

Return of the butter mountain sends danger signals

The capacity of EU politicians to contribute positively to solving the present international economic crisis is greatly outweighed by their capacity to make it very much worse

The chief executive of J.P. Morgan, one Thomas W Lamont, is said to have got down on his knees to beg the US President Herbert Hoover to veto the "asinine" Smoot-Hawley Act which raised US tariffs on over 20,000 imported items in June 1930. Car maker Henry Ford recorded that he spent an evening trying to persuade the US President to kill the legislation which is widely regarded as having been the catalyst that led to the Great Depression. Ford informed the President that the bill was "*a great economic stupidity*" - but failed in his mission.

Although he did not exactly get down on his knees Gordon Brown similarly pleaded with his European partners at the Economic Forum at Davos not to succumb to the temptations of trade protectionism. They don't seem to have listened.

Prominent Feature

In Europe the depressing reality is that the butter mountains and milk surpluses which were a prominent feature of the 1980s are already making a comeback.

EU officials are to buy up and store 30,000 tonnes of butter and 109,000 tonnes of skimmed milk over the coming months in order to provide assistance to European farmers. The Third World farmers can go hang or rather, starve.

The Independent calculated on 25th January that these purchases would be

equivalent in weight to 75 jumbo jets.

EU figures also show that the EU retains 717,810 tonnes of cereal, 41,000 tonnes of sugar and 2.3 million hectolitre litres of cheap and mostly undrinkable wine.

Nevertheless the stockpiles are tiny compared to those which existed 25 years ago. These dwindled as the EU found somewhat less harmful ways of wasting our money. Indeed, moves to scrap the provision for emergency purchases and subsidies altogether would have gone through last year - but for opposition from the French.

However, EU spokesmen are adamant that the latest developments do not mark a return to the butter mountains and wine lakes of the 80s.

New Methods

"We have a particular situation where prices on the market are particularly low...this is a temporary crisis," said Mr Michael Mann, a spokesman for the agricultural directorate.

The problem is of course that trade wars are always sparked off by "particular situations". In the 1920s the particular situation which led to Smoot-Hawley was the fall in farm prices as the result of new farming methods and the introduction of the tractor.

Even before the legislation had passed through Congress America's trading partners began retaliating. Overall world trade declined by 66 per

cent between 1929 and 1934. US imports from Europe fell from a 1929 high of \$1,334 million to just \$390 million in 1932.

Nor did "protection" save jobs in the way that was claimed by the advocates of protection: some farm jobs may have been saved but only at the expense of a far greater number of jobs in the wider economy. Unemployment in the US was 7.8 per cent when the Smoot-Hawley tariff was introduced in 1930, but it had jumped to 16.3 per cent in 1931, 24.9 per cent in 1932 and 25.1 per cent in 1933.

The economic history of the 1920s and 30s and the need to avoid repeating measures which turned a recession into something infinitely worse should be uppermost in the minds of Europe's politicians, a point made eloquently by Philip York, a spokesman for New Zealand's Federated Farmers.

History Books

"People need to be reminded that the 1929 share market crash did not cause the Great Depression, but politicians did. Protectionist legislation became a template for protectionism copied around the world. Maybe we need to send all Euro MPs and their eurocrats some history books."

It is also devoutly to be hoped that the right kind of history book is to be found by the bedside of President Obama. The House of Representatives

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: *New EU working time rules p.2 - Missing EU targets p.2 - Sinister or absurd? p.3 - German courts could hold up Treaty ratification p.3 - Cameron gets deadline on EPP p.3 - How well does the EU manage our money? p.4 - Russia brandishes the energy weapon p.5 - Most laws made in Europe p.5 - EU Regulations have cost Britain £107 million p.6 - Twenty per cent chance of eurozone exit p.6*

New EU working time rules will be “disastrous” for doctors

New EU rules that limit working hours for junior doctors to 48 hours will be “disastrous” for the NHS, according to the The Royal College of Surgeons. The restriction will come in to force in August under the EU’s Working Time Directive (WTD).

The College warned that patients are being put at risk and the quality of their care is under threat as many hospitals are covering up failures to implement new rotas that comply with the Directive. It is calling for the Government to agree an opt-out to safeguard patient safety and highlighted that in America junior doctors work an 80-hour week and in Germany a 61-hour week has been agreed. In addition the College wants the EU’s on-call rules, also part of the

WTD, to change so sleeping at hospital does not count towards the working hours as at present.

A survey for the Association of Surgeons in Training (ASiT) found more than half of trainees felt under pressure to falsify their hours and 80 per cent of respondents would support an opt-out of the WTD to protect training. ASiT said that 65 hours a week is required to gain the necessary training opportunities for junior doctors.

John Black, President of the Royal College of Surgeons, said,

“There are simply not the surgeons in the United Kingdom to fill the gaps when every doctor’s hours are cut to a 48 hour per week maximum. On the other hand, trainees are telling the

college they cannot gain enough experience to progress on the shortened hours. The choice for the nation is clear - do we want patients of the future to be treated by a group of highly-skilled and experienced surgeons; or be passed around a wider group of lower-skilled surgeons with less experience”?

Separately, the BBC has reported that Scotland’s fire service is under threat from the potential end of the opt-out from the maximum 48 hour working week, which is currently being negotiated. Although also part of the WTD, this opt-out is a separate provision in the Directive to that of the working hours restriction for junior doctors.

Missing EU targets could cost hundreds of millions

Council tax payers could be landed with the bill for hundreds of millions of pounds of fines in four years’ time because the government will miss mandatory EU targets to halve the dumping of waste in landfill sites, the National Audit Office has warned.

A report by Whitehall’s auditors says a big delay in implementing a programme of building incinerators and large-scale recycling schemes has now been compounded by the effects of the credit crunch on raising money from banks and getting planning permission.

The government’s solution to meeting the new waste targets has been to try to raise cash from banks under the private

finance initiative but many of the large-scale schemes can no longer get money because of the credit crunch.

Since many of the new schemes involve building large incinerators, they are also running into opposition from local residents, resulting in an average delay of over 19 months to get planning permission. As it can take between five and nine years for a new plant to come on stream this means that the government is now in real danger of missing the target.

According to the auditors, only two big waste-treatment plants in England have come on stream since the programme was launched in 1999 and another nine projects have been approved. A further 18 are still in the

pipeline.

The two completed schemes are in Leicester and east London. Other schemes for incinerators planned in 2003 and 2006 have not even started, including Newhaven for East Sussex council, Nottinghamshire and Cornwall.

The report says: *“England is likely to meet its 2010 landfill-reduction targets but to meet the 2013 target the Department [for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs] will need to reduce substantially the time taken to procure projects and bring them into operation ... It will not be met if there continue to be programme delays or the infrastructure built does not work as efficiently as expected”.*

Continued from p.1

Butter mountain sends danger signals

has already voted for a bill that bans the use of foreign steel in infrastructure projects funded from America’s \$820 billion bail-out package. There are plans to widen the scope of the legislation.

If President Obama, whose campaign speeches displayed a strong protectionist flavour, responds to the

EU measures in relation to butter and milk by introducing measures to protect US agriculture the remaining chances of a new world trade deal will be finally killed off. The outcome could be a rapid and frightening shrinkage of world trade with all its attendant human, social and political horrors.

The reality is that the capacity of EU politicians to contribute positively to solving the present international economic and financial crisis is greatly outweighed by their capacity to make it very much worse. The return of the butter mountain has brought us closer to the brink of economic disaster.

Sinister or absurd?

The EU can be both at the same time

Readers will be surprised to learn that events that diminish “the dignity of the European Parliament” are not allowed to take place on parliamentary premises. After all most parliamentary debates would appear to fall into this category.

Readers will be similarly amazed to discover that events which have a commercial basis are also banned from the Parliament building. This will presumably also come as a nasty blow to the 15,000 Brussels-based lobbyists who constantly stalk the parliamentary building in the hope of influencing MEPs and eurocrats on behalf of their clients.

These, however, were the criteria which were advanced for the cancellation at the very last minute of a conference on smoking legislation which was due to take place in the European Parliament (EP) building on

January 13th and 14th.

The decision was taken by the EP Bureau which comprises the Parliament’s President Han-Gert Pöttering and his vice-presidents.

The conference, organised by the Independence/Democracy group which includes UKIP, took place instead at a Brussels hotel.

Godfrey Bloom MEP, one of the organisers, said the decision to prevent the conference taking place in an EP committee room would be the subject of an official complaint and that the European Ombudsman would be asked to investigate.

“We simply wanted to debate the implications of prohibition on smoking in public places, and invited experts from both sides of the debate to take part”, he said. He denied that it had been sponsored by the tobacco industry.

The on-line magazine *The*

Parliament.com has published the minutes of the private meeting of the Bureau at which the decision to withdraw permission for the conference to take place was made. This states that there was an,

“exchange of views on the subject, programme and objectives of the conference” and says that “events on parliament premises may under no circumstances have a commercial purpose and must not undermine the dignity of parliament”.

There is often something comic about the conduct of Herr Pöttering, the former leader of the EPP (of which the Conservative Party remains formally a part), but this should not conceal the deep vein of intolerance which his decision reflects. Like other European Union institutions the European Parliament has the capacity to appear ludicrous and sinister at one and the same time.

German courts could hold up Treaty ratification

Germany’s constitutional court has been handed a second complaint over the EU’s Lisbon Treaty with the potential to delay the country’s final ratification of the document for months.

The new legal action, running to over 200 pages, is concerned with economic as well as political issues, which the complainants say are not addressed by the Lisbon Treaty.

They argue that a prognosis on European integration given by the country’s constitutional court in a 1993 judgement on the Maastricht Treaty - which paved the way to the euro - has turned out to be false.

Instead, EU integration has been characterised by “continuous breaches of the stability pact, a presumptuous over-stepping of power by the European Commission, unaccountable leadership and dissolution of the separation of powers”, say the authors in a statement on Monday 26th January, according to the German daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*.

They say that the constitutional court cannot approve the Lisbon treaty because it “strengthens the current practice of dismembering the division of powers and mixing of competences”.

The complaint is being brought by

Markus Kerber, a commercial lawyer, Dieter Spethmann, a former chief executive of Thyssen, former MEP Franz Ludwig Graf Stauffenberg and economist Joachim Starbatty.

Germany’s highest court is already dealing with a separate complaint on the Lisbon Treaty by conservative MP Peter Gauweiler. It is due to have a two-day hearing on his complaint - which says the treaty undermines freedoms guaranteed in the German constitution - on 10th and 11th February.

Source: *EUObserver* 27th January.

Cameron gets deadline on EPP

British Conservative Party leader David Cameron should make up his mind by end-April whether his party is to leave the European People’s Party grouping in the European Parliament, Wilfried Martens, head of the EPP, told a press conference on 30 January.

“We want to have a clear position

before the European elections. In order to start a real campaign, we need to know if they will stay with us or if they will try to form another group”, Mr Martens told journalists after launching the EPP manifesto for the EU elections in June.

Asked about a deadline for the Conservative leader to announce his

move, Mr Martens said this should come before the EPP congress in Warsaw on 29-30th April.

“I understand that Mr Cameron had to make a promise to some of his members to become leader of the party. And that is his problem. He has to solve it, if he wants to stay”, Mr Martens added.

How well does the EU manage our money?

Ian Pearson, Economic Secretary to the Treasury: Regrettably, today we are faced with the inability of the European Court of Auditors to give a positive statement of assurance on the EU's accounts for the 14th consecutive year. I want to be clear from the outset that the Government consider the situation entirely unacceptable. It is simply not good enough that the majority of the EU budget suffers from a material level of error; errors affect more than 2 per cent of expenditure in most policy areas. On expenditure in the structural and cohesion funds, the court estimated an error of 11 per cent, or approximately £4 billion. That is a particular concern, as is the Court's opinion that the member states' and the Commission's supervisory systems are only partially effective in ensuring the legality and regularity of transactions in that significant area of EU budget expenditure.

It is disappointing that the Court was unable to give a positive opinion on agricultural expenditure; last year, it anticipated that it would be able to do so. In that area, it estimates that the material level of error still lies between 2 and 5 per cent, which is between €1 billion and €2.7 billion. European Union taxpayers deserve better.

Philip Davies (Shipley) (Con): It really is not good enough for the Minister to say, "*It's not good enough of the European Union*". Surely the problem is that each year the accounts are not signed off, but the following year the UK Government give even more money to the European Union. In what other case would the Treasury agree to give ever more money each year to an organisation that had not had its accounts signed off properly? Surely the answer is for the UK Government to say, "*We won't give you any more money until you get your accounts signed off properly*".

Ian Pearson: I certainly agree that European Union taxpayers' deserve better. Before turning to some of the key actions that we believe are needed to deal with the recurrent problem, I

want to mention the improvements that have taken place in recent years. In many instances, they are in large part due to the UK's continued pressure on financial management issues.

The European Court of Auditors has again been able to give a positive opinion on 40 per cent of EU budget expenditure. That compares to 35 per cent in 2005 and just 6 per cent in 2003. It is not good enough, but still a significant improvement. This year, the Court for the first time gave a positive opinion on the reliability of the EU's accounts with no reservations. The accruals-based accounting system introduced by the Commission in 2005, with our support, is now fully on stream and is successfully giving the Commission greater control of its day-to-day finances, enabling it to produce more accurate financial information. The estimated level of error for agricultural transactions outside rural development programmes remains "immaterial", and the whole European agricultural guarantee fund, which makes up the majority of agriculture expenditure, has received a positive statement of assurance from the Court.

Bob Spink (Castle Pont) (Ind): When can we expect pragmatic progress on reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, and when that progress takes place, what financial benefits will there be for the UK? What savings will be passed on to the UK? What cuts can we make to the amount of money that we are providing to subsidise agriculture in the rest of Europe?

Ian Pearson: As the Hon. Gentleman is aware, it is a long-standing policy of the Government to seek fundamental reform of EU finances. Spend on agriculture accounts for 40 per cent. of the EU budget; we do not believe that that faces modern realities, and we will continue, through the review process that is under way, to ensure that we negotiate and make our points clear.

Mr. Peter Bone (Wellingborough) (Con): When we agreed to the massive increase in contributions to the EU,

was it not the Government's position that we did so only because, during the French presidency, the CAP was to be reformed and there would be a massive reduction in expenditure? That just did not happen.

Ian Pearson: There has been reform, although in the UK's view there needs to be further reform. The Hon. Gentleman will be aware that the EU budget is going to go down in this financial year, compared to the previous financial year. I would have thought that he would welcome that.

Mr. David Heathcoat-Amory (Wells) (Con): Will the Minister comment on page 210 of the pre-Budget report, which shows in a small footnote that our net contributions to the EU budget are increasing from £2 billion this year to £6.5 billion in two years' time? In the light of the appalling mismanagement and waste shown by the European Court of Auditors, to which he has just alluded, can he instance any other Government programme that is increasing by that magnitude?

Ian Pearson: I do not have to hand the detailed figures that the Right Hon. Gentleman has quoted, so I cannot verify or comment on them....

I must emphasise that the disappointing error rates highlighted in this year's report should not be mistaken for widespread fraud in the European Union budget. As the 2007 "Fight Against Fraud" report makes clear, overall levels of estimated fraud remain relatively low, at approximately 0.2 per cent across the 2007 budget, affecting 0.1 per cent of agriculture spending and 0.3 per cent of structural and cohesion fund spending.

Source: House of Commons Hansard, 20th January 2009. Parliamentary Copyright.

Russia brandishes the energy weapon

Europe has contributed mightily to its own vulnerability to Russian threats to halt gas and electricity supplies

The planned closure of a huge Soviet-built nuclear power station at Ignalia in Lithuania has attracted little publicity in Western Europe, although it has generated intense controversy in the Baltic states. In several ways the controversy highlights Europe's failure to think seriously about how it will meet its future energy needs and the vulnerability in which consumers in EU states have been placed.

The power station provides seventy per cent of Lithuania's electricity needs and when it ceases operation next year Lithuania will be forced to turn to Russia, the country which annexed it in 1940 and which deported thousands of its people to Siberia.

Safety Systems

Its closure on grounds of safety was a condition of Lithuanian entry to the EU in 2004, and despite public protests, will almost certainly go ahead next year as planned. The power station was designed along similar lines to Chernobyl although millions have been spent upgrading its safety systems and the Lithuanian government claims that it is now entirely safe. The irony is that the energy which Lithuania will now be forced to buy will come from almost identical power stations inside the Russian Federation.

According to the *Financial Times* on 2nd December the sense of injustice and outrage at the closure within Lithuania is now intense.

"We're becoming an energy-isolated island", Lithuania's president Valdam Adamkus is quoted as saying.

"I'd even call it a Russian monopoly. Lithuania is being forced to close something that isn't broken."

Lithuanians are acutely conscious of

their dependency on Russian energy supplies and have no doubts about the Russian readiness to use the energy weapon in order to get its way politically.

In 1990 Moscow cut energy supplies to the Baltic states in a futile attempt to stifle their demand for independence. It was used again in 1992 in retaliation for demands that Russia remove its remaining military forces.

But Lithuania, and the two other Baltic states are not, of course the only countries against which Russia has used the energy weapon; their dependency on Russia is an extreme example of the dependency on Russia of virtually all EU states.

In 1993 and 1994 Russia reduced gas supplies to Ukraine in part to pressurise it into ceding control over its energy pipelines. Belarus, and indirectly Poland, have suffered from politically motivated supply reductions. Russia also halted all piped shipments of oil to Latvia in a bid to control the port of Ventspils.

In July of last year Moscow interrupted oil supplies to the Czech republic following Prague's decision to press ahead with its participation in US plans to build a ballistic missile shield.

More recently, Bulgaria and Slovakia were left without gas as a result of Russia's dispute with the Ukraine over the price the latter pays for supplies, a dispute which clearly had a political dimension.

Europe currently gets 42 per cent of its gas, a third of its oil and a quarter of its hard coal from Russia. The Commission estimates that by 2030 Europe will be importing 84 per cent of its gas needs from Russia.

Despite all of this the EU has ignored the lack of transparency and competition in Russia's energy market.

The Russian pipeline monopolies of Gazprom (natural gas) and Transneft (oil) are not commercial entities of a recognisable kind; in large measure they are instruments of the Russian state with close links to the FSB, the successor organisation to the KGB. Several analysts have also suggested that there may also be links to the Russian mafia.

As we go to press Angela Merkel the German Chancellor is reported to have stepped up pressure on the EU Commission and member states to back the Russian-German Nord-stream gas pipeline project, despite fears in Scandinavia and Central Europe that this will increase energy dependency on Russia still further.

Russian Gas Fields

The deal, which will link Germany directly to Russian gas fields was sealed by Ms Merkel's predecessor Gerhard Schröder who has since become a member of the Gazprom board.

In January, at the Davos business forum, President Putin spoke eloquently about his vision of "a single energy partnership" with Europe based on "a clear-cut legal foundation" which he compared to the treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community.

Given that Dmitry Medvedev, Putin's successor as President, has suggested that Russia's greatest problem is its condition of "legal nihilism" this is a prospect which should be regarded with the greatest possible apprehension. The fact that Europe has contributed its own vulnerability to the weapon which Russia now brandishes with impunity provides no consolation at all.

Most laws made in Europe, says EU website

"Many, probably most, laws enacted in your country are a transposition of European acts voted by MEPs - your representatives. And it's not just laws:

money for new roads, cleaner beaches, research, education, development aid? MEPs also decide where our EU money goes."

From *10 Good Reasons to Vote*, European Parliament website (www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2009).

LETTERS

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

Next Phase for *eurofacts*

Dear Sir,

The letter from Ralph Maddern of 30th January - which suggested that *eurofacts* should exploit electronic means of communication in order to move the battle to achieve Britain's withdrawal from the EU to a new phase - is very interesting.

I believe that you would advance the case for withdrawal from the EU by going online, particularly perhaps by creating a *eurofacts* blog, with provision for comments etc..

Your own website/blog could be just what is required to attract new readers and stimulate debate on the Monster!

Certainly, a very good idea.

TOM COLLINS

Essex

What Kind of Big Beast?

Dear Sir,

With reference to the article in *eurofacts* "Ken Clarke: What kind of Big Beast" (dated 30th January), I think we all know what kind of a Big Beast Ken Clarke is.

If nothing else, he has always been quite honest and straightforward in speaking his mind. The fact that I personally, disagree with his European views is immaterial. What does cause me concern, however, is the nature of the man who chose him. Is he afraid of being honest and saying he wants to

get the United Kingdom out of the EU, or is he being honest in not saying he wants to get us out as he has no intention of pursuing that view? The more I see and hear of David Cameron, the more he appears to be a right-wing edition of Blair. I do not know what he stands for and in consequence, I feel I cannot trust him. Heaven help us if there is a general election and the Conservatives win it.

DAVID HALLETT

Kent

Cyclical Factors

Dear Sir,

Ken Clarke may come at a price that has been exacted by splits in the Tory party again and again during the five years after a recession. There is abundant evidence of an eighteen-year cycle of economic and political affairs that ends in slump. The first five are years of stagnation and political peril, the next eleven are easy boom years and the last two are an uncomfortable descent to slump. The cycle was affected slightly in its regularity and more in its intensity by two world wars but resumed its regularity again with the slump of 1974. The Tories were split by Joe Chamberlain over tariff reform, under Baldwin over protection, under Chamberlain over conduct of the war and Major over the EU. If Cameron wins the next Election in 2010, in a year of slump, he will

encounter an ungovernable situation, exacerbated by Brown's deranged and wild moves to save his rumbled reputation and Clarke's split over the grotesque EU, that will have been fractured by recession. Perhaps then will Clarke be washed up and left to expire but nothing is predictable.

MALCOLM HILL

London

Freddy's Next Letter

Dear Sir,

Frederick Forsyth's next *eurofacts* letter explaining how the cause of getting out of the EU will not be set back by Ken Clarke's inclusion in the Cameron team should make fascinating reading.

TONY STONE

Surrey

Bounden Duty

Dear Sir,

From the answer given by Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State Baroness Vadera to Lord Stoddart's Question regarding the EU Working Time Directive (30th Jan), the British "Opt out" remains then, does it? After all, all those that speak on our behalf have a bounden duty to put their own Queen and Country before all else.

ANNE PALMER

Wolverhampton

EU Regulations have cost Britain £107 billion

Regulations introduced between 1998 and 2008 have cost the UK economy £148.2 billion according to a report published by *Open Europe*. Of this, £106.6 billion, or nearly 72 per cent, had its origin in EU legislation says the report which is entitled "*Out of Control: Measuring a decade of EU*

legislation".

EU regulations introduced since 1998 have therefore cost the UK economy almost £107 billion - far more than the UK's total gross contributions to the EU budget over the same period.

The report argues that because of the high proportion of regulations being

made in Brussels,

"*The Government effectively has control of less than 30 per cent of the annual cost of regulation*".

It concludes that initiatives to cut red tape, as well as the system of scrutiny in the UK are misdirected as they fail to take this into account.

Twenty per cent chance of eurozone exit

After Portugal became the third Eurozone country in a month to have its credit rating downgraded by the rating agency Standard and Poor's

the *Wall Street Journal* has reported that, on the online betting site Intrade, gamblers are wagering that there is at least a 20 per cent chance a country

will announce it plans to exit the eurozone by the end of next year.

MEETINGS

**Campaign for an
Independent Britain**
0116 2874 622

Wednesday **18th February**, 7.00 pm

“Defence and EU related matters”

Sir Nicholas Bonsor

SOCIAL EVENING

The Gun Room of Naval Club, 38 Hill Street, Mayfair, London W1J 5NS (Green Park tube station 10 minutes)

Admission Free

(Space is limited so admission is by advance reservations by phone or Email: georgec.west@talktalk.net)

Marlborough Group
01672 511385

Sunday **22nd February**, 2.00 pm

“Conservatives versus Constitution!”

Dr Sean Gabb

Chairman, **Harry Beckhough**

PUBLIC MEETING

The Bear, Marlborough, Wiltshire

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **24th February**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidency: George H.W. Bush”

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

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH

Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

2009

European Parliamentary Elections **4th June**

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

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Tuesday **24th February**, 7.00 pm

“The Destruction of Parliamentary Democracy”

Martin Howe QC, *author and special-ist in EU law and the Constitution*
Rt Hon Peter Lilley MP, *Secretary of State for Trade & Industry 1990-92*

Wednesday **18th March**, 7.00 pm

“The EU, the Credit Crunch and the Budget”

Professor Tim Congdon, *economist, one of Britain's leading commentators*
Lord Lamont

PUBLIC MEETING

Foreign Press Association, 11 Carlton Terrace, London SW1Y 5AT

Admission £10

(Includes wine, juice, mineral water and nibbles)

The Swinton Circle
organiser@swintoncircle.org.uk

Thursday **26th February**, 7.00 pm

“Seven Stupid Separatist Sophisms (from Scotland and England)”

Alistair McConnachie, *publisher of Sovereignty*

PUBLIC MEETING

Orange Street Congregational Church, London (just behind the National Portrait Gallery)

Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(Salisbury Constituency Branch)
01722 790839

Monday **2nd March**, 7.30 pm

“UK can't afford EU”

Trevor Coleman MEP
Nigel Farage MEP and Dr Julia Reid

PUBLIC MEETING

The Guildhall, Salisbury
Admission Free

The Freedom Association
(Wiltshire and Bath Branch)
01225 705260

Friday **6th March**, 7.30 pm

Guest Speaker

The Rev'd Dr. Peter Mullen

ANNUAL DINNER

The Bath and County Club, Queen's Parade, Bath, Somerset BA1

Admission £27.50

FREE BRITAIN - The Campaign for an Independent Britain
0116 2874 622

Saturday **4th April**, 2.30 pm

“Freedom and Democracy not European Union Dictatorship”

Frank Keogh
Dele Oguntimoju
Sir Teddy Taylor
War on Want spokesperson

PUBLIC MEETING

The Friends Meeting House, Large Hall, 173 Euston Road, London NW1 28J

Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01626 831340

Saturday **18th April**, 10.00 am

Nigel Farage MEP
Further details including Speakers to be announced shortly

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

British Weights and Measures Ass.
020 8922 0089

Saturday **9th May**, 10.00 am

Further details including Speakers to be announced shortly

ANNUAL CONFERENCE
Victory Services Club, 63 Seymour Street, London W2 2HF
Admission Free

How much does the European Union cost Britain?
by Gerard Batten MEP. **£3.00**

This shows amongst other costs that the accumulated trade deficit since joining the EU in 1973 is £383.7 billion.

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 End Of The English
The European Superstate
by David Brown. **£6.99**

As an apology to all grandchildren, it analyses 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.

After Tamerlane The Rise & Fall of Global Empires 1400 - 2000
by John Darwin. **£10.99**

Rise and fall of empires continues, but the nation state is still more powerful.

The Return of History & the End of Dreams

by Robert Kagan Hdbk. **£12.99**

A new configuration of power is shaping the international order. Nationalism, and the nation itself, has now returned in Europe the EU model is now in decline.

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