

A Tory government must face the EU question head-on

Labour and the Lib Dems believe that Europe is the only game in town, but for the UK there is a unique alternative – the Commonwealth

So the Lisbon Treaty has achieved its destiny, as we said it would. Reading this, you may already know the identities of the “president” and “foreign minister” who are to be the public faces of the emerging united states of Europe – if it looks like a dog and behaves like a dog then reason suggests that it is a dog.

Only the most misty-eyed sceptic could believe that the Eurocracy, having seen its constitution die, would allow the same fate to overtake its genetically modified successor. Most electorates were ignored; fearful Ireland could be relied upon to give the right answer after a ritual protest, as it had done before, and the opposition of Czech President Klaus was open to the offer of some face-saving gesture. Lisbon was never going to fail.

Equally predictable, as we also said, was the fatal rusting of David Cameron’s cast-iron guarantee of a UK referendum on the treaty, once what proved to be the mirage of an imminent general election had faded. Now, with the treaty adopted and the election finally approaching, he has been forced to concede that such a referendum is no longer relevant.

Cries of “betrayal” in reaction to the Conservative leader’s change of policy are unjustified. Mr Cameron is quite right to say that a post-ratification referendum would be a pointless exercise, whatever Eurosceptics might like to believe. It is the Labour

Government that has betrayed voters by reneging on its own referendum promise, disingenuously claiming that a vote was unnecessary because Lisbon did not involve the weakening of our constitution.

One might have hoped that the Tories’ new policy would have contained more substance than the original rhetorical guarantee, but Mr Cameron’s cautious approach is both understandable and statesmanlike.

In promising a “sovereignty law” to prevent further constitutional erosion, a referendum on any future treaty and attempts to repatriate certain powers from Brussels, he has done the minimum necessary to keep many Eurosceptics on-side for the real election to come, and – he hopes – to contain any voter defection to UKIP.

Mr Cameron knows that the coming election will not be fought over the question of Europe and the policy statement he made earlier this month is an attempt to ensure that it does not become a distraction from the real, urgent and basic battles that need to be fought – as the euro did for William Hague. At the same time, he does not wish to face the prospect of office with a European punch-up at the top of his agenda. There is too much else to do.

His current policy, though, can be no more than a holding operation: a sovereignty law will make no difference; there will be no more treaties to trigger a referendum and the

repatriation of powers will not happen. So if the Tories do form the next government, Mr Cameron will have the opportunity to show the qualities of a real statesman by facing the EU question head-on.

Labour and the Lib Dems are wedded to the Europhile consensus that the EU is the only game in town. The Tories should demonstrate that this is not true by setting out a vision of what a more independent UK might be like.

Trade with European partners is important, but trade and co-operation do not require the common political structures of the federalist agenda. And in a globalised market the UK, uniquely among European nations, has an alternative – the Commonwealth. For too long our EU membership has blinded us to the possibilities of a market of 53 countries that spans the globe and which already has the necessary common structures.

A Cameron government, if it comes about, should initiate a serious debate on our future, with a view to holding at some stage during the next parliament a referendum on the UK’s continuing membership of the EU.

It is 25 years since we were last consulted, and the institution we supported then was very different from the one created by the Lisbon Treaty. This has led to EU membership becoming a festering sore on our body politic for which we must now seek a second opinion.

INSIDE: US challenge for EU’s foreign foray p.2 - EU aid ‘puts European interests first’ p.2 - The smell of stinking fisheries policy p.3 - Klaus raises the prospect of civil disobedience p.3 - European Parliament: Little to be gained from MEPs’ questioning of Barroso p.4 - Is the Commission now unlawful? p.5 - What we could do with £7.9 billion p.5 - Brigadier Anthony Cowgill p.5 - Letters p.6 – Euro-free UK tops world financial league p6

US challenge for EU's foreign foray

With the EU preparing to strut its stuff as, supposedly, a single entity on the world stage, with its High Representative for Foreign Affairs and the army of diplomats in its External Action Service, there are growing signs that it might have to do so without much of the support on which Europe has counted for so many years.

Last month *eurofacts* wondered aloud whether President Obama's America was actually less interested in Europe than previous administrations and we reported the view of eminent Russians that the EU was becoming increasingly irrelevant in terms of global political power. It is a theme that has been taken up by some American commentators.

What prompted these reflections was the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Mr Obama, which, it is generally agreed, was intended to encourage the President to embark on a new, multilateralist foreign policy. If he does so, where will that leave the traditional transatlantic alliance – and is it what the Europeans really want?

The questions were asked by a former US ambassador to the EU, C Boyden Gray, writing in *The Washington Times*. "This may be a case," he wrote, "where, after putting aside the usual political correctness and hypocrisy that occasionally afflicts both sides of the Atlantic, the Norwegians may regret suggesting more rather than less divergence between the US and EU."

Mr Gray cites the "unilateral nature

of the abrupt change in the US intention to deploy missile defence in Poland and the Czech Republic", which he regards as a nod to Russia in the hope of changing Moscow's opposition to tougher sanctions on Iran. If such rapprochement does indeed come about, what message might that send to the EU?

He points out that since 1945 US administrations have been committed to and invested in European independence in both economic and security terms, yet – the financial crisis apart – Europe has not achieved comparable growth rates and remains dependent on US military spending for its protection. What would happen if Mr Obama did go multilateral?

With President Bush, says Mr Gray, the Europeans knew precisely where they were, the only significant global policy differences being related to the response to climate change. With President Obama, the first task of the EU's new foreign policy arm might be to work out what Europe's relationship with a more outward looking US can and should be.

The historian and syndicated columnist Victor Davis Hanson, of the Hoover Institution, puts the dilemma in starker terms.

Mr Obama "defers to the United Nations and has criticised ossified Cold War-era alliances," he writes. "Judging by his actions and words, Obama views American habitual protection of an allied but militarily defenceless Europe as, well, kind of

passé." The President, Mr Hanson says, is spurning Europe in the face of new geopolitics: "We owe most of our debt to non-Europeans, buy our energy from non-Europeans and seem to send our soldiers increasingly far from Europe...China, India and Japan are also collectively larger than Europe and may one day be wealthier as well."

Nor is it only Mr Obama who is looking beyond the country's historical relationships: "America is changing. Millions of Americans now trace their heritages not to Europe, but to Africa, Asia or Latin America. For a generation, the schools have emphasised all sorts of non-Western ethnic studies courses instead of the old core curriculum based on Western civilisation."

Mr Hanson's message could not be clearer: "Get a grip, Europe...Obama's America is just not that into you."

They are words that Europe's new diplomats, as they look forward to moving into their "embassies" across the world, would do well to bear in mind. Multilateralism means that Europeans will no longer be at the head of the queue when it comes to handing out political power. Indeed it might be argued that 27 countries attempting to present themselves as one is the very antithesis of multilateralism.

It could be a lot colder out there than anyone in Brussels thought when they dreamed of seeing the EU as a significant force in the new world order.

EU aid 'puts European interests first'

The organisation that represents more than 1,600 non-governmental organisations across Europe has attacked EU aid to developing countries as undermining their economic, social and human development. It says that in spite of high-principled declarations from Brussels, such aid frequently ends up serving the interests of Europe rather than the countries it is supposed to help.

The European NGO umbrella group, the Confederation for Relief and Development (Concord), accuses the EU of "using development aid to control migration flows and reduce irregular migration." Yet some EU policies actually encourage migration, the organisation says.

It cites the subsidised export of European pork, beef and

dairy products to African countries as ruining the livelihoods of local farmers the EU is supposed to support and forcing them to migrate to the West.

Brussels has made a commitment to what officials call Policy Coherence for Development, but Concord claims EU policies are anything but coherent, development goals often conflicting with pro-European trade concerns. It concedes that the EU is trying to improve the cohesiveness of its policies but says there is much room for improvement, and that trade must become a top priority.

The Concord report *Spotlight on Policy Coherence* is available for download in PDF format at the organisation's website (www.concordeurope.org).

The smell of stinking fisheries policy

There is a certain irony in the fact that the European Fisheries Commissioner Joe Borg is to receive the Swedish Seafood Award for his achievements in sustainable fisheries and gastronomy, just as the Commission is warning that cod is on the verge of extinction in important European fishing grounds.

A meeting of fisheries ministers next month is likely to be faced with a call for 25 per cent cuts in the Total Allowable Catches (TACs) of cod in the English Channel, the North Sea and the Skagerrak.

So much for the EU's cod conservation policy, which began in 2002, and the disastrous Common Fisheries Policy, which has thrown tens of thousands of fishermen out of work without any notable benefit in terms of fish stocks.

"The stocks the EU is involved in managing are in terrible shape," says the Swedish Fishery Ministry.

Nor is cod the only species for which the Commission proposes that TACs should be slashed. Cuts will affect haddock in the West of Scotland, sole in the Channel and off the coast of Norway, lobster and herring off Ireland and whiting in the Irish Sea. Some 50 other species are attracting proposed cuts of up to 15 per cent in allowable catches.

This is bound to mean that more fishing vessels will be laid up or scrapped and more jobs will be lost while at the same time, on past performance, fish stocks will continue to decline.

"These reductions go in the direction of the scientific advice," says the Commission, "but have been moderated in order to alleviate hardship for the catching sectors in the

short term. The bottom line is that no fish means no fishermen. So while being a difficult pill to swallow, these measures are also necessary if we are to bring stocks to sustainable levels."

Given that our own Defra has admitted that many fish stocks are now in a worse state than they were last year, it is hard to see how the EU can claim that its policy is likely to lead to sustainability. Indeed, if the sort of pan-European quota system the Commission imposes is allowed to continue, it is likely to result in the very outcome Brussels cites in justification – no fish.

That is certainly the view of Canadian marine ecologist Daniel Pauly, whose recent article in *The New Republic* was starkly headed "Acqualapypse Now".

"Simply permitting all fisheries to catch a given aggregate number of fish annually" does not work, writes Professor Pauly. "The entire annual quota is usually landed in a short period, leading to temporary oversupply, which, in turn, leads to low prices."

Under the European Common Fisheries Policy, TACs are determined for specific fish stocks in each sea area. Of these, each member state is allotted a share, so naturally each country competes with the others to obtain the maximum possible allocation. That the system has not resulted in sustainable fisheries is evident. For one thing, it means that millions of tonnes of dead fish are thrown back into the sea each year so that quotas will not be breached. This, of course, helps neither stocks nor the incomes of fishermen.

Professor Pauly suggests instead limiting the numbers of fishermen, with those retaining "access privileges" being able to catch their

assigned fraction of the overall quota whenever they want, without competing against other fishermen. "Individual quotas would lead to less overall fishing effort and, hence, bigger profit in the fishery." Fishermen would bid for these quotas and be free to land their allotted catches as they pleased, reducing competition among fleets and offering more stable prices.

The professor believes that only the governments of maritime nations can truly protect both their fish stocks and their fishing industries:

"Only governments can zone the marine environment, identifying certain areas where fishing will be tolerated and others where it will not." Governments can also, of course, decide who will be permitted to fish in their territorial waters.

The CFP is due for review in 2012 and there are signals coming out of Brussels that fishing regulation might be decentralised, giving more power to national governments – surely a clear admission that the CFP has been a colossal failure.

If this happens, it must be on the basis of the maritime economic zones established by the UN Law of the Sea Treaty, within which a nation has the exclusive right to fish and which it can regulate as it sees fit.

The crazily regulated free-for-all we have seen in European waters has been catastrophic for both fishermen and the stocks of fish on which we all depend.

● *It is estimated that 90 per cent of the cod consumed in the UK comes from non-EU Iceland, Greenland and the Faroe Islands, where fish stocks are considerably healthier than they are in the waters subject to the Common Fisheries Policy.*

Klaus raises the prospect of civil disobedience

President Vaclav Klaus of the Czech Republic, the last leader to sign the Lisbon Treaty, has written to David Brown, author of *The End Of The English* (June Press – for details, see back page).

In his letter, the President

commented: "You prove to have a brilliant insight to the process of European integration and unification; you list numerous examples of the non-democratic attempts in the field of ideological background and various policies applied by the EU in the last

years and decades. I share your views and criticism; I'm also one of those who think of civil disobedience to be a relevant answer to the latest moves towards ever-closer Union based on the Lisbon Treaty, in fact a federal type of superstate."

Little to be gained from MEPs' questioning of Barroso

The European Commission has been congratulating itself on the success of its latest foray into what it calls democracy – the first ever Question Time in the European Parliament at which Commission President José Manuel Barroso could be called to account by MEPs. What it was, in fact, was something like an extended Commission press release, in spite of the efforts of some Eurosceptics to introduce a little heat and light.

Here are some extracts involving MEPs from the UK:

Stephen Hughes (Lab): Unemployment could rise to 27 million in the European Union next year, turning this financial and economic crisis into a social crisis. In the light of this, would you now agree that the economic recovery plan agreed last December was not enough in itself?

José Manuel Barroso: *I think that without our economic recovery plan the situation would be much, much worse. In fact there was a real cushion effect on the measures taken. We estimated around 5 per cent of European Union GDP was spent over 2009 and 2010, that is around €550 billion. So I think something was, in fact, done.*

Nigel Farage (UKIP): You have managed to ignore the French referendum result, you have managed to ignore the Dutch referendum result and you have managed to bully the Irish into submission the second time around. So you have almost got your Treaty. Now, of course, it is time to pick the President – the big global figurehead of the European Union. Tony Blair is the odds-on favourite with the bookmakers. I just wondered whether you agree with me that his continued support for Britain to join the euro, his surrender of £2 billion a year of the British rebate and his whole approach towards Britain's membership of the European Union –

his refusal to give the British a referendum – all show that he has sufficient pro-European credentials to become the President? Indeed, was this the deal that I predicted back in 2005? Was this agreed all along?

Mr Barroso: *First of all, Mr Farage, do not be so sad about the result in Ireland. It was not a great result – just 67% of the people!...Now, regarding the future President of the Council, I am not going to comment. That is a decision for the European Council. What I would like to tell you very frankly is that there are no hidden agreements and there are no hidden agendas...*

Elizabeth Lynne (Lib Dem): Even though the 2000 Employment Directive should be adhered to...many Member States are flouting the rules. Can you tell us what action is being taken against Member States who do not implement it properly...?

Mr Barroso: *Whenever there is non-compliance with our directives by Member States we launch infringement proceedings, so when there is a specific case we can and will act...The most affected categories are young people and migrants...*

Vicky Ford (Con): Every single European country is united in that we all face rising unemployment, which is obviously not just a social crisis, but also puts extra burdens on Member States' public purses...Given this, would you agree, Mr Barroso, that we, as Members of this Parliament, and the Commission should be extra cautious with every penny that we add on to public sector burdens?...Why do we keep meeting in Strasbourg?

Mr Barroso: *We have to be extremely careful with all taxpayers' money, and we have to see the priorities...As you know, the Commission has been extremely strict...in committing ourselves and the European Union to the rules of sustainability. Of course we do not think that problems can be*

solved just by throwing money at them, but in fact there are situations, like the current one, when we believe special attention has to be given to a situation of social urgency. Exceptional measures were needed for what was an unprecedented situation.

[The Strasbourg question was not answered]

Graham Watson (Lib Dem): How does your Commission intend to ensure that growth in future will be of a different nature and that we will not find ourselves in a situation where, after another 20 years of growth, we have a planet unable to sustain what we are doing and a society unable to afford the real costs of living in such a way?

Mr Barroso: *I am for a strong industrial base in Europe – but a strong industrial base for the new age of sustainability, where we have to think about green development, green technologies. That is where we can create new products, new markets. That is why we are organising our future programme in terms of what I called, in my political guidelines, “new sources of growth”.*

John Bufton (UKIP): If EID [electronic identification of sheep] comes into force in January, we will know how many sheep we have in the UK, where they are and all their movements, yet in the UK – due to unlimited immigration – we have no idea of how many people we have in our country, or who they are or what movements they will make.

Jerzy Buzek, EP President: *That is a very specific question. We prefer general questions about the crisis and how to overcome it. The President of the European Commission cannot be informed about specific issues in individual countries, so please be more general in your questions.*

It was hardly the sort of grilling we are used to with Prime Minister's Questions in the Commons, we think you will agree.

Is the Commission now unlawful?

The longstanding plan to reduce the size of the European Commission has just succeeded beyond all expectations, but not quite as intended.

Legally there is now only one Commissioner, José Manuel Barroso, who was recently re-appointed as President according to the procedure laid down in the treaties.

The five-year terms of the other 26 people who were previously Commissioners expired at midnight on Saturday 31st October, and legally those posts must now be vacant.

The claim that their terms have been extended for a few months has no legal basis, as the treaties do not provide for the discretionary prolongation of the term of any Commissioner, under any circumstances and whether in a full or a so-called “caretaker” capacity.

Obviously, there could well be potentially serious consequences if those 26 individuals continue to draw salaries to which they are not entitled, while unlawfully purporting to be carrying out the functions of a European Commissioner without actually possessing that status. Most

importantly, all their actions and decisions would be open to challenge in the courts and could be declared null and void.

None of the treaty provisions relating to the appointment of EU Commissioners permits any extension of the five-year term of office of the present Commissioners, in either a full or a caretaker capacity.

It follows that, with the exception of the recently re-appointed President Barroso, nobody can legally claim to be a member of the European Commission after that time, unless they have been authorised to do so through the use of the so-called “flexibility clause”, Article 308 of the Treaty establishing the European Community.

Article 308 states:
“If action by the Community should prove necessary to attain, in the course of the operation of the common market, one of the objectives of the Community, and this Treaty has not provided the necessary powers, the Council shall, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European

Parliament, take the appropriate measures.”

The use of that Article involves three EU institutions – the Commission, the Council and the Parliament. I have searched the websites of all three institutions looking for evidence that Article 308 has been invoked to legally extend the term of the present Commissioners, but without success.

In particular I can find no trace of the European Parliament having ever been consulted on a proposal to extend the terms of office of the present Commissioners, as would be required for Article 308 to have any effect.

However, as this is what historians would call “arguing from silence”, I appeal to the MEPs either to confirm or deny that the European Parliament has ever been consulted on any such proposal.

The relevant Articles in the Treaty establishing the European Community may be found online at:

(<http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2006:321E:0001:0331:EN:pdf>).

Article by Denis Cooper

What we could do with £7.9 billion

House of Lords, 27th October 2009

Question by Lord Vinson: To ask Her Majesty’s Government what impact the United Kingdom’s net expenditure transfers to the European Union budget for 2010, forecast in the Budget Red Book to be £7.9 billion, will have on infrastructure spending in the United Kingdom.

The Financial Services Secretary to the Treasury (Lord Myners): My Lords, the UK’s net expenditure transfers to the EU budget for 2010 will have no impact on infrastructure spending in the United Kingdom.

Lord Vinson: I thank the Minister for that reply and for the idealism that I know configures it. However, would it not be more sensible for us to spend £8 billion on ourselves rather than on other people’s infrastructure – wonderful roads and railways in Spain, Portugal and, not least, Ireland – while here at home we cannot even find the cash to dual carriageway the A1 to Scotland? Is it not time that we put British interests first?

House of Lords © Parliamentary copyright 2009.

Brigadier Anthony Cowgill

It is with great sadness that we report the death on 29th October of Brigadier Anthony Cowgill, at the age of 93. Over the past 17 years, Brigadier Cowgill, with the help of his son Andrew, had produced the only comprehensible texts of the treaties by which the European Union has been

created. He began this extraordinary work through his British Management Data Foundation when he realised that British MPs were being asked to approve the Maastricht Treaty without seeing the full text.

His “consolidated” versions of the Amsterdam and Nice treaties followed

and it was his *The Treaty of Lisbon in Perspective* which demonstrated that the treaty was virtually identical to the rejected European Constitution.

Brigadier Cowgill’s contribution to public understanding of what the EU really means was unique. He will be sorely missed.

LETTERS

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

The ultimate betrayal

Dear Sir,

At this time of year we remember our war dead. It is sadly ironic that the final hurdle delaying the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty has just been overcome.

Both Labour and Conservatives, whether in power or opposition, have misled the British electorate for decades about holding a referendum on our membership of the European Union knowing that defeat would be inevitable.

We, as a country, have now finally lost our fundamental right to govern ourselves in this so-called democracy, as have other European countries.

Historically, Europe has been divided by religion, culture and political ideals and in years to come Europe will be divided again as laws imposed by unelected bureaucrats in Brussels will become intolerable and unacceptable to the peoples of Europe.

As a Labour government finally surrenders our sovereignty and takes this country another step closer to a united states of Europe, it will be the ultimate betrayal of the millions who sacrificed their lives for our freedom through the centuries.

JOSEPHINE ALLEN
Norwich

Thanks to *eurofacts*

Dear Sir,

Having only this year begun to realise the full extent of the EU's control of my country, I'm grateful that *eurofacts* has decided to soldier on and keep me up to date with what the BBC and a lot

of the media choose to ignore. I'm also grateful to the June Press publication *The End of the English*, by David Brown. In about 100 racy pages it unfolded for me the whole story of how and why we are afflicted by the EU and its plans for a new European dictatorship.

DR RACHEL HARDIE
Berwickshire

A question of loyalty

Dear Sir,

The question from Thomas Pares (Letters, September) is one that he should have asked 37 years ago when the issue was first raised. To understand the context, we need to go back to 1952, when Princess Elizabeth succeeded to the throne. At her coronation she solemnly swore to govern us according to our laws and customs. There was no mention of signing away her power or the authority of Parliament.

When she gave the Royal Assent to the Treaty of Rome, she surrendered the sovereignty of her office and became, technically, a suzerain, subject to higher courts and law-making powers and no more than a local authority in a wider organisation. A sovereign monarch who is no longer sovereign is no longer a monarch and it follows that the parliament that governs in her name has no legal standing.

Treaty by illegal treaty, the process has continued to the point at which the European Union is about to launch itself as a country called Europe, with all the institutions that comprise a

sovereign state. Our rulers in Brussels are prepared to tolerate our monarchy for the present, but be assured that they will regard any attempt to resist this process as a local insurrection and use force to suppress it.

PETER HOWELL
Wiltshire

Where is our confidence?

Dear Sir,

Throughout the period since the end of the Second World War, this country has been lumbered with governments unable to find rational direction. We withdrew from empire, so where did we go from there? No political leader had a clear idea. So, inevitably, we drifted towards being part of the European Union, the originators of which did know what they wanted – a single European state.

In Britain, attitudes prevailed such as: *We can't stand alone; We have to be part of a larger entity; We need to be in or we shall be isolated.*

This indicates where to begin anew. Look to our attitudes, our ways of thinking, and make a conscious decision to embark on new thinking.

It must be new thinking that cancels the negative, self-defeating attitudes of the post-war period, new thinking based upon the idea of an independent Britain that can make its way in the world to the benefit of all its citizens. New thinking based upon self-confidence in a deliberately chosen independent course is the key to fulfilment.

RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

Euro-free UK tops world financial league

The UK might be in recession, but that has not prevented the World Economic Forum from placing us at the top of the league table of global financial centres.

Last month a WEF study reported that in spite of the banking crisis and current economic difficulties, the UK

overtook the USA in a financial scale based on more than 100 variables, including capital market size, financial stability and institutional structure.

Although the UK's score fell during the past year, mainly over stability concerns, that of the US fell further, leaving the country in third place in the

rankings, behind Australia. The most striking falls in the rankings, however, were those of Germany and France, both of which slipped out of the top ten in the table.

So much, then, for the global benefits of membership of the European single currency.

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **19th November**, 6.00 pm

“From the New Jerusalem to New Labour: British Prime Ministers from Atlee to Blair”

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

PUBLIC MEETING

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

Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Saturday **21st November**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

“The Future of the EU - Can it survive?”

Gerard Batten MEP, *UKIP*

Christopher Booker, *Journalist*

Richard Conquest

Peter Davies

John Mills, *Labour Euro-Safeguards*

Ian Milne, *Financial expert*

Prof. Kenneth Minogue

Bruno Waterfield

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, King's College London,
Strand, London WC2R 2LS

Admission £20

(Includes, tea, coffee, water, juice and lunch)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **1st December**, 6.00 pm

“Refugees, economic migration and the future of the world economy”

Professor Nigel Harris, *Council for Assisting Refugee Academics (CARA)*

PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London

Admission Free

Advertising Space Available

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **10th December**, 1.00 pm

“Recovering confidence in politics: What makes us think that God wants democracy?”

The Rt. Revd Lord Harries of Pentregarth, *Gresham Professor of Divinity*

PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London

Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Monday **23rd November**, 4.05 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The Better Regulation Agenda* via video link from Alexander Italianer, Deputy Secretary General, European Commission.

Tuesday **24th November**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry on the Alternative Fund Managers Directive* from Citadel.

Wednesday **25th November**, 10.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into EU policy on protecting Europe from large-scale cyber-attacks* from witnesses to be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2009

Lisbon Treaty Comes into force **1st December**

2010

Spain takes over EU presidency (prior to Lisbon Treaty) **1st January**

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

Belgium takes over EU presidency (prior to Lisbon Treaty) **1st July**

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 People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

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 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?

Central Banking in a Free Society

by *Tim Congdon*. **£12.50**

Congdon argues in this lucid and very readable book, that the Bank of England should act as the lender-of-last-resort.

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.

Warning: Immigration Can Seriously Damage Your Wealth

by *Anthony Scholefield*. **£6.00**

Why immigration increases a nation's GDP it must inevitably reduce income.

An Environmental Audit

How membership of the EU has changed the face of Britain

by *Tom Wise MEP*. **£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
Nigel Farage MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006