obvious benefit of withdrawal would, of course, be the saving of Britain's annual net contribution to the EU budget (over £7 billion in 2007).

The cost of over regulation has been put at a massive £26 billion.

Although difficult to calculate with

Continued on p.2

EU polices increase prospect of power failures

A majority of scientific experts now believe that drastic action will be necessary to keep the lights on

As the *euofacts* masthead proclaims, the task of this publication is to explain the reality behind the EU. Our work has been cut out. The European project has become so large and all-embracing that we frankly acknowledge that it is difficult to remain informed about every EU issue and to inform our readers accordingly. Among the biggest omissions in these columns has been an adequate account of how EU policy on climate change has damaged Britain's ability to generate sufficient energy supplies to meet domestic and industrial needs.

It is clear, however, that EU policies in this area, combined with Labour inertia, have a tremendous potential to make our lives more miserable and even dangerous.

As Dr Jon Gibbins of Imperial College recently pointed out;

"You don't want to take a risk with the electricity supply. People die when you lose electricity supplies. We have had endless dithering, with inquiry after inquiry but nothing built except a few gas plants".

According to a survey of 31 leading experts carried out by BBC News earlier this month thirteen said that there is an unacceptable risk of blackouts in the next ten years, while seven warned of a problem within just five years.

A majority of the experts, 18, take the

view that a major extension of nuclear power is necessary to ensure that the lights stay on.

As most readers will be aware the problem has arisen because ageing nuclear power stations in Britain dating back to the 1950s are now closing, whilst many coal plants will also have to close to comply with the EU's Large Combustion-Plant Directive (LCPD). This requires operators to scrub sulphur dioxide and oxides of nitrogen more efficiently from power-station chimneys.

However, the equipment is expensive and six have chosen to close rather than install it. The rules, which came into force on January 1st, allow non-complying stations to run for 20,000 hours or until 2015, whichever comes first. And those hours are being used up already, as the high price of natural gas makes burning cheaper coal attractive

Maximum Demand

In recent years companies have spent billions based on the LCPD requirements, but the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED), which incorporates six earlier directives, tightens existing limits on emissions of oxides of sulphur and nitrogen.

Under the LCPD, targets are flexible enabling plants to be phased out over time and allowing them to be used only at times of maximum demand even if

they are not fitted with the required kit. The IED removes this flexibility, forcing companies to install the equipment or to close by December 31st 2015 when the IED comes into force.

The Government is aiming to cover 20 per cent of electricity needs from renewable energy sources such as wind and wave by 2020, but such methods are hugely expensive, there are serious doubts whether they can achieve what is claimed on their behalf, and little sign that the billions of pounds needed is likely to be forthcoming

The consequence is that Britain is set to lose 40 per cent of its peak time generating capacity over the next seven years before new power stations come on stream.

The Government could deal with this situation by seeking a special dispensation to keep oil and coal power stations open, or by building new gas-powered plants which would make nonsense of its promise to cut carbon emissions.

The looming recession is likely to reduce energy demand, and so there is only a slight prospect of power failures in 2009-10. But as we finally emerge from the gloom generated by negative growth and high unemployment there is going to be an increasing prospect that, thanks to EU membership we will be plunged into darkness. Now, isn't that something to look forward to?

Continued from p.1

Fund tax cuts by slashing EU spending

precision the opportunity costs of membership i.e. the cost of missing out on economic opportunities by virtue of EU membership are also huge. Ian Milne has suggested by 2013 these could rise to 12.5 per cent of GDP resulting in an opportunity cost in that year of £125 billion annually at 2004. values.

Gerard Batten, the UKIP MEP has recently calculated that in all the total annual net cost of Britain's membership of the European is £50 billion.

Staunching the flow of British money to the EU would permit resources to be used more productively than at present, and would enable a future British

government to reduce the mountains of debt now being built up. It is only necessary to list the sums involved and the purposes for which they are being spent to recognise that on cost grounds alone the case for heading rapidly for the EU exit door is growing stronger as the financial and economic storm clouds grow darker.

MEPs prepare for boring leadership fight

As we go to press Conservative Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) are preparing to elect a new leader in what must be one of the least exciting democratic contests ever staged. The two candidates are Timothy Kirkhope, a previous leader of the group, and James Elles, MEP for the South East, previously known as an enthusiastic cheer-leader for the European People's Party.

Until asked to do so by *ConservativeHome* neither candidate had issued a manifesto. Elles then did so. However, this makes no reference to the Lisbon Treaty, the desirability or otherwise of a referendum on the issue, the future direction of the EU or Britain's role within it, Cameron's promise to renegotiate aspects of the existing treaties or any other contentious issue. Instead, Elles promises:

"We must ensure pragmatic politics in all our areas of engagement, whether in matters of policy or party relations. I am convinced that, with all of us contributing in our different ways to tasks at hand, we can and will re-emerge proud of our role and our

ability to exercise the strong influence we all want".

Nor does Elles mention the EPP - except to say that "like other candidates" - presumably a reference to Kirkhope - he has signed a declaration supporting Cameron's promise to form a new centre-right grouping within the EP following the 2009 elections.

Contributors to the blog *ConservativeHome* were quick to draw attention to fact that this is not what Elles has said in the past; one quoting from a letter signed by Elles and other europhile Tory MEPs and published by the *Daily Telegraph* on 5th October 2005 which stated:

"We profoundly disagree with the minority of our colleagues who have always disliked our European Democrats (ED) group associating with the European People's Party (EPP) as the EPP/ED Group".

Kirkhope declined to write an article which would explain whatever it is he stands for, preferring to circulate to his Conservative MEP colleagues a letter which stressed his experience and

"achievements".

There are 28 Conservative MEPs of whom, on our reckoning, eight could be described as more less eurosceptic, but at the time of writing none of these have thrown their hats into the ring. This is a pity. As matters stand the outcome of the leadership election is a matter of supreme irrelevance. The intervention of a eurosceptic candidate, though probably doomed to fail, would at least have ensured a degree of controversy. If the Conservatives do well in the 2009 election - and we have no idea whether this will turn out to be the case - it is likely to be because eurosceptics such as Dan Hannan and Roger Helmer have frankly acknowledged that Britain's interests would be best served by a rapid withdrawal from the EU and thus given the party a misleading and undeserved veneer of eurosceptic respectability with the voters. Lord Randolph Churchill famously declared that being a Tory implied a readiness to trust the people. A substantial proportion of the Tory MEPs seem to believe that it lies in deceiving them.

CAP trebles cost of food - EU Commissioner

An EU Commissioner has suggested that the cost of the Common Agricultural Policy to consumers is even greater than that suggested by some eurosceptic critics of the CAP.

Dalia Grybauskaite, a Moscow-educated Lithuanian who is Commissioner for the EU Budget, told the *Irish Times* on 14th November:

"In reality our CAP today is a more protectionist policy than a market-orientated policy and because of this, we pay, all of us, all consumers, two to three times more for food than we would pay without this policy".

Ms Grybauskaite will present a

formal Commission proposal outlining her plans to reform the EU budget in 2009.

She said the CAP presented "real issues" in terms of fairness, quality and size and that it was the only EU policy to fail a series of academic studies recently commissioned by her department to determine whether it produced added value for the citizen.

"Agricultural output or input represents about 5-7 per cent in each member state and we pay about 40 per cent out of the EU budget. Is it proportional?" she asked.

Ms Grybauskaite, a former minister of finance in the Lithuanian

government, criticised the fact that most CAP payments went to large landowners or businesses rather than to small farmers and said it was unfair that the twelve most recent members of the EU had to co-finance some payments to farmers while the EU '15' benefited from direct EU payments.

An average British family of four are reckoned to spend £100-120 a week on food, according to *MySupermarket*, a website that monitors prices at the supermarket check-outs. If the Budget Commissioner's estimate of the impact of CAP is correct the saving resulting from the abolition of the CAP would be between £40 and £60 a week, a huge saving for every family in the land.

The defining characteristics of an MEP

"You have a sort of hybrid, strange animal that has ever increasing power and decreasing legitimacy,"

Antonio Missiroli, director of studies at the Brussels-based European Policy Centre commenting on the role of members of the European Parliament, quoted on *EUobserver*, 14th November 2008

UK plc's export growth is coming from outside the EU

Trends discernible in the data time-series set out in the Pink Book 2008 suggest that, by the end of the next Parliament, around two-thirds of British exports will be going outside EU-26

The proportion of UK exports going to the other 26 EU countries is shrinking, and well under half of UK worldwide exports – even on the unadjusted official statistics produced by the Office for National Statistics (“ONS”), which overstate UK exports to the EU. In 2007, the real adjusted proportion is likely to be below 40 per cent.

Table 1: Proportion of Worldwide British Exports¹ Going to the EU²									
Year	'99	00	'01	'02	'03	'04	'05	'06	'07
Percentage	51.6	50.9	52.4	52.3	50.8	49.2	47.3	48.8	46.9

1: Exports of Goods & Services plus Receipts of Income & Transfers
2: EU-26: the 26 countries which are the UK's fellow-EU-members

Table 2: Rate of Growth¹ of British Exports², 1999 - 2007		
	Percentages ¹	Index
To EU-26	6.91%	100
To Rest of World	9.48%	137

1: Average annual compound growth rate, 1999 – 2007 inclusive
2: Exports of Goods & Services plus Receipts of Income & Transfers

According to the unadjusted official data, over the period 1999-2007 inclusive, UK exports to the world OUTSIDE the EU grew at a rate 37 per cent faster than that of UK exports to EU-26. (Table 2). Even within the geographically-defined area of Europe, there are big differences in the growth rates of UK exports to its component regions. Exports to EFTA grew 58 per cent faster than to the EU, while exports to other European states (including Russia and Turkey) grew 2.6 TIMES faster than to the EU.(Table 3).

Table 3: Rate of Growth¹ of British Exports² to “Europe”, 1999 - 2007		
	Percentages ¹	Index
To EU-26	6.91%	100
To EFTA ³	10.94%	158
To other European States/Russia	17.97%	260

1: Average annual compound growth rate, 1999 – 2007 inclusive
2: Exports of Goods & Services plus Receipts of Income & Transfers
3: Switzerland, Norway, Iceland, Lichtenstein

NB All tables: figures not adjusted for the Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect or the Netherlands Distortion.
Source (All Tables): The Pink Book 2008

'Mediocre' euro currency fails to meet objectives

Even as the pound falls to new lows against the euro a French eurocrat concludes that on almost any measure you choose the single currency has been a failure

One irrational by-product of the current financial turmoil is the notion that we need more "big government" to fix it. And, especially in France - though also, amazingly, in the UK - fans of the euro are quivering with excitement at the rumour that mighty economies such as Iceland's could be thinking of joining the currency, and that sentiment in Norway, Denmark and Sweden appears to shifting ever so slightly in favour of euro membership.

Such wishful thinking is articulated despite the inescapable rock-hard fact that the euro hasn't prevented its member-countries being hit by the banking crisis as severely as non-euro countries. Neither is the euro shielding its members from the real-economy recession now gathering force. In short, the "protection" which the euro was supposed to bring to eurozone economies (and the basis on which the euro was sold to eurozone electorates) is as fanciful as ever.

The fifth edition of the highly-serious French magazine *Les Cahiers de l'Indépendance*, which came out last spring, contains an article by Romain Rochas, a former head of department at the European Court of Auditors. The article, titled "*Une Evaluation de l'Euro*", marks the tenth anniversary of the euro, and examines the evidence for the various claims that are made in support of the currency. The statistical evidence for his analysis comes from the IMF, Eurostat and the Bank for International Settlements.

Rochas' method is to compare the economic and social performance of the euro and the eurozone against the aggregation of the "legacy" (pre-euro) currencies (the DM, the French Franc, the Lire etc) and against other major currencies such as the dollar, sterling and the yen.

The euro as a reserve currency

Rochas shows that the global share of the euro today is less than the aggregated pre-euro shares of the legacy currencies. And, during the last ten years, contrary to predictions, the

global shares of dollar and sterling in central banks' reserves have actually increased (though shares of the Swiss franc and the yen have decreased somewhat). Concludes Rochas:

"If one of the reasons for creating the euro was to challenge the dollar, the gamble has failed".

The euro as a currency of invoicing

Here, the legacy currencies' pre-euro aggregate global share was around 23 per cent, compared with a current euro share of 19 per cent. Over the ten-year period, the global share of sterling has almost doubled, from 4.8 per cent to 8.2 per cent, while the dollar and yen shares decreased slightly. Concludes Rochas:

"If one of the reasons for creating the euro was to challenge the dollar, the gamble has failed".

The euro and inflation

Rochas points out that the "fight against inflation" is the over-riding objective of the European Central Bank, enshrined in the Maastricht Treaty and the subsequent "Growth and Stability Pact". One would have expected, he says, that on this criterion at least, the euro would have been successful. He compares the eurozone's inflation performance over time and against that of other jurisdictions, concludes that it is "extremely mediocre", and that the euro is "a long way from having gained credibility in this area".

The euro and growth

Once again, over time and against other jurisdictions, the euro is bottom of the class. Concludes Rochas, ruefully:

"Remember those slogans (in France particularly): 'L'euro fait la force' and 'L'euro facteur de croissance (growth)'? A case of 'jam tomorrow': we're still waiting".

The euro and unemployment

Rochas notes that correlatively with the eurozone's lack of growth, its unemployment rates are higher than

those of many non-euro countries such as the USA and the UK.

The euro and bond issuance

The one area where, relative to other currencies, the euro has "done well" is in international bond issues, where, since 2001, euro volume has increased and dollar volume shrunk. But Rochas notes (not entirely convincingly) that bond issues are for the rich, while those who suffer most from inflation and unemployment are the poor: hardly, he says, an advertisement for the euro.

Rochas' analysis shared at the highest level of French government

The conclusions of Rochas echo those of the 2006 report on "*Economic Policy and Growth in Europe*" by the French Conseil d'Analyse Economique*. One of its authors remarks:

"The actual experience of the euro is the opposite of that predicted by (monetary union) theory.....there is a minor positive impact of the euro on exports from non-euro countries to the eurozone, but not in the other direction.....it's as if the euro has worked as a one-way valve".

Fifteen years before Rochas wrote his pessimistic retrospective article, euro-sceptics in the UK (this writer included) were pointing out the flaws in the project. Given the current shambles in US and UK economic and financial policy it would be rash to bet that over the next few years the eurozone won't out-perform the Anglo-Saxon economies. Nevertheless, the flaws in the euro project remain as fundamental as ever - indeed, if and when more countries join, those flaws will amplify. And with British governments' genius for doing precisely the wrong thing at the wrong time, joining the euro may yet become official policy.

*Summarised in *Global Britain Briefing Note No 43, "France Assesses Costs & Benefits of EU Membership", 13.10.06, (www.globalbritain.org).*

LETTERS

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

Economic Woe or Silver Lining?

Dear Sir,
Readers, especially Alastair McConnachie and Edwin Bateman (letters, 31st October) may be interested in the following reflections.

The EU's single currency was designed to be consistent with monetarist theory. This employs interest rate changes to regulate inflation. The mechanism only works within a specific monetary zone. A currency with higher intrinsic inflationary pressures will require a higher rate. The UK's housing market gives rise - or did - to just such a pressure, producing the disparity between the euro and sterling rates produced by Mr Bateman. This in turn makes sterling more attractive to hold, and, with a floating exchange system, causes its value to rise. The consequence of this is that exporting becomes less competitive and imports cheaper.

Now, with this pressure removed, sterling has become less attractive, and its value fallen to be consistent with that needed to maintain a neutral trading balance. Commentators are decrying this result but we should consider it a silver lining.

There is talk about Britain belatedly joining the eurozone. While readers may not wish that outcome, should we not be advocating that any such talk must be based on an understanding that the trade value of sterling, not its artificial monetarist one, will be used?

Unlike Building Societies and Credit Unions that can only lend as much as they have on deposit, banks are allowed to lend a multiple of that amount. In the good old days it was by controlling the amount of this multiple

that inflation was kept in check. As a result, interest rates found their own market level and did not directly alter the exchange rate for sterling. Ted Heath ended this arrangement just prior to the UK's Common Market entry. Thirty years later it is now clear why.

Mr McConnachie is right to blame the system that allows banks to create credit out of nothing but worse than that allows them to benefit from the interest. Social Creditors argue that this creates a bubble of interest that eventually cannot be paid off and a slump results. On the other hand, Keynes warns that where trade surpluses are not spent back into circulation debtor economies decline.

The UK is unique in that there is an imbalance between supply and demand in the housing market that, for planning reasons, cannot be satisfied. A surge in Eastern European migrants only exacerbated this problem.

JOHN S. CHURCHILL
Gloucestershire

Still off the Agenda

Dear Sir,

It was entirely predictable that the present credit crunch would be used to launch a new drive to get Britain into the euro.

The campaign began on 14th November when Roland Rudd, chairman of *Business for New Europe*, argued in the *Evening Standard* that a further slide in the value of the pound would force membership of the single currency back on to the agenda.

The tentative quality of his case - which was entirely constructed around a scare story of massively rising unemployment and was entirely devoid of argument and analysis - suggests that even he believes that this

isn't going to happen.

When conditions are bad a certain amount of momentum can be developed for the claim that we should follow the herd in a dash for cover, that there is strength in unity, that we should be isolated etc.

But a moment's reflection prompts the thought that had we been in the eurozone, the 1.5 per cent reduction in bank rate announced on 6th November would not have been possible.

It was this decision that produced the fall in sterling against other major currencies including the euro - and it was intended to do so. Such a fall is an important element in the process of economic recovery since it provides a major boost to our exporters. As long as we remain outside the single currency we will continue to enjoy the flexibility to make further reductions if we so decide.

The case for staying out of the euro is as strong as it was a decade ago - and maybe stronger.

PATRICIA SMITHERS
Surrey

The Precautionary Principle

Dear Sir,

Demanding proof from those warning us against CO2 is no doubt very scientific (*eurofacts*, letters 14th November), although some purists might wish for the claims of the sceptics to be treated with equal rigour. But in the real world, when one is driving one's car and notices another apparently on a collision course, does one wait for proof that a crash is now unavoidable, before moving one's foot from the accelerator to the brake pedal?

ANTHONY HOYLE
Buckinghamshire

Christmas publishing plans

The Christmas double issue of *eurofacts* (Vol 14 No 5/6) will be published on 19th December 2008.

MEETINGS

Marlborough Group
01672 515275

Sunday **7th December**, 2.00 pm

“Liberty? Defend it or lose it!”

John Bingley

PUBLIC MEETING
The Bear, Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **9th December**, 6.00 pm

“The rich man in his castle, the poor man at the gate”

Professor Rodney Barker, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **11th December**, 6.00 pm

“The Fall of the Third Reich 1944-45”

Professor Richard J. Evans, FBA,
Visiting Gresham Professor of History

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London
Admission Free

The British Constitution
01752 312743 or 0781 352 9383

Saturday **24th January**,
11.00 am - 5.00 pm

“Invoking the British Constitution -
Actions not words”

John Bingley, David Bourne, Albert Burgess, Brian Gerrish, John Harris

CONFERENCE
Kings Hall, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire ST4 1JR
Admission £12.50 (only 1,000 seats)
Phone or E: roger@thebcgroup.org.uk

Marlborough Group
01672 515275

Sunday **25th January**, 2.00 pm

“Parliamentary Supremacy!”

Michael Shrimpton

PUBLIC MEETING
The Bear, Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **27th January**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidency: Ronald Regan”

Professor Vernon Bogdanor, CBE FBA,
Emeritus Gresham Professor of Law

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

Freedom in the City
07979 695611

Wednesday **11th February**, 1.00 pm

Simon Heffer, *Journalist*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Counting House, 50 Cornhill, London EC3V 3PD
Admission Free

Marlborough Group
01672 515275

Sunday **22nd February**, 2.00 pm

“Conservatives versus Constitution!”

Dr Sean Gabb

PUBLIC MEETING
The Bear, Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

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.

Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Thursday **4th December**, 10.10 am
Evidence will be heard on *The EU Commissioner's proposals for a directive on patients' rights in cross border health-care* from the NHS Confederation, Royal College of General Practitioners; and Royal College of Nursing.

Thursday **11th December**, 10.10 am
Evidence will be heard on *The EU Commissioner's proposals for a directive on patients' rights in cross border health-care* from the British Medical Association; and British Dental Association.

Thursday **11th December**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The EDA Steering Meeting Board and Defence Directive* from Baroness Ann Taylor PC, Minister for International Defence and Security accompanied by Mr Andrew Mathewson, Director for Policy on International Organisations, Ministry of Defence.

Thursday **18th December**, 10.10 am
Evidence will be heard on *The EU Commissioner's proposals for a directive on patients' rights in cross border health-care* from Unite; and Unison.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

EU Summit **11-12th December**

European Reform **December**
Treaty to be Ratified?

2009

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

Slovakia to adopt **1st January**
euro

European Parliamentary **June**
Elections

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

Germany's Fourth Reich

by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Beckhough a former code-breaker and intelligence officer, shows how the EU is being formed by the needs of Germany.

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.

The End Of The English

The European Superstate

by David Brown. **£6.99**

As an apology to all grandchildren, it analysis how the EU plans for control of the UK have destroyed democracy. Required reading for all those worried in any way about the EU's power over us.

The Plan

Twelve Months to Renew Britain

by Douglas Carswell and

Daniel Hannan. **£10.00**

Britain is heading in the wrong direction. This book shows how to put our country on the right track to self-governance.

The O.F.P.I.S. File

The Organisation for the Preservation of Individuality and Sovereignty

by Vernon Coleman. **£15.95**

Why citizens all across Europe are fed up with the EU.

A Tribute to Ralph Harris 1924-2006

by CRCE. **£9.95**

Lord Harris of High Cross was one of the leading figures in the fight against the EU and injustice everywhere.

Squandered

How Gordon Brown is wasting over one trillion pounds of our money

by David Craig. **£8.99**

An exposé of the huge levels of financial waste by government on Quangos and Advisers, which are self serving at the tax-payers expense.

The Costs Of Regulation

And How the EU Makes them worse
by William Mason. **£4.00**

How by imposing EU regulations power is taken from national Governments.

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.

The Principles of British Foreign Policy

by Philip Vander Elst. **£4.00**

Should BFP reflect political principles or should it merely be shaped by current conceptions of national self-interest?

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)	£18
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	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