

One small step for union, one giant leap for uniformity

The post-Lisbon landscape of Europe looks bland, uninspiring and over-managed, but the boring image could well conceal something of greater concern

It was impossible not to sympathise with the plight of the former leader of UKIP, Nigel Farage MEP, as he delivered his verdict on the new “top jobs” in the EU. Mr Farage was, unusually, almost lost for words: after all, the appointment of two political nonentities as President of the Council and High Representative for foreign policy hardly looked like the next step along the road to the European superstate UKIP has been forecasting.

“Disgraceful,” was the best Mr Farage could produce, referring to the Council horse-trading that had produced the results and the fact that High Representative Baroness Ashton’s political elevation had been achieved without the inconvenience of election. It seemed that not even UKIP could see the dread hand of European federalism at work laying this first brick of the post-Lisbon architecture.

The rest of the world seemed not to know whether to smirk or shake its head in disbelief. Neither Baroness Ashton nor the new Council President, Belgian Prime Minister Herman van Rompuy, looked like one of the international power-brokers that we had been led to expect. Were these really the people to propel the EU to a leading role on the international stage?

In fact, the anointing of Mr van Rompuy and Baroness Ashton is completely in accord with the new arrangements that brought about their promotion. The Lisbon Treaty – née

the European Constitution – is not about politics. Its chief purpose is to do with management and it has thus created additional layers in an attempt to impose “consensus” more firmly on the still distressingly nationalistic member states.

In that respect, the new executive directors seem ideal. Both have risen without trace through the pathways of management – we are tempted to recall the Peter Principle relating to advancement and competence. Both have reputations that resonate only among their own managerial classes and both lard their public utterances with the buzzwords of management-speak. Post-Lisbon Europe could hardly be better served.

While commercial management can sometimes be imaginative and innovative and benefit from big personalities, those are not qualities required in bureaucracies. Their survival depends upon a certain drab uniformity (see “consensus” above) enforced by Kafkaesque regulation unintelligible to those outside the circle. Consequently, Mr van Rompuy will direct an army of civil servants whose job will be to bamboozle the leaders of the member states into what can be presented to their voters as the desirable “European” approach.

Baroness Ashton will command a budget of £3.6 billion a year and 3,000 new bureaucrats spanning the globe to mould the foreign relations of what

used to be 27 sovereign governments into a similar “European” position.

For such responsibilities, a distinct lack of charisma is beneficial. Already there have been mutterings among governments that their foreign affairs ministries are being downgraded and concern at a suggestion that their ministers should become EU envoys instead. How long before similar diminution overtakes national justice departments, social security ministries and treasuries? In order to complete this process, Brussels has calculated that for the moment it needs an invisible managerial hand, rather than a political Colossus, so as to confuse potential opposition.

These are early days, however. The European project is a long-term venture and far from being popular (which is why the successor to the rejected Constitution was not generally submitted to electorates and written in such a way as to avoid unpredictable votes in the future). That being so, the appointments of two unknowns were designed not to frighten the horses – hence Mr Farage’s difficulty in responding. The promoters of the single European state know that their vision can only be realised through attrition, not by revolution. Our new managers have the task of achieving a bland, ideology-free European uniformity. Once that is in place, their successors will be free to go all out for full European Union.

INSIDE: 27 minds with but a single thought? p.2 - EU fund rules ‘could choke investment’ p.3 - Fishing policy reform tied up in nets p.3 - EU trade: Doha may be the top priority, but barriers and anomalies remain p.4 - A minor key for the election campaign p.5 - Letters p.6 – UKIP should make clear what it is really for p.6

27 minds with but a single thought?

Baroness Ashton's first encounter as High Representative with the Foreign Affairs Committee of the European Parliament produced a good deal of waffle and pious hope, but little to suggest that EU member states will make much more of foreign policy – except in terms of cost. Here are edited highlights of what she had to say.

“ I M A G I N E that my appointment may have come as somewhat of a surprise to many of you – perhaps to all of you. It was quite a surprise for me too, but a very welcome one.

There has also been some talk of a lack of experience, and you might say that if you define experience very narrowly. However, I have never been someone who has considered things from a narrow perspective, and I have 28 years of experience of negotiation, of consensus-building and of advocacy.

If there is one thing we have learned in this very difficult past year, it is that by building confidence in one another and working together, we keep our fate in our own hands. To do this, we need people who can listen as well as talk, who can learn as well as teach, and who can work behind the scenes as well as in the glare of the spotlight.

I have shown that I have those qualities throughout my career. I led significant changes in the British Health Service. I have been UK Minister for both Human Rights and Justice. As UK Justice Minister I participated in and chaired the Justice and Home Affairs Council and I know very well how difficult but important it is to manage national preferences on the road to a common European policy. I was made leader of the House of Lords in 2007 and took the Lisbon Treaty through that House.

As Trade Commissioner I have completed negotiations on the biggest trade agreement ever by the European Union, with South Korea, and done so during one of the most difficult periods the global economy has ever faced. I have also kept our positive trade relations with partners like the US and China firmly on track. I believe that all this is why the 27 leaders in the European Council see me as the right person for this new role.

The first thing I can promise is that as I move forward there will be continuity

in EU foreign policy and in our dealings with our global partners. The reputation of the European Union is a good one, based on our strong values. We already speak with conviction and clarity on the major challenges that face us, be they climate change, poverty, conflict or terrorism. We are the biggest provider of humanitarian aid and project funding. We are a superpower economy with half a billion people, but are still accused of not punching our weight politically.

My job is to make our voice stronger and more unified still. As underlined in the European Security Strategy, the European Union should become a more capable, more coherent and more strategic global actor.

As High Representative I must help ensure consistency between different areas of our common foreign and security policy, and also with other policy areas. I must also give the right impulses for the future: I intend to fully use the right of initiative conferred to the High Representative by the Treaty to make proposals in the area of Common Foreign and Security policy. In doing so, I can maximise the synergies that arise from my two roles.

I will draw my authority in international negotiations from the European Council in which I will take part, and from the foreign affairs council composed of the EU foreign ministers, which I will chair from January. The council will deliberate, will determine views, with my support and input, and that will be the voice I will speak with. I will equally be a member of the European Commission as Vice-President, drawing on its many resources and instruments. I know that the College of Commissioners is one of the great assets of the European Union. Anyone who thinks that I will take my eye off the ball regarding Commission business is very much mistaken.

As High Representative I do not replace member states or the Commission, but rather ensure that we

combine views and input in the best interests of Europe. My ambition is to help member states and the Commission, through dialogue, to upgrade their level of consensus on CFSP. I will do so pro-actively, and I will not settle for the lowest common denominator.

All this will only be possible if I am backed by a strong new service, one that will be the envy of the rest of the world. That is why setting up the External Action Service, which I will then head, will be my main priority for the coming weeks and months.

The External Action Service will add value to what our member states already do, and in many areas can offer a “one-stop shop” to those who want it and need it. It is a unique selling point for many of our partners, and I will make it my legacy and first priority to establish.

I have been clear that I need to increase my understanding of what we need to do and how to do it. That is why I intend to launch a review of our external policy in certain key areas, something I will be discussing further with foreign ministers.

The goal of the High Representative is to present a clearer and stronger voice to our international partners, but we must also explain clearly to our own citizens what we aim to achieve. I am mindful of the fact that there is still much work to be done here.

As some commentators have put it, citizens were not dancing in the streets on entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. Even our best efforts were unlikely to achieve that, but there is much we can do to improve understanding of our work, and I want to play my part.

This challenge will also require us all to work closer together to convey the message to our citizens that we are working in their interests on EU foreign policy.”

EU fund rules ‘could choke investment’

No area of the financial sector can escape the attention of the European Union – that was the chilling message delivered to the European Parliament this month in a report on the Commission’s aim to take regulatory control of alternative investment vehicles such as private equity and hedge funds.

The Parliament’s rapporteur, Jean-Paul Gauzès, a centre-right French MEP, told the Economic and Monetary Affairs committee that he proposed going beyond the Commission’s Directive on Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities (UCITS).

The draft directive proposes to force hedge fund managers to justify their pay and prove it does not encourage excessive risk-taking. It sets out rules that discourage “golden-handcuff” payments designed to retain high-fliers and insists that nearly half of bonus payouts should be deferred for at least three years.

Under the directive, the new pan-European watchdog for markets that is due to emerge from an overhaul of financial supervision will be responsible for the pay guidelines for the fund managers.

This, however, is not enough for the traditional French statist approach to markets of Mr Gauzès. He proposes a series of amendments to the draft,

ranging from the scope of the directive to new provisions on depositories’ liability, leverage limits, valuations, remuneration policy and funds from non-EU countries.

Mr Gauzès advocates reducing the exemptions set out in the Commission proposal and seeks to remove its investment threshold – the draft directive would cover only entities managing portfolios with total assets of over €100 million. He wants all managers of alternative investment funds, including pension funds, set up and operating in the EU to be subject to a legally-binding authorisation and supervisory regime, which should apply irrespective of the legal domicile of the fund managed.

Any such fund manager operating in the EU would also be required to hold and retain a minimum amount of capital which, according to the rapporteur, should correspond to the amounts set by the UCITS Directive, which aims to ensure that investors receive useful cost and performance disclosures.

Mr Gauzès insists that fund managers should describe their leverage policies to the regulator, who should decide whether or not they should be implemented. He believes “the EU should not be a fortress”, which in his view means that funds from outside Europe should apply for a “European

passport” to allow them to operate in the EU, while funds located in the EU could market funds throughout Europe, provided that EU member states other than their own were notified.

The real aim of Mr Gauzès is to apply harmonised rules for private investment, but he admits that it is “not realistic” at present to seek approval for this – so he proposes transitional periods for introducing such rules.

In London – whose world-leading financial services the EU would love to control – Business Secretary Peter Mandelson has given a warning that the proposed regulation would damage investment prospects across Europe and might turn the credit crunch into a permanent feature of EU economies.

“Even before the credit crunch we just weren’t getting enough venture capital to innovative and high tech companies.” Lord Mandelson said. “Even in this environment, US firms could tap venture capital markets worth over \$5 billion this year. In the EU it was about a tenth of that.”

Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee MEPs have until 21st January to table amendments, which should be debated in committee on 22nd February put to a committee vote on 12th April. The plenary vote is scheduled for 1st July.

Fishing policy reform tied up in nets

Our suggestion last month that the European Commission was preparing to admit the disastrous failure of the Common Fisheries Policy by walking away from it came a step closer on when an open debate in the European Parliament demonstrated what a mess the policy has created.

A public hearing involving fisheries experts concluded that the main CFP aims had not been achieved. The only other point of agreement was that the Commission’s customary “one size fits all” approach must be abandoned if CFP reform was to deliver sustainable solutions to problems such as over-fishing, fish discards and economic

and social decline. As the Rapporteur, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves of Portugal, noted, a consensus might be reached on the need to decentralise fisheries management, improve social conditions for fishermen, increase profitability and boost investment in scientific knowledge, but there was little common ground on how these aims could best be achieved.

Guus Pastoor of the European Fish Processors Association said small-scale and industrial fisheries would take very different views on transferable fishing rights as an alternative to the quota system, while Sean O’Donoghue of the Federation of

Irish Fishermen said decentralisation and regionalisation did not offer a good solution for highly migratory species.

Many representatives of the fishing industry argued for better scientific data, but some MEPs accused fishermen of being more interested in social sustainability than the viability of fish stocks.

Public debate will continue, but it is evident that neither the Commission nor the Parliament’s Fisheries Committee has any idea of what might replace the CFP in 2013. We can only hope that whatever emerges can begin to reverse the damage caused by the current policy.

EU trade: Doha may be the top priority, but barriers and anomalies remain

ON 1st December, the House of Lords debated the Report of the European Union Committee on Developments in EU Trade Policy, though the report was published a year ago. It was introduced by Baroness Cohen of Pimlico, who chairs the EU Economic and Financial Affairs, and International Trade Sub-Committee. Extracts from the debate:

Baroness Cohen: Today, the Lisbon treaty, which gives the European Parliament powers of co-decision with the Council on matters of trade, comes into force and, today and tomorrow, a World Trade Organisation ministerial meeting is taking place to discuss the method of resuming the stalled Doha round in the hope that it can be concluded by the end of next year...

Alongside the WTO multilateral negotiations, liberalisation can occur through unilateral, bilateral or regional agreements. The number of bilateral agreements has increased in recent years and we were told that the disadvantages of bilateral agreements included the possible political motivations behind a deal and the complex "spaghetti bowl" of agreements if you did not have a multilateral agreement. Despite these disadvantages, we noted that bilateral deals are now a fixture of the trade landscape and could usefully contribute to economic growth. The EU moratorium on bilateral deals, concluded in the interest of encouraging multilateral deals, ended in 2006 and many more member states are expected to support a move to bilateral deals in the absence of the conclusion of a multilateral deal...

We also considered dumping, which is the practice of exporting below cost to gain a market share. The European Union can apply anti-dumping measures equal to the difference between the export price of the goods and their production cost. Proposals for the reform of anti-dumping have not progressed since the Commission

Green Paper of 2006. We expressed our disappointment in the report and there the matter rests, obviously squarely in the Commission's "too difficult" box...Independent witnesses warned us of increased protectionism, while Ministers and officials were always optimistic about the imminent conclusion of the round. Promises of aid support have not always materialised. The disconnection between word and deed appears to be in the nature of the subject...

Lord Trimble: Most of the recent liberalisation has occurred not through comprehensive rounds but through unilateral action or through bilateral, multilateral or plurilateral agreements. Since 1980, between 65 per cent and 70 per cent of the reduction in tariffs has been through unilateral actions...

Lord Haskins: It may be more difficult to get the EU 27 to agree a single position in 2010 as Lord Mandelson, did in 2008...The EU, incidentally, has always been at a disadvantage in these negotiations because, unlike the other countries, it has to have two negotiations: one within the EU 27 to agree a position, and then with the WTO itself. Of course, during the process of the internal negotiation within the EU 27, it reveals its hand and enables other people to take a position.

Lord Woolmer of Leeds: Services make up around 77 per cent of GDP and employment in the European Union, but represent only 28 per cent of EU external trade. Services make up 64 per cent of the US economy, 80 per cent of the Australian economy, 55 per cent of the Indian economy, 54 per cent of the Brazilian economy and 40 per cent of the Chinese economy. They are therefore very important across the world, not just in Europe. Despite restrictions, international trade in services is several times that in agricultural products, yet liberalisation of trade in services has, in the words of paragraph 23 of the committee's report

"been curiously neglected: left until last in the negotiations and of less interest to most witnesses".

Lord Dykes: It is sad that the United Kingdom is not a member of the eurozone because the euro has become probably the most successful currency in the world. It has some effect at the margin on global imbalances...but it is none the less an outstandingly successful international currency as well as an intra-EU currency...

Lord Hunt of Wirral: The Government have said that they will continue to press for further reform of the common agricultural policy. What new approaches are they going to take? What assurances can the First Secretary of State give us now that opportunities will not be wasted again? Can he explain what action is being taken to push for such reform?...One step which the UK could push for would be an immediate end to all production-related support under the CAP to bring the rest of the EU into line with England...

Lord Mandelson: The completion of the Doha round has to remain the top priority for the European Commission, even though we all recognise the competing pressures that are operating in Washington...Trade and certainly the Doha negotiations are not taking centre-stage on the US Administration's radar...

My next point concerns the European Parliament's new role in European trade policy...This new framework will be good for the legitimacy of the European Union's trade policy as long as we can avoid the wider institutional process slowing down the wheels of policy advancement, as we have seen happen in the United States...It would set back the credibility of Europe's trade policies and standing in the world if we were to find our mandates being blunted and feet being dragged in the European Parliament...

House of Lords © Parliamentary copyright 2009

A minor key for the election campaign

Tory strategy might work in 2010, but the Eurosceptic parties could turn out to be the real beneficiaries later on

David Cameron's withdrawal of his policy a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty, clears up the political scene.

After Vaclav Klaus signed the Treaty, Mr Cameron rejected the obvious next move of having a referendum after the general election on a "negotiating mandate" to repatriate the most objectionable items in the EU treaties. Such a mandate would have numerous advantages, as outlined by David Davis. It would be clear, transparent and accountable. The people would have their say and the government would have a formidable weapon to force change, rather than being depicted by EU politicians as an obsessive minority.

However, the Cameron policy change flows naturally from his previous strategy. This strategy is set by an incredibly small number of people – fewer than ten – who make all the decisions. This has the effect that policy and strategy are poorly thought out and the new Cameron proposals have been widely criticised and even ridiculed from all sides as ineffective and meaningless.

Moreover the Tory leadership regards the EU as a non-salient issue when it comes to obtaining votes in a general election. The fixation is on the strategy winning over the swing 20 per cent of voters in the swing 20 per cent of constituencies in what the *New Statesman* calls "the stranglehold of a million or so voters in a handful of marginal seats in Middle England."

More sophisticated observers, such as Kavanagh and Butler in their analysis in *The British General Election of 2005*, point out: "There was little correlation between the Conservative share of the vote and the change in the Labour share of the vote."

Labour's share of the vote was down by 6 per cent in 2005, yet the Conservatives gained only 0.5 per cent. For unexplained reasons, Tory strategists believe this trend will not

influence voting again. A number of political conclusions may be drawn from these events.

It is clear that in the next Parliament David Cameron will do nothing substantive to alter Britain's relationship with the EU. He has even reiterated the pledge to get Turkey into the EU. In effect, he has vindicated Gyles Brandreth's recommendation of David Cameron for a job with Kenneth Clark in 1994 by telling Clark "he is one of us", a liberal Conservative.

There is also the effect on David Cameron's reputation in general as regards his principles, his competence and his willpower. It is hard to see how his reputation for any of these will be enhanced. Many people who were on the edge of voting Conservative or voting for an alternative may have drawn conclusions, especially on Tory promises to cut immigration, keep taxes down and restore public sector financial discipline.

Some Eurosceptic Tory MPs, especially those of the BOO group, may maintain principle, but the leadership has indicated it will not address the EU issue and, apart from Dan Hannan and Roger Helmer, the Tory MPs and MEPs and candidates have gone along with the Cameron volte face.

This episode will give a substantial boost to the long-term trend of the Conservatives shedding votes to minor parties grounded on former Tory principles of democracy, patriotism and protecting the interests of the British people. These are UKIP, the BNP, the English Democrats and the Christian Party. It is often said that the BNP mainly takes votes away from Labour. That is true, but they are also votes which, in the face of disillusionment with Labour, in past elections before the 1990s the Tories would have gained and, indeed, must gain.

In 2005 the average vote secured by a

UKIP candidate was 3.2 per cent and the BNP 4.3 per cent. The upward movement was sustained in the Euro elections of 2009, with UKIP gaining 16.5 per cent and the BNP 6.2 per cent of the vote. UKIP performed very well in the recent by-election in the Norwich North constituency.

The drivers of discontent with the major parties have not gone away and have indeed been enhanced by the parliamentary expenses scandal. The minor parties seem well placed to be polling an average combined share of 6-8 per cent of the votes in the seats they contest in England, with outliers in the 10 percent range. With few gains expected for the Tories in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, and with the Liberals likely to shed perhaps only 15 seats to the Tories, if that, the Tories need to win 100 seats from Labour in England to form a majority.

The minor parties would be well advised to concentrate their resources on these seats. Ten per cent of the vote is certainly sustainable in some seats and these could materially affect the election outcome.

Tory strategy is based on a Labour collapse and the Tories gaining a majority in what will be a very fragmented election. Even supposing this works and delivers an election victory, quite a number of seats will be won on low pluralities because of the fragmented votes, so the leakage to minor parties may carry on growing if the Conservatives continue to neglect core interests and ideals.

At present the prospect of a Conservative government is soaking up most discontent with Labour. If the Cameron government goes off the rails, the scope for the minor parties to grow is quite spectacular if they get their own houses in order.

It has seemed for some time that it is the election after 2010 that will have the scope for a major upset in British politics whatever the result this time.

Article by Anthony Scholefield

LETTERS

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

The party we need is here

Dear Sir,
Ralph Maddern (*eurofacts*, October) is quite right to say that we need a political movement dedicated to releasing Britain from the shackles of the EU.

Where has he been? We have one.

The UK Independence party was set up precisely for that purpose and has been fighting for this since 1993. In the European elections earlier this year UKIP came second beating Labour and Lib-Dems and winning 13 seats. UKIP will field more than 500 candidates in the forthcoming general election. Polls show that at least 45 per cent of the electorate want Britain to leave the EU. If these people all vote UKIP that percentage will win enough seats for us to do the job.

DAVID ROWLANDS
Wales

A different future?

Dear Sir,
Are Britain's parliamentary political parties intellectually dead? In the first months of 2010 we shall have opportunity to judge.

From about 1900, Labour developed a programme for the remaking of society. This was tested from 1945 to 1951, after which the party lost interest in ideas, preferring to concentrate on gaining and keeping office, an outlook that has intensified under New Labour.

As the world's most enduring political party, the Conservatives are no strangers to re-invention. The last such was the Thatcher period. Since then the party has tiptoed cautiously, opting where it can to imitate New Labour. It appears to be still in that

mode, which does not augur well for the future of our country, should the electorate decide in 2010 that the Tories are the least-worse option.

The Lib-Dems and liberalism generally have had, arguably, the broadest effect upon society despite their party having been denied office. The metropolitan liberal elite has imposed political correctness which one infringes at one's peril. Part of this mindset derives from the European Community, which has been insinuated as the standard of "right" thinking.

Britons may wish to see all this sorry detritus swept away so that a fresh beginning could have a chance of making traction. Like the way out of the economic recession, no one, "expert" or lay, seems to have a clue what might turn up. However, do sceptics have a sense of groundswell feeling that the future cannot be like the present?

RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

The question of loyalty

Dear Sir,
Mr Howell (*eurofacts*, November) kindly suggests that I (*eurofacts*, September) should have raised the question of Minister's first loyalty to monarch or president in 1972.

Actually I started asking it some six years ago, when I first became aware that the European Union was considering the appointment of a permanent president of its Council. I repeated the question some six weeks ago to the Prime Minister and the Lord Chancellor. I still await their replies.

I disagree with Mr Howell that Her Majesty has surrendered her supreme

sovereignty. Her Ministers could still withdraw the UK from the European Union.

Our anointed Queen is superior to this new-fangled secular president, and she retains her supreme sovereignty over the UK under Almighty God.

I for one, as Mr Howell suggests, am not ruled from Brussels, as long ago I renounced my EU citizenship imposed upon me without my consent (*eurofacts*, 2nd November 2007). That option is still open to Mr Howell or any of Her Majesty's subjects.

LT COL T H PARES
Norfolk

Lisbon is not for ever

Dear Sir,
You (*eurofacts* November) and David Cameron are wrong to say that a post ratification referendum on the Lisbon Treaty would be a pointless exercise. A treaty lasts only as long as all the signatories so desire; also a government cannot bind its successor
GERALD STANCEY
Leicestershire

Gordon for the ECB

Dear Sir,
Names are already being put forward to succeed Jean-Claude Trichet when he vacates the presidency of The European Central Bank.

Gordon Brown was "the best Chancellor that Britain ever had" as the BBC so often reported.

Gordon Brown then went on to "save the world" from global meltdown and is therefore the man best qualified to be the next president of the ECB.

PAUL METSON
North Yorkshire

UKIP should make clear what it is really for

UKIP's fruitless offer to the Tories to stand aside at the next election in return for a commitment to a referendum on EU membership has produced much confusion and statements of "clarification" from both

the UKIP press office and the party's new leader, Lord Pearson of Rannoch.

There was some dismay at the suggestion, subsequently disavowed, that the party would "disband" if it got its longed-for referendum, which it is

convinced would lead to EU withdrawal. The affair shows the dilemma at UKIP's heart: is it a campaign group merely seeking our exit from the EU, or a broader political party? Potential voters should be told.

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **19th January**, 6.00 pm

“The New Consensus of the Governed: Re-imagining Corporate Governance”

Kenneth Costa, *Mercer's School Memorial Professor of Commerce at Gresham College*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **4th February**, 6.00 pm

“The Wars of German Unification, 1864-1871”

Richard J Evans FBA, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Thursday **7th January**, 9.40 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the European Social Fund* from the Convergence Partnership Office for Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2009

UK Parliamentary Recess Starts **16th December**

2010

UK Parliamentary Recess Ends **5th January**

Commonwealth Day **8th March**

Last date for UK General Election **4th June**

USEFUL WEB SITES

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.eurosceptic.org.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

Team
www.teameurope.info

The TaxPayers Alliance
www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org

FREE

Advertising Space

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

eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65
or Email: eurofacts@juneypress.com

The season's greetings

eurofacts wishes all our readers the compliments of the season.

Our next issue will be published on the 22nd January 2010

Brussels Laid Bare

by *Marta Andreasen*. **£10.00**

How the EU treated its chief accountant when she refused to go along with its fraud and waste. That's the strap line.

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.

The Real Global Warming Disaster

by *Christopher Booker*. *Hdbk*. **£16.99**

Is the obsession with 'climate change' turning out to be the most costly scientific blunder in history? That is the question Booker deals with and concludes that the answer is 'Yes'.

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.

Bloodless Revolution

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£4.99**

Are political parties the cause of our problems? Why we would be better off without them and how to do it one day.

Reflections on the Revolution in Europe:

by *Christopher Caldwell*. **£14.99**

How mass immigration affects Europe and what the culture-shaping potential of religion can have on democracy Can Europe be the same with different in it?

The Great European Rip-Off

by *David Craig & Matthew Elliott*. **£8.99**

How the corrupt wasteful EU is taking control of our lives.

While the Earth Endures

Creation, Cosmology and Climate Change

by *Philip Foster*. **£10.00**

A theological look at the earth, and myths associated with global warming with a foreword by David Bellamy.

Babylon In Europe

What Bible Prophecy Reveals

About The European Union

by *David Hathaway*. **£6.00**

Is there a hidden purpose in the creation of the European Union?

Cool Thinking on Climate Change

by *Roger Helmer MEP*. **£4.00**

Why the EU's climate alarmism is both mistaken and dangerous.

Why Did Britain

Take The Wrong Path?

by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£9.99**

How and why the UK lost its way and ended up with a fear of self-government, resulting in democracy being exchanged for the EU dream of a superstate.

Ten Years On: Britain Without The European Union

by *Dr Lee Rotham*. **£5.99**

The title explains the idea of this book, with a foreword by Trevor Kavanagh and an epilogue by Frederick Forsyth.

An Environmental Audit

How membership of the EU has changed the face of Britain

by *Tom Wise*. **£2.00**

From the view of the landscape through fishing and ending with immigration.

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 **£30**
 Europe (Airmail) **£42**
 Rest of World **£55/\$95**
 Reduced rate (UK only) **£20**

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.

Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

Please send me the monthly *eurofacts* and the occasional briefing papers.

I enclose my annual 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 7385 9757
 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
 Lord Pearson of Rannoch

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006