

Pan-European parties prepare for June election

A new Europe-wide political party, including members of the far Left, is to be created in April in preparation for the June elections to the European Parliament. The decision to bring the new party into being was taken in Berlin on 11th January by the leaders of the French, Italian, Austrian and Slovak communist parties and social democratic parties in Germany, the Czech republic, Spain, Greece and Luxembourg.

A leading figure behind the development, Lothar Bisky, head of the German Party of Democratic Socialism described the move as "historic" - which may well turn out to be the case since it is likely to be quickly followed by the creation of other Pan-European parties, many able to claim the support of the taxpayer.

In order to claim EU funds parties are supposed to demonstrate "wide public support". In fact, the bar has been at such a low level that the new party may well qualify at its first attempt which will come with the June EU elections. Under a law passed in the European Parliament on 19th June 2003 funding will be limited to those winning three per cent of the vote in one quarter of EU states.

Funding for pan-European parties has long been on the integrationist agenda, but for a time was blocked by Austria, Denmark and Italy. However, new voting procedures included in the Nice Treaty meant that only a qualified majority was necessary - and this came at a meeting of EU foreign ministers in June. This development represents a significant step forward in the integration and development of EU institutions and powers. It also demonstrates that even when the integrationist goals are thwarted - as

they were repeatedly during 2003 - the integrationists are proceeding on such a broad front that they can make up ground elsewhere.

In order to qualify, parties must "*demonstrate respect for freedom, democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law*". A three-strong committee of "wise men", one each from the EU commission, the EU Parliament and the member states will have the right to exclude those who, in their view, do not live up to these principles - which should effectively rule out any party which is not servile to Brussels.

Anxieties and Aspirations

Typically, the new directive was welcomed by the big groupings, the centre-right PPE, as well as the Liberals, the Greens and the regionalist DPPE-EFA group - all of which may well have plans of their own to establish pan-European parties to draw on EU funds.

Welcoming the development the British Liberal MEP Andrew Duff was quoted as saying: "*Transitional political parties are a vital sinew of democracy, articulating the anxieties and aspirations of the citizen on a European scale* (EUbusiness website 19th June 2003)".

Mr Duff's remarks are not merely ignorant but profoundly undemocratic. *eurofacts* regularly meets those with differing views on EU matters but if one excludes the EU salariat, we have never encountered those with the kind of anxieties to which he alludes, and we certainly doubt whether Mr Duff's constituents are gripped by such concerns, either. Genuinely democratic parties (how often the inclusion of the

word 'democrat' in a party's title indicates leanings in an opposite direction!) are not created from the top down or brought into being by cash inducements. Nor are such parties likely to accept "monitoring" from Brussels. In the absence of a European *demos* such creations will remain artificial constructs designed to promote the process of EU political integration and to counter criticisms of EU institutions coming from national parties. An early and perceptive critic of the move to create pan-European parties has been the British Labour Euro Safeguards Committee which has grasped that the present moves not only disadvantage national parties in financial terms, but have the ultimate aim of ensuring that they are kept a long way from the levers of power.

No doubt *eurofacts* readers may wish to express their views on this subject to Mr Duff and to other MEPs ahead of the June elections.

LATE NEWS: since the birth of the new socialist grouping 31 Green parties from across Europe have announced that they are to meet on 20th-22nd February with the aim of forming a single Green Party. The new entity - to be called the European Green Party - is expected to announce that it will run a single campaign ahead of the June EU elections backed up with common posters and slogans. It will "*introduce big changes to the European political landscape*", said Helmut Weixler, a spokesman for the German Greens. Regrettably, he could be right.

UK stuck in a tariff trap

In terms of effective tariffs, the UK finds herself in the ludicrous position of paying over three times as much to export goods to the EU as she does to import goods from outside the EU

One of the main “benefits” - perhaps the prime “benefit” - of Britain’s belonging to the EU is alleged to be the “access” it gives us to the “Single” Market. That access comes at a price: in effect, a tariff that British taxpayers pay to Brussels for access to the Single Market. In 2002 the UK exported goods to the rest of the EU worth £109.6 billion. In the same year she paid over £4.3 billion as her NET contribution to Brussels. In effect, Brussels charged the UK 3.92 per cent (4.3 divided by 109.6) for the privilege of exporting goods to the EU. (Trade in services is tariff-free worldwide.)

But that’s not all. Brussels also forces the UK (under the EU Common Commercial Policy set by majority voting) to charge tariffs on all her imports of goods from outside the EU. In 2002, that tariff amounted to £1.57 billion; it was applied (as customs duties) to imports of goods into the UK

from non-EU countries worth £102.85 billion. The average rate of tariff works out at 1.53 per cent (1.57 divided by 102.85).

Thus, in terms of effective tariffs, the UK finds herself in the ludicrous position of paying over 2.56 times as much to export goods to the EU as she does to import goods from outside the EU (3.92 divided by 1.53).

If the UK had been fortunate enough to be outside the EU in 2002 she would not have paid £4.3 billion to Brussels for the “privilege” of exporting to the Single Market. She would also have been able to abolish tariffs unilaterally (which she can’t do as an EU member) on imports from outside the EU, thus benefiting consumers in the UK and in the countries sending us the exports.

Would the EU levy the Common External Tariff on imports from the UK if the latter were outside the EU? Highly unlikely: we’re their biggest

single export market, and they have a massive structural surplus on their trade with us. But even if they did, it would only (by virtue of World Trade Organisation rules) be 1.2 per cent, a third of the effective tariff we pay currently as members of the EU. The USA - whose exports to the EU are growing far faster than Britain’s - is already paying that 1.2 per cent. So we’d be in good company - especially since, having got back our vote at the WTO (which we abandoned to the Commission in 1973) we’d be able to strike up beneficial trade alliances with countries like the USA, Australia and Canada.

Source: HM Treasury: www.hm-treasury.gov.uk; “European Community Finances: Statement on the 2003 EC Budget”; and ONS: www.statistics.gov.uk/productsp1140.asp

Former Prime Minister to become the EU’s man in Washington

In accordance with its big-power ambitions, the European Union is about to appoint a high profile ambassador to Washington - the former Irish Prime Minister John Bruton. In the past, the EU has been represented in the United States by an official with the title of “Head of the EU Delegation to the US”. The position is currently held by Günter Burghardt, a German career diplomat. But according to *The Irish Times* on 21st January 2004 the Commission has been seeking support for plans to raise the EU profile in the United States and to cultivate better relations with the US following the bitter rows over the war in Iraq by

appointing a first rank politician from a country on good terms with America.

A major aim of the new appointee will be to influence the US Congress whose members are increasingly critical of the EU, on a wide range of issues.

According to the report, the decision to upgrade the position was taken at a private lunch attended by EU foreign ministers in the Greek port of Thessaloniki in June 2003. Since then Chris Patten, the EU External Affairs Commissioner has been actively seeking support for Mr Bruton’s candidacy which is widely expected to be confirmed - although it has not yet

received the blessing of the Commission President Romano Prodi, or Neil Kinnock, the commissioner with responsibility for personnel.

Mr Bruton, who was Prime Minister of Ireland from 1994-97, chaired Ireland’s last EU presidency and sat on the Convention on the Future of Europe.

The fact that the job that he is now likely to fill is being referred to as “ambassador”, and that he is a former prime minister, are a reflection of both the EU’s nascent statehood and the Commission’s recognition of just how unpopular the EU has become with many Congressmen.

Don't come - life in Britain is too tough, Government tells Czech gypsies

The Home Office has asked the International Organisation for Migration to run an advertising campaign in the Czech republic pointing out how hard life can be in Britain. Its purpose will be to discourage gypsies from settling here on 1st May when the Accession States are admitted to the EU.

As we pointed out in *eurofacts* on 19th December, there has been no serious research into the numbers likely to take advantage of Britain's open door policy. Until recently the Government did not appear worried about claims that large numbers of immigrants would arrive in Britain following EU enlargement. Nor did it seem alarmed by reports that immigrants might include significant numbers of gypsies. The Home Office now says that it expects 5-13,000 immigrants a year from Central and Eastern Europe as the result of EU enlargement, while the independent think-tank Migration Watch puts the

number at 40,000.

According to the *Sunday Times* (18th January) many Czech gypsies have already tried and failed to claim asylum in Britain, but now plan to enter the country legally. An estimated 80 per cent of Czech Romanies are unemployed and many claim that they suffer from discrimination in the labour market as well as being banned from bars, cafes and restaurants. The newspaper quoted Romany leaders who estimate that around 100,000 gypsies are likely to leave the Czech Republic for a better life once they are able to do so, plus an unknown proportion of the 1.7 million gypsies living in Poland, Hungary and Slovakia.

Czech welfare benefits amount to £100 a month for a family of two - compared to weekly benefits of £54.65 per person in income support, housing benefit, council tax benefit, and extra payments for children in Britain. Other benefits available to those from the new EU states include free school

meals and access to the NHS.

Like most other EU members Britain could have exercised its right under the accession treaty to delay granting full worker's rights for up to seven years. During this period the wealth gap between East and West Europe is likely to narrow - and the incentive for Central and Eastern Europeans to migrate will be correspondingly reduced. Instead, having partially and belatedly woken-up to the problems that are likely to be created by an influx of Eastern European gypsies the Government has taken the quite bizarre step of backing an advertising campaign with the aim of stressing the downside of life in Britain. A spokesman for the IOM said: "*The Home Office feels some Czechs have the idea that the pavements are paved with gold. We intend to give a more realistic picture. If you dissuade 100 welfare shoppers from coming over you have paid for it*".

What history demands...

What does France believe should be the correct response to the failure to get agreement on a constitution for Europe?

According to Dominique de Villepin, the French Foreign Minister, speaking in Lisbon on 6th January the way ahead is clear:

The first objective must be to achieve economic governance...we must coordinate our economic policies...the creation of a council specifically for the Euro area, genuinely able to

coordinate economic policies, better coordination of budgetary and tax policies and simplification of European decision-making procedures [he means more qualified majority voting - Ed] would all be steps in the right direction...After the failure of Brussels France is ready to move forward. History demands this. Our citizens expect it. Consequently we must relaunch the work on the constitution...

Putting the political dimension back at the heart of our project means

having the ambition to make the EU...a model not just for all Europeans but for the whole world.

Europe is arousing tremendous hopes the world over. I see this on all our visits abroad. Despite its hesitations, like those aroused by the Iraq crisis, the European project is creating new hope because we are capable of coming together on what's essential...since we place an order based on the law, ideals and values above any obscure ulterior motives.

97 per cent of viewers back EU withdrawal

So many people contacted the BBC in support of Lord Pearson of Rannoch when he argued the case for British withdrawal from the EU on the Politics Show on 11th January that its system for receiving e-mails could not

cope. The presenter of the programme Jeremy Vine invited viewers to express a view on the subject, but one caller reported that he was unable to key into the programme's website until ninety minutes after the programme had

ended. Lord Pearson said later that the BBC staff believed that around 97 per cent of those who succeeded in sending their e-mails backed withdrawal. The programme has a viewing audience of 1.2 million.

Taxpayers to fund huge Presidency bill

A million euros here, a million there - and soon we're talking serious money

The Irish may love to party - but, as *euofacts* has already suggested, the mood in Dublin on 1st May when the Irish government celebrates EU enlargement may not be as joyous as it would like. This is because of the growing tide of complaints about high prices since entry into the euro. Dublin is now one of the most expensive cities in the world, a situation which the opposition party Fine Gael has been able to exploit by running a highly successful "Rip-off, Ireland" campaign.

There is now a further reason for thinking that the Irish taxpayer will not feel like dancing a jig: the huge cost of

the EU presidency. This will run to 500,000 for every day that Ireland remains at the helm. According to the *Irish Independent* (12th January 2004) the total bill is likely to be well in excess of 90 million (23 million of which was spent on preparations last year).

Meanwhile, another small country - the Netherlands - which takes over the Presidency from Ireland later in the year is having difficulty finding the funds. The Dutch government had hoped to defray a part of the costs through business sponsorship. But companies are refusing to cooperate - presumably because they have come to

the conclusion that to do so will do their corporate image no good at all.

The figures released by the Irish and Dutch governments help bring home the hidden costs of EU membership. At about £60 million per presidency, this adds an annual figure of £120 million to the costs of the EU, which does not appear in the EU budget. Add the costs of Coreper (Committee of the Permanent Representatives), all the technical committees, the agency costs and the rest (to say nothing of the matched funding found by all the member states) and it becomes clear that the real EU cost is substantially more than the declared budget.

What's in a label?

The EU Commission is reported to be busy working out plans to force manufacturers to carry a "Made in the EU" label on their produce. However, like many recent ideas from the Commission this does not strike *euofacts* as being terribly popular - not least because the EU is not associated in the public consciousness with quality or excellence. In effect a number of items already bear a 'Made in Europe' label. There is, for example the Euro-Fighter, which was built as the result of British, German, Spanish and Italian cooperation. The Euro-

Fighter is about to enter service with the RAF - 13 years late and at many times the original price, but in important respects it was obsolete even before taking to the skies. Then there is 'EU wine'. This comes from the EU 'wine lake' and used to be offered at much reduced prices in British supermarkets. As a condition of sale the wine had to be produced from grapes grown in two or more EU countries (tasting notes: thin, insipid, bears some resemblance to hock from a poor vintage.) Even at knock-down prices no one bought it, and it has

happily disappeared from our shelves.

euofacts cannot pretend to be impartial in this matter but we venture to suggest that most manufacturers will do almost anything to avoid attaching the 'Made in Europe' label to their goods and the producers of the following would probably risk jail in order to avoid doing so: premier cru Bordeaux, Belgian chocolates, Palma ham, Scotch whisky, German sausage. And *euofacts*.

Fraud common, say two out of three

Almost two in three people believe that fraud against the EU budget is commonplace and only one in five believe that EU institutions are effective in fighting fraud, according to the latest Eurobarometer, the EU-wide survey of opinion funded by the Commission. The questions asked in the poll are as revealing as the answers. Predictably, there are none on whether Neil Kinnock, the EU Commissioner

should resign for having failed to root out fraud, or why it is that so many EU employees commit fraud. Instead, there are questions about whether the public has enough information on the subject, whether there should be "greater cooperation" between governments and whether the media is doing a good enough job in reporting the subject. Commenting on the poll findings, a spokesman for the

Commission said: "There is a real need for information. We are considering launching an information campaign in the coming year". Actually, the poll shows that there is already a high degree of public awareness about EU fraud: but there is, is a real need for honesty - not the expenditure of more public money on spin campaigns to shift the blame on to national governments and the media.

EU money will go west - even if Brown wins battle on regional aid

Michel Barnier, the EU Regional Affairs Commissioner is claiming victory in his battle with Gordon Brown, the British Chancellor over how regional aid should be used.

The Chancellor wants the money (which accounts for one third of the total EU budget) to assist the poorest countries in Eastern and Central Europe, leaving national governments to decide how it should be allocated. M. Barnier wants the cash to be divided up 50-50 between existing and new member states with the regions taking responsibility for the use of the funds.

According to the *Financial Times*, M. Barnier believes that he has seen off the Chancellor, partly by recasting regional policy under the title "*cohesion for growth and employment*".

"Regions have to be participants, not spectators", he told the newspaper on 19th January. "*Words are not enough - they have to be backed up by money.*"

If adopted M. Barnier's plans would further weaken the authority of the nation state - which is presumably one

of his aims. It does not worry him that much regional aid has been poorly spent in the past. In an interview with the *FT's* George Parker he declared: "*It is true that 15 years ago there was too much spending on roads and railways. But increasingly money is being spent on laboratories and so on.*"

Better at Spending

M. Barnier did not explain why governments - regional or national - should be better at spending money on laboratories than on roads. Indeed, whether half or all the money goes east we are inclined to the view that, metaphorically speaking, most of it will go west.

Not that his plans - which would mean that the regional spending budget would rise to 50 billion euros by the end of the 2007-2013 spending round - have universal support, even within the Commission. Michael Schreyer, the EU budget commissioner has privately described them as "ridiculous".

And quite apart from the fact that the British Chancellor will not have

enjoyed reading an account in a British newspaper of how M. Barnier had outwitted him there is another reason for supposing that Mr Brown will now be out to gun down the regional affairs commissioner. In his interview with the *FT* M. Barnier confirmed that the Commission is looking at ways to end the British rebate by coming up with a general mechanism "to help all countries - not just the UK - that feel they are paying too much".

In a recent interview with *The Times* Jacques Delors, the former EU President spoke of Mr Brown's "*passionate contempt about the euro*". Is it possible that Mr Brown is a closet eurosceptic? Or are his expressed views and recent actions over regional aid the reflection of intra-party power play and personal ambition? Is it better that Barnier should prevail because by making matters worse his plan could conceivably hasten the demise of the EU? Of what we do not know we cannot speak. But we are inclined to offer Michael Schreyer a free subscription to *eurofacts* for having characterised the plans of her Commission colleague so aptly.

Europe to defend itself within 10 years

Europe will take responsibility for its own defence within 10 years, according to General Gustav Hägglund, the Finnish chairman of the EU's military committee.

The General, whose comments contradict British statements about the future purpose of the 60,000-strong European Rapid Reaction Force, said that the American and European "pillars" would become responsible for their own territorial defences.

"There are no threats against Europe now that Europe cannot handle on its

own", he declared at a conference on defence issues at Sälen in Sweden on 18th January.

As *eurofacts* has repeatedly argued, there are currently significant threats to the security interests of Britain and other EU countries which Europe cannot deal with alone. These include missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction based in unstable Middle Eastern countries. Such is the nature of this threat that it can only be dealt with by means of pre-emption (to which Germany is strongly opposed even in

principle) or by ballistic missile defence to halt missiles in flight (which Europe lacks).

As a result of its imperial past, its participation in the Gulf and Iraq wars, and its close relationship with the US, Britain is bound to be high on the target list of rogue states and international terrorists. General Hägglund's comments are unlikely to reassure those who believe that 'European defence' will leave Europe defenceless.

The CAP is even unkind to birds

EU subsidies have reduced the number of farmland birds by more than 30 per cent since 1980 through encouraging farmers to use intensive farming methods, according to

BirdLife, a partnership of conservation organisations. The corncrake has almost totally disappeared. "*In fact, this has been so marked that you can pick out the*

outline of the Common Agricultural Policy imprinted on the distribution map of the bird", complained a spokesman for the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.

LETTERS

Tel: 01548 821402 Fax: 01548 821574 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

How Best to Disengage

Dear Sir,

Permit me to reply to three genial assailants in your last issue (16th January 2004), especially Tony Stone. Of course I am not daft enough to think the resolution to our national problem is to reform the present European Union from within. That is the nostrum of the good Mrs Gisela Stuart whose monograph on disenchantment was reviewed in that same issue.

We of course recognise that today's EU is both irreversible and unrecoverable. The issue is not disengagement but how. The UKIP says: "*This is what I want. I want it all, and I want it now. If not granted, then like Violet Elizabeth Bott, I shall thcream and thcream till I'm thick.*"

Achievable Political Reality replies: "*This is not going to happen in one fell swoop. This is going to be a bit-by-bit extrication. But first, we and the people like us have to win the power in Westminster.*"

This is the key. Without it all is lost. Of course the Conservative Party is not yet there. Of course it is nervous of being outspoken. But consider this: about twenty MPs will stand down to be replaced. About 180 seats are now deemed recoverable. Of those 200 candidates about 99 per cent are known to be sound on love of country and sovereignty. Do you really think that is a coincidence? That it took no effort?

Read that front page of *eurofacts* again. Just when the tide is turning, why sabotage the vessel. The UKIP cannot win. It can only destroy all our chances.

FREDERICK FORSYTH
Herts

Dear Sir,

Frederick Forsyth argues the case that the Achievable Political Reality is that the Conservatives could form the next government and that UKIP cannot (Letters, 19th December). Though I strongly disagree with the current Conservative policy of 'in Europe, not

run by Europe', under the first past the post system, he is right.

However, what we face in June 2004 is a very different set of elections, the European Parliament Elections conducted under proportional representation. In 1999 though poorly funded and little known, UKIP won three seats under this system. The APR is that this time we could cause quite a shock and win many seats.

To a Conservative loyalist like Mr Forsyth the question in 2004 must be what effect would a significant UKIP result have on his Party? I believe that it would help to move the Conservatives towards an unambiguous EU policy that may win them the General Election and remove the need for UKIP. Their policy on the pound certainly hardened during the 1999 Euro Election campaign, winning them many more votes. I doubt this would have happened without a UKIP presence.

Mr Forsyth may also be interested to know that not all Eurorealists are Tories. The UKIP has grown in membership by 78 per cent in 2003 and only a small proportion have come from the Conservative ranks. The majority of our new supporters have joined us from Britain's biggest political party, the Given Up Voting for Anyone Party.

Who can blame them after 30 years of lies and deceit from all three traditional parties?

NIGEL FARAGE MEP
UKIP

Monnet's Record

Dear Sir,

Grateful though we were for the opening sentences of Russell Lewis's note on our book *The Great Deception*, when he turned to the book itself he seemed rather more to reflect his own views on the EU than anything in our analysis. We do not describe how Jean Monnet wanted to create a 'federal' Europe. Nothing could have been further from his intentions. What our book tries to do is give the first

documented historical account of how Monnet wished to set up a supranational government over the nation states, based, as suggested by his British friend Arthur Salter in the 1920s, on the model of the League of Nations. We then show how Monnet continued to shape the destinies of his 'project' right up to the 1970s, including his key role, through his US collaborator George Ball, in persuading Macmillan and Heath to apply for British entry in the 1960s.

The central 'deception', which gives our book its title, was not, as Mr Lewis suggests, that Monnet's 'Europe' would eliminate democracy. It was to conceal that the real aim was political integration, behind the pretence that it was just about economic integration, a deception in which Macmillan and Heath, as we show, knowingly connived.

Finally Mr Lewis refers to the setting up of the Common Agricultural Policy without apparently having read the chapter in which we show how the CAP's real intention was to preserve political stability in France, at the expense of the Germans and the British. This was why de Gaulle twice vetoed British entry in the 1960s, because Britain had to be kept out until arrangements for the CAP were locked into place by the Luxembourg Treaty of 1970, the existence and significance of which has been largely buried.

Our history of the European project from the 1920s to the present day does in fact include rather more than this, and I suspect that not a few readers of *eurofacts* would find the wealth of new material it contains both useful and shocking.

CHRISTOPHER BOOKER
Somerset

MEETINGS

New Britain
020-7247 2524

Sunday **1st February 2004** 6.00 pm

Australian/New Zealand Celebrations

(**Australia Day** 26th January - **New Zealand Day** 6th February)

St Paul's Cathedral, London
All Welcome

**Newcastle-under-Lyme
Conservative Association**
07900-438489

Friday **6th February 2004**, 8.00 pm

"The EU Constitution"

Daniel Kawczynski

PUBLIC MEETING
The Conservative Club, Merrial Street,
Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffs
Admission Free

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

Wednesday **17th March 2004**, 7.00 pm

Speakers to be announced

ANNIVERSARY MEETING
The British Academy, 10 Carlton House
Terrace, London SW1
**Admission £10 on the door - or in
advance (Refreshments included)**

Cross-Party Organizations
01628-666456

Saturday **24th April 2004**

March & Rally calling for a
National Referendum on the
European Constitution

10.30 am, Victoria Embankment
12.00 am, March
(Presentation of petition at No 10
Downing Street)
3.00 pm, Rally, Hyde Park

Speakers to be announced

MARCH & RALLY
London
All Welcome

UK Independence Party
Chichester Branch
01243-532509

Tuesday **4th May 2004**, 7.30 pm

"Who Governs Britain"

Philip Benwell, *National Chairman of
the Australian Monarchy League*
Petrina Holdsworth, *Barrister*
Ashley Mote, *Author of Vigilance and
OverCrowded Britain*

PUBLIC MEETING
Schola Grammaticus Hall, Midhurst,
West Sussex
(opposite the North Street car park)
Admission Free

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

Wednesday **5th May 2004**, 7.00 pm

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING
The British Academy, 10 Carlton House
Terrace, London SW1
**Admission £10 on the door - or in
advance (Refreshments included)**

Gresham College
020-7831 0575

Thursday **6th May 2004**, 6.00 pm

"Dollarisation and Gresham's Law: Will
there in the future be just one or two cur-
rencies?"

Professor Avinash Persaud, *Mercers'
School Memorial Professor of
Commerce at Gresham College*

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2004
European MEP Elections **June**

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

2005
Luxembourg takes over **1st January**
EU presidency

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **3rd February 2004**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard on *The World
Trade Organisation: The role of the EU
post-Cacun*.

Tuesday **3rd February 2004**, 3.45 pm
Evidence may be heard on *Science and
International Agreements* from representa-
tives of the Royal Society; and Professor
Brian Hoskins, Dept of Meteorology,
University of Reading.

Wednesday **4th February 2004**, 4.15 pm
Evidence may be heard on *The Proposed
Regulation on the Law applicable to non-
contractual obligations ("Rome" II)* from
the media.

Monday **9th February 2004**, 4.30 pm
Evidence may be heard on *Deaths in
Custody* from the MIND, the Mental
Health Act Commission and Dr Stephen
Ladyman MP, PUSS, Department of
Health.

Tuesday **10th February 2004**, 3.45 pm
Evidence may be heard on *Science and
International Agreements*.

Wednesday **11th Feb. 2004**, 3.45 pm
Evidence may be heard on *The
Practicalities of Renewable Energy*.

Wednesday **11th Feb. 2004**, 4.15 pm
Evidence may be heard on *The Proposed
Regulation on the Law applicable to non-
contractual obligations ("Rome" II)*.

Wednesday **25th Feb. 2004**, 4.15 pm
Evidence may be heard on *The Proposed
Regulation on the Law applicable to non-
contractual obligations ("Rome" II)*.

Wednesday **10th March 2004**, 3.45 pm
Evidence may be heard on *The
Practicalities of Renewable Energy*.

Wednesday **17th March 2004**, 3.45 pm
Evidence may be heard on *The
Practicalities of Renewable Energy*.

Wednesday **24th March 2004**, 3.45 pm
Evidence may be heard on *The
Practicalities of Renewable Energy*.

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

Subsidiarity and the Illusion of Democratic Control

by *John Bercow MP. £2.00*

A critical examination of the concept of subsidiarity as employed in the draft EU Constitution.

The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union

by *Christopher Booker & Richard North. £20.00*

A comprehensive history of the European Union project.

An Analysis of the Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe

by *Anthony & Andrew Cowgill. £15.00*

The definitive guide to the draft of the proposed EU Constitutional Treaty.

Whip's Nightmare

Diary of a Maastricht Rebel
by *Christopher Gill. £17.50*

Former rebel MP gives an insight into the way politics works and why Britain's freedom is being surrendered.

The Trojan Hearse

by *J. Brian Heywood. £9.99*

This book although a work of fiction - or is it? raises a multitude of awkward questions and provides some uncomfortably plausible answers.

A Constitution For Europe

by *Martin Howe QC. £5.00*

A clear and easy to understand assessment of the EU Draft Treaty by a Constitutional Lawyer.

A Constitution to Destroy Europe

by *Bill Jamieson. £2.00*

A financial expert examines the proposed EU Constitution.

Criminal Justice and the draft Constitution

by *The Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP. £2.00*

A review of the legal implications of the proposed EU Constitution.

A Critical History of Economics

by *John Mills. £19.99*

Mills's questions whether economists really do know the causes of economic growth. He sets out in simple language, the history of economic thought and its major influences.

OverCrowded Britain

by *Ashley Mote. £8.95*

This book looks at the facts and consequences of large-scale immigration.

The Making of Europe's Constitution

by *Gisela Stuart MP. £6.95*

An insider's insight into the proposed EU Constitution and a call for greater democratic scrutiny.

Britain v Europe

by *David Winn. £11.99*

A factual account of Britain's fifty year dilemma over Europe and the development of the EU.

VIDEO

Shockwaves

by *Sanity*

Video £5.00

A clear thirty minute presentation of the EU threat to the United Kingdom.

Send Payment to

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Tel: 01548-821402

Fax: 01548-821574

Email: info@junepress.com

www.junepress.com

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P
(UK ONLY)** Ring for foreign rates

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£14
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"

Britain in Europe	020-7233 0123
European Movement	020-7881 8989
Federal Trust	020-7799 2818

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403-741736
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020-8922 0089

Campaign against the Single Currency
07071-663876

Campaign for an Independent Britain
020-8340 0314

Democracy Movement 020-7491 3072
Freedom Association 01746-861267

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
No Campaign 020-7378 0436

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group 020-7287 4414
Global Britain

Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative 020-7222 9000
Rt Hon Michael Howard MP

Democratic Party 01684-891700
Mr Geoff Southall

Labour 020-7802 1000
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP

Liberal 01562-68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft

Liberal Democrats 020-7222 7999
Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP

New Britain Party 020-7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield

UK Independence Party 0121 333 7737
Mr Roger Knapman

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771 361 4 13006