

Let the battle be joined, let the issue be put

In response to the Prime Minister's challenge we list what we believe to be the ten strongest reasons for saying no to a European Constitution

"Let the Battle be joined, let the issue be put." The Prime Minister, announcing his historic U-turn on the European Constitution in the House of Commons on 20th April 2004.

The Prime Minister's U-turn on the EU Constitution is undoubtedly a triumph for the eurosceptic cause and a tribute to the vigour and effectiveness with which its arguments have been advanced. To assist eurosceptics of all parties in the coming battles we set out below what we believe are the strongest ten arguments against a European constitution. We hope that this will help inform a debate which will run and run until after the next election after which the British people may finally be given the opportunity to express their view on the issue. The list will subsequently be amended in light of changes to the constitutional text and the comments of readers and an improved version will be published in a later issue or placed on our website.

1) A new state is born: Until the proposed Treaty on a Constitution for Europe is ratified it will be possible to regard the EU as being a matter of treaty relations between independent states. But the proposed Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe will supersede all existing treaties. Once it has been ratified and the Constitution comes into force the EU will enjoy an independent existence, separate from and superior to member states. Accordingly, the Constitution will constitute the supreme source of legal and political authority in Britain, as in all member states. This will represent a qualitative step forward in

the creation of a unitary European state for which there is no public support whatever.

2) A recipe for confusion: Ministers say that a Constitution will clarify the division between the powers of the EU and those of member states. The reverse is true: the vague and opaque nature of the constitutional text, the incorporation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights into law and the proposals for 'shared competences' guarantee that there will be disputes between the EU and member states. Given the duty placed on the European Court of Justice to further the process of political integration, the EU will have a considerable advantage in all such disputes.

3) The nation state will be further weakened: All of Europe's supra-national institutions including the Commission, the EU Parliament, and the European Court of Justice will acquire additional powers; national institutions will be correspondingly weakened.

4) Taking an axe to the national veto: The Constitution abolishes the national veto in nearly thirty policy areas. These include civil and criminal law procedure, asylum and immigration, Europol and Eurojust, energy, structural funds and commercial treaties dealing with services. The Draft Constitution does not propose restoring a single power from Brussels to the Member States

5) A new actor on the world stage: The Constitution will give the EU full legal personality so that it may negotiate with foreign governments

and sign treaties on behalf of members. This makes nonsense of the Prime Minister's declared aim of preserving an independent British foreign policy as does the requirement that members "*actively and unreservedly support the Union's common foreign and security policy in a spirit of loyalty and mutual solidarity and shall comply with acts adopted by the Union in this area.*"

6) The new EU will be even less democratic: The Laeken Declaration promised to make the EU more democratic and to bring it "closer to the citizens". An essential basis for this is a common political culture and heritage. But these will not exist in a Union of 25 states and the 19 languages. In practice the Constitution will make the EU less democratic: the reverse: the supra-national bodies to whom additional powers will be passed are not directly elected and are not democratically accountable.

7) Cocking a snoot at Westminster: The claim that the Constitution will ensure that the UK Parliament has a greater role in EU affairs is nonsense. True, Westminster will be sent legislative proposals and will be entitled to submit "a reasoned opinion" if it believes that these breach the subsidiarity principle. But even if a third of parliaments agree about this, the only obligation on the Commission will be to "review" a proposal - after which it may withdraw or amend it - or simply go ahead as planned.

8) Making an economic malaise still more serious: The EU - and especially the eurozone - is in a state of

Continued on P.2

How secure is the red-line on tax?

According to the Chancellor decisions about tax must at all cost remain with nation states - to use his favourite phrase it is "a red line issue" about which he is prepared to fight to the last ditch. It is perhaps worth pointing out that other EU members do not see matters that way at all. Indeed, even before they enter on 1st May those Accession States with low income tax rates such as Estonia and Poland are coming under massive pressure, from their future partners to introduce huge tax hikes.

In a rare show of unity both the German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and his Christian Democrat opponent Edmund Stoiber have attacked new

member states for "tax dumping" and "unfair" tax competition (*euobserver* 20th April).

Herr Schröder has declared that it was out of the question "that Germany as the biggest net payer of the EU has to finance unfair tax competition against itself". Herr Stoiber was equally emphatic: "What we do not accept is further relocation of jobs mainly financed by the German taxpayer".

Additional pressure on the Accession States has come from the Swedish Prime Minister Göran Persson during a visit to Berlin on 30th March when he said that Sweden was not prepared to subsidise new member states via EU contributions where the highest earners were taxed at a low rate (*EUbusiness*

1st April) "If they [the new member states] believe that we will tax heavily in Sweden, Finland and Denmark and send the money to Eastern Europe, where the upper class does not pay taxes, this is not sustainable", he said.

Prior to the promised referendum Britain, being a large country - but one with relatively low tax levels and high levels of foreign investment - can expect to escape similar threats and pressures. But what if Britain was rash enough to sign up to the Constitution? Could Gordon really make our EU partners stand on their heads and admit that tax competition is really a very good thing? Or would we fall meekly into line?

And another taxing matter..

"We must adopt an EU tax which would take the form of a corporation tax. It would replace the present complicated method of financing the activities of the EU, and, in particular, would put an end to current tax competition between European states arising from a large variety of systems

of taxing business....."

"We must have a single EU seat and a single EU vote in the councils of the World Bank and of the International Monetary Fund....." Pascal Lamy, European Commissioner in charge of Trade, article in *Figaro*, 7th April 2004

Mr Lamy is a French Socialist who used to be *chef de cabinet* of Jacques

Delors when the latter was president of the European Commission. Mr Lamy is in charge of the UK's worldwide trade policy; it is he who decides what tariffs the UK may impose on imports from outside the EU; it is he who negotiates at the World Trade Organisation on behalf of the UK and its EU "partners".

Chirac takes some liberties

Suggestions that the Irish were being silent on heavily by France and Germany to come up quickly with an agreed compromise on the European Constitution that would meet their objectives were scarcely quashed by the joint press conference given by President Chirac and the Irish Taoiseach Bertie Ahern in Paris on 26th March, as the following exchange made clear:

Reporter to the Taoiseach: "Are you

ready to follow President Chirac's advice on the matter?"

President Chirac (interrupting Mr Ahern): "I said earlier that we and the Germans had taken a number of positions for reasons which, as you well know, aren't in the national interest but correspond to a certain vision of Europe. Naturally, we have no intention of imposing our conditions on everyone, and the whole art of the presidency is to find

compromises...France and Germany accept the principles of this process, and France and Germany have confidence in the Irish Presidency's ability to complete it at the European Council of 17-18th June."

Reporter: "You also said you gave the Taoiseach some advice."

Chirac: "I did not give any advice to the Taoiseach. I took the liberty of making a few friendly suggestions."

Continued from P. 1.

Let the battle be joined

economic malaise. The architects of the Constitution showed themselves completely uninterested in the real-life economic problems faced by companies and individuals. However, the impact of the Constitution will be to further centralise economic decision-making - which suggests that

the 'European disease' will worsen.

9) Giving words a new meaning: The proposal for 'shared competences' (powers) amount to no such thing; member states may only decide to legislate in areas where the EU has decided not to do so.

10) Political integration will

continue: The Constitution allows Prime Ministers to move EU policy areas from unanimity to majority voting without the need for further treaties or ratification by national parliaments. So the juggernaut of European integration will continue to roll.

France's new 'special relationship'

Franco-Sino relations are characterised by cynicism and anti-Americanism - all of which poses major problems for the UK

On 26th January the Eiffel Tower lit up the Parisian skyline as a million red light bulbs provided a unique welcome to Chinese President Hu Jintao on the 40th anniversary of the establishment of formal ties between France and China.

The Chinese President, who was met at the airport by his French counterpart, was subsequently accorded the rare honour of being invited to address the French assembly and feted in a style seldom seen even in Paris.

France is China's closest European ally and both men paid tribute to the growing intimacy of the "special partnership relationship" that now exists between the two countries. They also expressed enthusiasm for strengthening "the multi-polar world order" - a euphemism for constraining US power.

Everyone of course knew that the ending of the EU arms embargo would be at the top of the Chinese agenda, although France - which has ignored the embargo in significant respects - had already signalled its support. According to the French President the embargo "no longer makes sense". But few were prepared for the tangible expression of the Sino-Franco relationship which came just a few weeks after President Hu's visit to Paris - a joint naval exercise following a five day visit to the Chinese port city of Qinadao by a French anti-submarine destroyer and a frigate - in the immediate run-up to elections in Taiwan.

During the exercise the French naval vessels were joined by a Chinese

destroyer and tanker in eight hours of military operations - the largest exercise carried out by the Chinese navy with any foreign navy and the first such exercise carried out with a major Western country.

Meanwhile France has not only shown itself indifferent to human rights concerns by engaging in military exercises designed to intimidate the Taiwanese it has shown itself ready to help China suppress dissent closer to home. French critics of the French government have complained that Gao Xinjian, a dissident Chinese writer and Nobel laureate now living in France was denied an invitation to this year's Paris book fair despite the fact that this year's theme was China.

Close Relationship

Since the Franco-Sino summit in Paris the closeness of the relationship has been illustrated by the intensification of French lobbying in favour of an end to the arms embargo. In pressing their case French diplomats have passed on hints that if the EU lifts sanctions China will switch big-ticket civilian purchases, including aircraft, power stations and mass transit systems away from US companies to EU firms.

Despite the embargo France has supplied surface to air missiles and anti-aircraft radars to the Chinese navy. Chinese warships are believed to be powered by diesel engines made by a company with headquarters in Paris, as well as a range of military technology. An end to the embargo - which is also supported by Germany -

would enable it to sell high-profile items such as Mirage jets.

China's \$65 billion defence budget is the second largest in the world after the US and the country is now rapidly modernising its military. Among US military analysts there is concern that should America find itself in a military confrontation with China it might discover that the world's largest dictatorship had been armed by the EU.

In addition there are deep concerns that China will find a way to exploit the military potential of the Galileo satellite navigation system in which China has purchased a \$259 million stake.

All of this makes nonsense of Tony Blair's frequent assertions that a militarily stronger and more cohesive European Union would provide a robust second pillar of the Atlantic Alliance. Equally, it makes nonsense of claims that Britain's best interests are served by a government that positions itself mid-way between Europe and the US and takes whatever opportunities that come along to play one off against the other. America and Europe are further apart than at any time since the Second War: in the absence of common values or a common enemy it is doubtful whether in any but a purely formal sense the Alliance can be said to exist.

It would be unfair to accuse Mr Blair of following the French-led EU foreign policy; but it is perfectly fair to accuse Britain's most pro-EU Prime Minister since Edward Heath of failing British interests because he no longer knows what they are.

The Chancellor's Dilemma

He (Gordon Brown) has a dilemma: should he oppose the new constitution, and lose the support of Mr Blair for his move to no 10, or support the constitution, actively or passively, and inherit an address and an office stripped of the power he has always coveted? To complete the nightmare,

imagine that Peter Mandelson's benefactor grants his wish, and installs the twice-fallen minister as Britain's man in Brussels, with more power under the new constitution than Mr Brown can muster.

No one ever promised the Chancellor that life would be fair, but not even the

most dour of Scottish backgrounds could have possibly prepared him for that.

Irwin Stelzer, *The Times* 13th April 2004

National interest: the vice that dare not speak its name

For a thousand years the idea of the national interest has been central to our freedom as an influential and honourable actor on the international stage, writes Kenneth Minogue in this Bruges Group pamphlet. It is an idea that connects foreign policy with our identity as a people, one moreover, that enables us to answer the question: "What should we do?" That we actually possess a national interest also tells us what it means to be British, and to be a liberal democracy.

In these confused times, however it is no longer clear what that interest amounts to, or even that we are allowed to ask the question.

This is because, in Professor Minogue's view, the idea of national interest is being undermined from several sources. A major threat comes from "the Olympians" whose "facile mapping of individual morality onto the arena of international relations" leads to some extremely unfortunate consequences. By "Olympians" Professor Minogue means educated liberals who adopt "a God-like posture in relation to the passions and prejudices of mankind" - those who shrink from the application of power and who believe in the ever-present possibility of rational negotiated settlement to all questions.

Olympians are particularly susceptible to the argument that the entire world be brought into a single legal order which, it is assumed, will display a more moral character than

The Fate of Britain's National Interest

By Kenneth Minogue

The Bruges Group Pamphlet 26 pp
Available from the June Press
Price £4.00 + p&p see back cover
ISBN 0-9541909-3-9

nation states which they associate with selfishness and violence.

The national interest is also challenged by the development of the EU (which Minogue regards as a triumphant expression of the Olympian spirit) because it cuts us off from alliances to which, as the result of cultural affinities, we have customarily looked for support at moments of danger. Such moments have been conveniently banished in the Olympian vision of the world. But to what dangers will we be exposed if, having been isolated from our traditional allies, the vision and reality do not coincide?

Professor Minogue illustrates his arguments by reference to the Iraq conflict. He points out that as a result of opinion in his party and the country Tony Blair was unable to justify war in terms of national interest even though he had quite properly gone to war in its defence. Instead, he was forced to do so in terms of the violations to UN resolutions dealing with but a single

aspect of the threat posed to those interests - Saddam's possession of weapons of mass destruction. This, as he indicates, has left Blair vulnerable to attack ever since.

These trends, which Minogue describes very well, are relatively new, but perhaps not quite as new he suggests. The reasons that led Margaret Thatcher to invade the Falkland Islands were those of national interest: she knew instinctively that failure to respond militarily to the Argentine invasion would do critical damage to the nation at a low point in its history. But many of the arguments put forward by her government were couched in terms of liberal ideology. Possibly, Mrs Thatcher could have got away with a defence of her actions based purely on the basis of an unambiguous assertion of national interest rather than by references to a UN resolution, the violation of international law and the self-determination of the Falklanders. It is a measure of how far the Olympian vision has progressed that Tony Blair had no such option.

In Professor Minogue's memorable words, we are now moving into a future in which our national consciousness is a fugitive to be hunted down by the architects of the new order. Our sense of who we are and what it means to be British will now fade. He concludes: "*Like the Cheshire cat, we are disappearing and soon there'll be nothing left but the smile*".

Bedside reading for Michael Howard

It is taken for granted by the media that arguments in favour of EU withdrawal are so "extreme" that they are not worth considering seriously. Evidence that the public has a much more open mind on the issue and has not been duly influenced by the media on this subject is to be found in an impeccable neutral source - Robert Worcester and Robert Mortimore's account of the 2001 election victory, *Explaining Labour's Second Landslide (2001)*: - from which the following

extract is taken:

Undoubtedly the Tories were hampered in establishing Europe as an issue on the agenda by the apparent acceptance by much of the media of Labours argument that Eurosceptic positions - ruling out joining the Euro for ever, especially ever contemplating leaving the EU - were "extremist". On several occasions during the Parliament we, and the other pollsters, produced polls finding a narrow plurality saying they would vote to

leave the EU. On each occasion it was met with virtual incredulity. Media memories can be short when the facts do not fit the preconceptions, and the next time it happened it was the same story over again. It was almost as if we had produced a poll showing that the British thought the world was flat.

Most of the public keep an open mind on the European issue; we're not sure every journalist does.

Turkey and the EU: the acute dilemma facing Jacques Chirac

By Ian Milne

Mr Chirac's party, the Union pour la Majorité Présidentielle (UMP), has found itself in an acute dilemma over Turkey's possible entry into the EU. Having suffered a humiliating reverse in the French regional elections in March (one wonders whether Mr Prescott drew any lessons from that), the UMP is now staring at a wipe-out of its MEPs in the elections to the European Parliament in June.

Chirac, up to now, has been in favour of Turkey joining the EU, despite 75 per cent of the French electorate being hostile to the idea. However, on 8th April, Alain Juppé, still president of the UMP despite his conviction for fraud while Chirac was mayor of Paris, said that it was "unthinkable" that Turkey be allowed to join. Another faithful Chiraquien, Michel Barnier, until recently one of the two French Commissioners in Brussels, now French Foreign Minister, was even more forthright: "There is no question of Turkey entering the EU in the short to medium term in current circumstances". This not-very-subtle manoeuvring of the UMP is designed to stop votes at the European elections next June going to various small parties who are against Turkish entry. Once those elections are out of the way, the Chiraquiens can revert to being vaguely pro-Turkish. So the theory goes anyway.

One of the UMP's targets is Philippe de Villiers' eurosceptic Mouvement pour la France (MPF), which plans to campaign against Turkish entry and against a federal Europe. Turkey, he says, is European "neither geographically nor culturally". Worse, because of its galloping demography,

"this country would have more than 100 MEPs against only 72 for France and 99 for Germany". Ghastly thought. De Villiers says that there should be a referendum in France to determine whether Turkey be let in.

Another target is Jean-Marie Le Pen's Front National (FN), which pushed the Socialists into third place at the last presidential election. They have always been the soundest of the French eurosceptic parties. They want to tear up the Maastricht, Amsterdam and Nice treaties and return powers to the member-states. For them, the emasculation of nation-states in favour of supranationalism can only increase US hegemony. They reject the Constitution, because "its very existence proves that it's meant to create a super-state". Good point, that. They are against not just Turkish entry ("100 million Muslims suddenly having free access to Europe and France"), but also that of Israel, Palestine and North African countries.

In Favour of Entry

Meanwhile, the Socialists are in favour of Turkish entry. In the words of one of their stars, Ms Ségolène Royal, (the partner of the leader, François Hollande), "*We can't say no to Turkey: the Turks are very close to the Greeks: we can't take the latter and not the former*". Admittedly she's stuck with the position of her former boss, Lionel Jospin, who was in favour when he was PM, but even so, her supposition that the Turks and Greeks are "very close" has understandably caused French eyebrows to rise.

Back on what passes for the "right" in France, Francis Bayrou's Union pour

la Démocratie Française (UDF) - Giscard d'Estaing's old party - is against Turkish entry "in the name of a Christian and federal Europe". The outgoing UMP MEPs are also against; they voted in the European Parliament against an interim report (which was passed anyway) on the progress made by Turkey in fulfilling its entry conditions. For them, said Alain Lamassoure, a former minister for "Europe", if the EU's to become a "free-trade zone like NAFTA then yes, Turkey has its place, alongside Israel, Palestine, the Ukraine and Morocco". When French politicians utter the phrase "free-trade zone" it's like mentioning a social disease, so we can take it that the last thing Monsieur Lamassoure wants is free trade. It's widely-supposed in France that the UK supports Turkish entry for that very reason - to "dilute" the Union into a mere free-trade zone. If only that were so. Nothing is as obscure as other countries' internal politics, but this brief review of what French politicians are saying about Turkey illustrates the growing anguish amongst ordinary French people about what the EU's supposed to be about. For this observer, the dominant feeling (eerily recalling the British debate in the 60s) is "France is weak, let's turn to 'Europe' to compensate". But which 'Europe'? A Christian one? A Muslim one? A super-state? A Europe of the regions? In any case, to the French, it looks as if Europe's just as weak as France is. Worse, with enlargement, France will no longer be running the show. I've said it before, and I'll say it again: the first country to head for the EU exit will be France.

French voters set to snub EU elections

Almost half of French voters intend to abstain or not vote in the EU elections according to a survey of public opinion carried out by the polling organisation CSA between 13-14th April. The poll also indicated a swing away from the centre-right to the centre-left. EU Elections in France are held on 13th June.

LETTERS

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

Break the Spell!

Dear Sir,

I cannot understand the misplaced loyalty that Frederick Forsyth and Christina Speight continue to display to the Tory Party in the columns of *eurofacts*. Although I have the highest regard for their achievements in other spheres of activity, they continue to believe that the Tory Party under Michael Howard is going to trigger some sort of political magic that will eventually free Britain from Brussels' domination. Vote Tory at the next election, they say, and everything will turn out hunky-dory when a new Conservative government is formed. Well if you believe that, you'll believe anything.

Eurosceptics are accused of 'lack of realism' for not wanting to trust their country to the Tory Party. This is the party that has betrayed all the principles that it stood for in the immediate post-war period.

I can neither forgive nor forget what the Tory Party has done to our once proud country and it will never receive another vote from me. I have seen perfectly good lathes and machine tools ripped from their foundations in various Colleges of Further Education and other educational establishments for no other reason than that they were calibrated in imperial units, to be replaced by sometimes inferior machine tools calibrated in metric units. I attended every court case that involved Steve Thoburn, (God rest his Soul), the first Metric Martyr, and witnessed the supremacy of European law over British law as Steve received a criminal record for selling a pound of bananas. I witnessed the House of Lords dismiss his appeal in less than 20 minutes of deliberation with a curt rejection of Michael Shrimpton's legal arguments. I have been to Boston to campaign for Ken Bagley and seen at first-hand how he was subjected to court action for catching herring in with his catch of sprats and how he and all the other fishermen are being deprived of a living by the rigid implementation and application of EU

legislation by British fisheries inspectors. Shall I go on?

The Tory Party was responsible for all of the above and much more. They have sold our country down the river and now they think they can renegotiate the treaties we have signed with the EU. I suggest that anyone who thinks that that is possible should read "The Great Deception" by Booker and North and discover just how fallible British politicians are when dealing with Europe.

If all the wretchedly loyal Tory supporters voted at the next General Election on Principle rather than by rote, they would support the only democratic, non-racist, political party that states clearly in its manifesto that its main objective is to pull Britain out of the European Union. It can and will happen if the Tory voters can bring themselves to break the spell of party loyalty.

DEREK NORMAN
Norfolk

A Second Vote?

On reflection, after reading the many letters for and against voting Conservative, I have to somewhat reluctantly agree with Christina Speight's proposition, and yet fervently hope that Frederick Forsyth knows something I don't! I can't remember such a dilemma, of knowing the only way to stop Blair and his euro-cohorts, is to vote for a party you really don't want!

With regards the Constitution, what I do find hard to believe is that it will be dead in the water if any country votes against it. Can we really believe the usual contempt for the people won't kick in to force a second vote?

I remember standing outside the Houses of Parliament holding the Irish flag on which I had printed IRELAND SAID NO, NICE IS DEAD. It was the day on which our MPs voted to ratify a treaty that Ireland's vote had

supposedly made null and void!

JOSE H O'WARE
Middlesex

Time to show our Strength

Michael Howard is a career politician rather than a crusader. Given the choice between being Prime Minister of a province of Soviet Europe and a conscientious Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition, one can guess which role he would prefer.

Buffeted by the conflicting winds of EU-reality and EU-fantasy, with the vast majority of voters still largely unaware of the realities of the European Union, but with a powerful group of EU-fantasists within his own party, no wonder that Howard swings like a weathercock. He woos the fantasists by promising that he will never quit the EU, the rest of us by promising to negotiate withdrawal from within it (No prize for picking which of those promises he would achieve.)

So EU-realists of every political party need to blow harder on him. Many may have feared to vote UKIP in the past for fear of splitting the vote and so losing a Parliamentary seat to a third party. But that cannot result from the EU and local elections, so for everyone to vote 100 per cent for UKIP on 10th June would not be "striking postures" or "playing political games" (letters 16th April). The resulting vote-count could for the first time reveal our real strength, and show our politicians what a gale they will face if they do not reverse Britain's slide to extinction.

ANTONY HOYLE
Buckinghamshire

The debate about whether the Tory party or UKIP provides the best means of withdrawal from the EU has raged on in our column for several issues. Without wishing to halt the debate in the next few issues we intend to give priority to readers who wish to write about the proposed Constitution or some other aspect of the EU affairs - Ed.

MEETINGS

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

Jeffrey Donaldson MP

Carl Mortished, *The International Business Editor of The Times*

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

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

UK Independence Party

01903-885574

Thursday **6th May 2004**, 7.30 pm

Trevor Coleman

Nick Faulkner

PUBLIC MEETING

Enterprise Room, Torpoint, Cornwall

Admission Free

UK Independence Party

0161-487 1168

Tuesday **11th May 2004**, 8.00 pm

“UK or EU - our new D-day?”

Steve Roxborough

PUBLIC MEETING

All Saints’ Parish Rooms, Church Road,
Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire

Admission Free

UK Independence Party

01903-885574

Saturday **15th May 2004**, 7.30 pm

Graham Booth MEP

Malcolm Wood

PUBLIC MEETING

E.W.S.A. Club, Saltash, Cornwall

Admission Free - Bar Provided

UK Independence Party

01395-276130

Wednesday **19th May 2004**, 7.30 pm

“Who Governs Britain?”

Trevor Coleman

Elizabeth Burton, *Farmer*

David Wilson, *Businessman*

PUBLIC MEETING

Town Hall, Seaton, Devon

Admission Free

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

020-8922 0089

Saturday **22nd May 2004**, 2.00 pm

Speakers to be announced

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Victory Services Club, Seymour Street,
London W1

Admission by ticket £5

UK Independence Party

Winchester Branch 01962-711112

Monday **24th May 2004**, 7.30 pm

“European Union - the great deception”

Christopher Booker, *Author and
journalist*

Nigel Farage MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Guildhall, Winchester, Hampshire

Admission Free

UK Independence Party

Hertford & Stortford and
North East Hertfordshire 01279-842185

Tuesday **25th May 2004**, 8.00 pm

“The EU Constitution - The final surrender”

Christopher Gill, *Chairman, Freedom
Association, author*

Ashley Mote, *author*

PUBLIC MEETING

Corn Exchange, Fore Street, Hertford

Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

2004

Accession of ten new **1st May**
Member States

European MEP Elections **10-13th June**

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Wednesday **4th May 2004**, 10.30 am

Evidence will be heard on *The State of the
Economy and Economic Policy, Long
Term and Short Term* from (a) the Rt Hon
Gordon Brown MP, Chancellor of the
Exchequer, and (b) 4.15 pm from
Professor Nicholas Crafts, London School
of Economics.

Wednesday **5th May 2004**, 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on *Towards a
Sustainable EU Policy on Climate Change*
from the British Cement Association.

Wednesday **5th May 2004**, 4.15 pm

Evidence may be heard on *Eurojust (the
EU’s Judicial Co-operation Unit)*.

Tuesday **11th May 2004**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *The State of the
Economy and Economic Policy, Long
Term and Short Term* from Professor
Jonathan Haskel, University of London.

Wednesday **12th May 2004**, 10.45 am

Evidence will be heard on *Eurojust (the
EU’s Judicial Co-operation Unit)* from
Franz-Hermann Bruener, Director-
General; and Lothar Kuhl, Director of
Legislation, Legal Affairs and Relations
with other institutions, OLAF (European
Anti-Fraud Office)

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

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.

Britain and the European Project

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

Reflections on sovereignty, history, politics, psychology and economics. How they point to the UK regaining her independence.

A Critical History of Economics

by John Mills. **£19.99**

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

The Fate of

Britain's National Interest

by Professor Kenneth Minogue. **£4.00**

The author argues that the national interest is being undermined by legal activists and international bureaucrats.

OverCrowded Britain

by Ashley Mote. **£8.95**

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

Health and the Nation

by Dr Lee Rotherham. **£2.00**

How the future of the NHS will be directed at a European level.

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

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020-7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk	
New Frontiers	020-7494 3000

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

