

Let down by the leaders of all political parties

The eurosceptic cause is being damaged by UKIP squabbles, the Blair-Brown feud and the Tory desire to say as little as possible about Europe

eurofacts does not presume to tell its readers how to vote, and it won't be doing so at the forthcoming general election. We also refrain from becoming embroiled either in inter-party battles or intra-party feuds - although we receive a constant stream of readers' letters trying to promote the cause of particular political parties or factions. We try to live up to the claim implicit in our masthead: that of explaining the reality of the European project to all those who are interested.

Titanic Struggle

However, with a general election perhaps no more than three months away, we cannot avoid observing that at present the cause of euroscepticism is not being well served by either the Conservative Party or by UKIP, the two parties which claim the support of eurosceptics - while the Labour government position on European issues can only be understood by the titanic struggle between Brown and Blair.

Since fighting a skilful and deservedly successful campaign for the European elections in June last year, UKIP appears to have become distracted by internal squabbles from its task of explaining the harm being done by Britain's membership and of campaigning for withdrawal and a new relationship with the EU. As we go to press it seems possible that Robert Kilroy-Silk will attempt to split UKIP

by forming a new party that campaigns on immigration, asylum and crime as well for EU withdrawal.

In seeking to claim the leadership of UKIP Kilroy-Silk displayed egotism and impatience of a high order but the party leadership is also to be criticised for not having sought more skillfully to find a role commensurate with Kilroy-Silk's following in the country and his talents as a communicator.

Criticism of the party leadership is now widespread and is not confined to the supporters of Mr Kilroy-Silk. It is measure of how personal relations have deteriorated that a clumsily-written Christmas message of the party leader to members should have become the cause of criticism and complaint by members. More disturbing is the use of a hoax message and a series of dirty tricks by senior members of the party to damage opponents.

Agreed Framework

It was inevitable that the party's organisation and structure would need to change as the result of rapid and deserved increase in membership. Members complain that power is now being centralised. If this is so it would be a mistake: party members are far more likely to accept discipline and to behave responsibly if they are given particular tasks within an agreed framework. Moreover, a policy of centralisation would sit uneasily with a

political philosophy that stresses the virtue of decentralisation.

What actual and potential UKIP supporters had been hoping to see from the UKIP leadership was a sign that the party had thought seriously about the next stage of its development, its role in the forthcoming referendum campaign and a strategy for achieving its goals; they are still waiting.

Recent Debate

The principal complaint to be made against the Conservative Party is that, like the Liberal Party, it seems not to want to talk about the EU during a general election campaign. As a consequence, it has missed important opportunities to criticise the European project. The party has a better policy on fishing than formerly, but anyone who was hoping for heavyweight speeches on Britain's future relationship with Europe will have been disappointed. The recent debate on international aid, and the expression of US disquiet over the EU's attitude towards defence matters have provided the occasion for a distinctive Tory voice on these issues but the chance has not been taken. It is sometimes said that in the age of spin and sound bites there is no point in making closely argued speeches, combining intellectual rigour with passion, of the kind once made by Enoch Powell and Keith Joseph. Is this so? The last

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: Government confidence in Barroso p.2 - Pensions: UK less badly-off than Continent? p.3 - EU budget contribution soars p.3 - Europe produces fewer entrepreneurs p.3 - Review of "The Missing Heart of Europe" p.4 - British rebate under pressure p.4 - European project could kill NATO p.5 - Czechs against the Constitution p.5

Government has 'every confidence in Barroso'

Lord Pearson of Rannoch asked Her Majesty's Government: Whether they believe that the recently appointed European Commission is suitably composed to act as the initiator and executive of European Union legislation.

Baroness Crawley: My Lords, yes. The Government have every confidence in President Barroso's Commission. We can only applaud the new Commission's focus on delivery, reform and better regulation. We look forward to working with it to face some of the great common challenges - Africa, climate change and European economic reform - during our presidency next year of both the G8 and the EU.

Lord Pearson of Rannoch: My Lords,

I am grateful to the noble Baroness for that admirably succinct reply. But is she aware that the new Commission contains six former communists, an agriculture commissioner who benefits from the CAP, an anti-fraud commissioner who has been tried for fraud, Monsieur Barrot who was found guilty of fraud but who was pardoned by President Chirac, for fairly obvious reasons, not to mention that fine example of British political probity, Mr Peter Mandelson?

Does the noble Baroness further agree that the Latvian candidate did not make it on to the Commission because she favours member states retaining their tax systems and that Signor Buttiglione was excluded because he is a good Catholic and a thoroughly

decent man?

In those circumstances, can the noble Baroness tell the House why Her Majesty's Government are happy to see most of our new laws largely controlled by such people, as they now are?

Baroness Crawley: My Lords, the noble Lord is well known for his less than high regard of the European Union and its works. I was waiting for the corrupt octopus of Europe to make an entry. I would then have been able to say that it is not so much the corrupt octopus of Europe, but the tired tentacles of European scepticism which strangle coherent debate.

HANSARD - House of Lords 7th December 2004.

Parliamentary Copyright 2004

Continued from P.1

Led down by the party leaders

heavyweight intellectual speech made by a Tory on a European topic that we can recall was delivered by William Hague in January 2001 and dealt with the EU's attempt to create an autonomous defence capability and why this would damage British relations with the US. The speech won fulsome praise from *The Times* (which said it was the best speech he had made - despite having been no great fan of the then Tory leader) as well as other Tory papers, while a columnist in the *New York Times* wondered whether Hague was the 'new Churchill'.

Unfortunately Mr Hague's rigour deserted him when he later asserted, quite wrongly, that the approaching general election was the last occasion when the British people would have a say on the euro.

Having observed his predecessor deal badly with the European issue Mr Iain Duncan Smith drew the conclusion that it would be better not to deal with it at all. Many of those now on the Tory front bench appear to think the same way.

As for the Labour Party, only a small

number seem to resent the fact that Britain's political destiny is being subordinated to the outcome of personal rivalries between the Prime Minister and the Chancellor.

Permanent Brake

Writing in *The Guardian* on 18th January, Martin Kettle described the current situation: "*The details may be in dispute, but it is clear - and was clear before Robert Peston's account of their disputes over the euro - that the Blair-Gordon Brown rivalry has always acted as a massive and permanent brake on any decisive Labour initiative on Europe. Blair is always in favour. Brown is invariably against. So the question after May 5th is why it should be any different this time. The formal answer is that voting yes to the constitution is Labour policy and will be in the manifesto. But to believe that things will play radically differently this time, you also have to believe that, in reality, Blair and Brown will now promote the case for the yes campaign together, without*

ambiguity and with equal vigour over many months. It is, to put it mildly, a rose-tinted vision, especially in view of what we are now told about their relationship. For, if nothing else, the campaign challenges Brown to put at risk key parts of the coalition that he has so assiduously assembled behind his succession claims, notably the eurosceptic press, especially the Sun and the Daily Mail, as well as Labour's anti-EU MPs. Perhaps he will dare to do that in order to win the battle for Britain's place in the world - certainly the backing of such a sceptic would send a powerful signal. But it is hard to believe."

It is hard to believe, although unlike *The Guardian*, we take some consolation from that fact. We remain convinced that the European issue remains the most important of all, and cannot in the long run be avoided - but we are profoundly depressed by the fact that no political party is treating it with the attention and high seriousness that it deserves.

Pensions: UK less badly-off than Continent - perhaps

A detailed report* by the Pensions Commission on the long-term future of the British pension system highlights the UK's apparent relatively comfortable position compared to the main Continental countries.

The report says that "the UK system overall (public and private combined) probably transfers a percentage of GDP [to pensioners] somewhat similar to that transferred by other systems which have a larger public pension element and where the demography is similar".

The difference between the UK and the big Continental countries is that private pension provision in the UK is so much greater, as Table 1 shows.

Data on France and Italy are not

shown, but are similar to that for Germany. The UK data is perhaps better than it looks, since it is for self-administered pension funds only and excludes pension policies held via insurance companies. The other point to note in Table 1 is that UK pension policies hold over 70 per cent of their assets in equities compared to less than 10 per cent for Germany and Italy, 26 per cent for the Netherlands and 14 per cent for Switzerland.

Table 2 shows Public Pension Expenditure as a Percentage of GDP - in other words, what the different governments have to pay to pensioners out of taxes and national insurance contributions - the so-called Pay-As-You-Go burden.

It should be noted that in Table 2 the UK figures are most probably understated (in other words they appear to be better than they actually are), since they exclude pensions paid to former public sector employees.

The Pensions Commission is a quango set up by the Government in 2002 "to keep under review the adequacy of private pension saving in the UK, and to advise on appropriate policy changes...". Its chairman is Adair Turner, a favourite Downing Street "adviser". Its report is

voluminous and highly detailed. Pensions are a notoriously complicated subject, and as can be seen from the "health-warnings" referred to above the statistics are badly flawed. It is worth pointing out as well that the Pensions Commission cannot be regarded as "independent"; that an election is coming up; and that punches may be being pulled, as they are in many other areas of government. Nevertheless, this report is a useful source of data on a difficult - and crucial - policy area.

Table 1:

Size of Total Investments of Autonomous Pension Funds as Percentage of GDP: 2001

Germany	3.3
Netherlands	105.1
Switzerland	113.5
UK	66.4
USA	63.0

**Source: OECD
Global Pension Statistics Project**

Table 2:

Public Pension Expenditure as a Percentage of GDP

Country/Region	2000	2030
EU-15	10.4	13.0
France	12.1	16.0
Germany	11.8	15.5
Italy	13.8	15.7
Spain	9.4	12.6
UK	5.5	5.2

Source: EU Economic Policy Committee (2001)

*Pensions: Challenges and Choices www.pensionscommission.org.uk

EU budget contribution soars

According to the Chancellor's Pre-Budget Report issued in December 2004* the UK's net contributions to the EU Budget over the next few years will be as follows:-

	2004/5	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8
£bn	2.6	3.6	4.8	5.1

That's an average increase of 25 per cent per year between

the current UK financial year and 2007/8, representing almost a doubling of the figure in just three years.

Not that Gordon exactly shouted this imprudent increase from the rooftops; it can be found in footnote 4 to "Table B16: Total Managed Expenditure" on page 216 of the 258-page report.

*Cm 6408, HM Treasury, www.hm-treasury.co.uk

Europe produces fewer entrepreneurs

The EU continues to lag behind the US when it comes to entrepreneurship, a poll published on 17th January by the European Commission shows.

The survey - conducted on both sides

of the Atlantic - shows that nearly twice as many Americans are thinking of setting up their own business (28 per cent) than their European counterparts (15 per cent).

Moreover, the gap appears to be

widening. The number of people thinking about starting their own firm increased by eight per cent since 2003 in the US, but only by two per cent in the EU.

The eccentric British

By Ian Milne

Mr Kremer's father served as an officer in both the Hungarian Army and the Romanian one. His son, the author of this book, was born in Transylvania before the last war and has seen more of Europe, the worst and the best, than most. He escaped from Bergen-Belsen, fled to Switzerland, emigrated to Israel, studied in France, Scotland and England. His home has been in Britain for over fifty years. He is a professional inventor who discovered and made popular Rubik's Cube. He writes very well.

Mr Kremer, like at least half of the British population, is deeply worried about the European "project". His book, a series of essays exploring what it is to be British, and how we differ from the French, Germans, Italians and others, is a tour-de-force of sharp insight and original ideas. There are chapters on Authority and the Individual, Doing Business, Language, Philosophy, Sense of Humour, Superpower versus Sovereignty and much else. The point about the British, he says, is that, in different senses of the word, they're "eccentric" - tending out of, or away from, a centre. The French and Germans on the other hand are "concentric" - tending towards a centre. Theirs is the project for a federal single European state: that is what they (or their leaders, anyway) want, deeply, sincerely and genuinely. Mr Kremer notes that most British politicians can't or won't admit that;

The Missing Heart of Europe Does Britain hold the key to the future of the Continent?

By Thomas Kremer

The June Press,
2004 Paperback 254 pp £11.99

Available from *The June Press*
Price £11.99 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 0-9534697-3-5

hence the debilitating confusion into which politics has fallen not just in Britain, but, more generally, across the whole European continent.

Mr Kremer believes that only Britain can save Europe from its federalist folly. Europe can be "reclaimed", he says, if Britain formulates and puts into place a "new European people's agenda". This would include: no Constitution; no European President; no European military body; no European police force. He then calls for the "*reversal of the ongoing centrally directed process of standardisation*", the "*gradual (his italics) elimination of all subsidies*", the "*severe curtailing of Brussels....*", the "*reform of the European Parliament*" and so on. As a set of long-term aspirations, few in this country outside the Labour and Lib-

Dem leadership would disagree.

He rejects the idea that Britain should simply leave the EU altogether, because he believes that the EU, left to itself, would collapse in chaos, and that that would be as bad for the UK as for the Continent. He proposes that this country should play the leadership role in reforming the EU from the inside. His view is therefore broadly that of the present Conservative Party, a view which, as readers of the Letters page of *eurofacts* know only too well, is emphatically not shared by many erstwhile Conservatives, let alone UKIP supporters. Mr Kremer, rightly, fears the consequences of what he believes is the inevitable collapse of the present European project: political crisis, perhaps worse, on the Continent. With his vast experience of matters European, and of the UK, it is flattering to find that he believes in the ability of this country to affect matters while remaining inside the EU - even, presumably, if we sign up to the Constitution. Sooner or later, we British are going to have to make up our minds whether "reforming from inside" or "pressing the ejector button" is the better course. Whichever way the decision goes, Pitt the Younger's famous dictum, (which Mr Kremer quotes), will once again have to operate: *England has saved herself by her exertions and will, as I trust, save Europe by her example.*

British rebate under new pressure

Without the UK rebate - now coming under renewed pressure at Brussels - Britain would have paid 14 times as much as France or Italy during the period since it was negotiated. Over the last 20 years the rebate has brought back 64 billion to Britain or about 1,000 per citizen. But as *eurofacts* has predicted would be the case, Britain has not found a single ally in the fight to preserve the rebate which is worth 4.6 bn a year.

In an interview with *The Times* on

14th January Dalia Grybauskaitė, the Lithuanian EU Commissioner for the Budget urged Britain to give up the rebate and said: "*If other member states started to negotiate just on physical amounts of money, you are forgetting solidarity, a core policy of the European Union...It's a sensitive issue...We don't want anybody to be jeopardised, we don't want anybody to use it against the European idea, or use it against the Constitution - and to*

become a tool for eurosceptics".

In other words, the only reason why pressure on Britain to give up the rebate is not even more extreme is the fear that strong-arm techniques could have implications for the UK referendum result. If, however, the British public were foolish enough to say 'yes' in that referendum there would, of course, be absolutely no reason for restraint by those desperate to get their hands on our money thereafter.

European project could kill NATO, CIA warns

Further proof that that the European Union is likely to disintegrate unless it undergoes profound change is contained in a report from a US government think-tank

Further evidence that the European project will damage Britain's capacity to defend itself is contained in a report from the US National Intelligence Council, the CIA's think-tank.

The report, entitled "Mapping the Global Future", warns that NATO is set to be marginalised by the development of the EU's common foreign and security policy and that relations between the EU and the US will be "dramatically altered". The report also suggests that although it is unlikely, the EU could seek an alternative to strong reliance on the US by creating an EU-China alliance. While it does not say so this is a danger that will loom somewhat larger if, as expected, the embargo on EU arms sales to China is lifted later this year following a lengthy Franco-German push to achieve this.

For reasons of operational and political clarity the US chose not to use NATO in the war in Afghanistan. The fact that the CIA now openly suggests that NATO has a distinctly uncertain future makes it unlikely that America will ever again use it in a war-fighting or peace-making as opposed to peace-keeping role. In the long run, America's commitment to NATO is bound to be reviewed as an increasing number of Americans question why it should continue to commit millions of dollars to updating the organisation when its allies fail to match its spending and seek constantly to frustrate the pursuit of US security and foreign policy interests.

The report states: "The EU, rather than NATO, will increasingly become

the primary institution for Europe, and the role which Europeans shape for themselves on the world stage is most likely to be projected through it".

There are many ironies in the present situation. The most obvious is that while EU spokesmen frequently complain about the implications of "US unilateralism", the attempt to create an autonomous European defence capacity is bound to encourage the very thing that Europeans say they fear most. Another irony is that such attempts would not have been even half credible if they had not been backed by the European Prime Minister that the Bush White House likes the most - Tony Blair.

Slipping behind

In the long term, however, present trends suggest that the close security relationship between America and Britain is coming to an end.

These also suggest that defence spending by individual European countries will fall behind that of China and India over the next 15 years. The next stage of the technological revolution will involve the convergence of nano, bio-information and materials technologies, which has implications for both the domestic and military sectors. But whereas the US is predicted to maintain its overall lead in these areas, the report says that Europe risks slipping behind.

While euophiles may be pleased by at least some aspects of the report dealing with the EU's future security arrangements, they will not be at all happy about the sections dealing with

Europe's economic and political future, not least the suggestion that the EU may break up unless welfare systems are reformed.

"The current EU welfare state is unsustainable and the lack of any economic revitalisation could lead to the splintering, or, at worst, the disintegration of the EU, undermining its ambitions to play a heavyweight international role", the report states.

It also says that economic growth in the EU is held back by Germany and its restrictive labour markets. Major reform in Germany, France and Italy remains the key to breaking out of the EU's "slow growth pattern". But it is doubtful whether the EU is capable of initiating change, having been advised by the experts it consulted that they are "dubious that the present political leadership are prepared even to make this partial break, believing a looming budgetary crisis in the next five years would be the more likely trigger for reform".

In other words, Europe's political elites do not credit themselves with the ability to escape from a crisis of their own making and are now waiting for an even bigger crisis to provide them with a justification for radical change. But if they lack the courage to attempt change now, why should anyone credit them with the courage to take tough measures when the stakes are still higher. And even if they find that courage, does anyone credit them with the skill and moral resources sufficient to perform such a task?

Czechs against the Constitution

Der Standard, the German newspaper reported on 14th January that a poll in the Czech Republic has found that 69 per cent of Czechs are against the EU

Constitution. There is still political disagreement over when to hold the referendum although there is speculation that it may be held around

the time of the UK vote in spring 2006. Opposition to the constitution has been led by the Czech president, Vaclav Klaus, a long-standing critic of the EU.

LETTERS

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

Historic opportunity

Dear Sir,
The front page of your 3rd December edition wrongly asserts "The Conservative leadership rather suggests that things would go on as much before" (following the rejection of the EU Constitution in a referendum). This could not be further from the truth. We will campaign vigorously for a "NO" vote, not because we want Britain to muddle along as before but because we believe a resounding "No" from the British people will provide a historic opportunity for Britain to strike a new and different deal with the EU. Our specific pledges to withdraw from the Social Chapter, Common Fisheries Policy and much of the EU aid programme are important; but far more important is the establishment of the principle that powers can be returned from Brussels to the Sovereign Member State. The creation of a freer, more flexible, less centralised Europe is a democratic imperative for Britain; it is also essential if our continental friends are to avoid a continuing slide into economic stagnation.

As Dan Hannan MEP suggests in his article in the same edition a "no" vote is not good enough. A Labour government faced with a "no" would seek to make cosmetic changes to the constitution before returning to urge the British electorate to think again.

Armed with the double mandate of a "No" vote and a general election victory, a Conservative government would set about negotiating a less integrated, less regulated, less insular Europe.

The Conservative vision has many supporters in the countries of "New Europe" and increasingly among those in the Eurozone who want to escape from their world of high unemployment, high taxation and sluggish growth.

GRAHAM BRADY MP
Shadow Minister for Europe
Westminster
London
SW1

Origins of the Identity Card

Dear Sir,
Your readers might like to know that the Irish Minister for Justice was reported here yesterday as saying that if identity cards were introduced in the UK, they would also be introduced in the Republic of Ireland, as part of the common Anglo-Irish travel area.

The ultimate source of the current pressure to introduce identity cards in both Britain and Ireland comes from the EU, with its moves towards visa and asylum harmonization and its aim of establishing a centralised cross-EU data base on all citizens of the 25 EU Member countries as part of its "common area of freedom, security and justice".

Identity cards are no defence against terrorism, as was shown by the Madrid bombings. They introduce a whole new range of criminal offences. They make every citizen a potential criminal for failing to have or carry an ID card and could lead to a marked deterioration in relations between the public and the police. Their introduction moreover would be financially costly for citizens.

Opposition to the introduction of identity cards is surely an issue on which EU critics in Britain can put the Blair Government on the defensive, while appealing to popular sentiment in support of traditional British liberties and the notion that the State exists to serve the citizen, not the citizen the State.

ANTHONY COUGHLAN
Dublin

Elite Behaviour

Dear Sir,
It is astounding how little attention is given to the way the elite in the EU behave (see *eurofacts* 14th January, P.1). A sickening but minor example being the behaviour of Mrs Kinnock, that paragon of socialism, politically correct values and the EU elite, who is reported to have claimed an attendance allowance (£260 per day) on 26 occasions in last session for days she

was not present in the chamber.

Mr Kinnock's portfolio was to stamp out corruption and to get the EU accounts into a fit state for auditors to sign. Putting these two facts together explains everything we need to know about why the EU will not, and never can work.

The gravy train at the heart of EU was created by an executive, made up of people like Mr and Mrs Kinnock, which is democratically unaccountable and opaque.

Placing facts together tells even fools and dreamers that the EU is beyond reforming. The public have not grasped this point, not because they are fools, but because we have not got our facts into a nutshell yet!

JULIAN WILLIAMS
Wales

Irrelevant Election

Dear Sir,
The parties are now announcing 'goodies' to tempt the electorate. But there is no real choice at the general election: all the main political parties would have us stay in the European Union!

According to the publication, "*A Cost Too Far?*," by Ian Milne, the EU costs the UK taxpayer, one way or another, £100 bn per year! The party which will have a referendum on exit from the EU would win by a landslide!

Jean Monnet, founding father of the EU, said: "*Europe should be guided towards the superstate without their people understanding what is happening. This can be accomplished by successive steps, each disguised as having an economic purpose, but which will eventually and irreversibly lead to a federation*".

Under the EU plan for a 'Europe of the Regions', Wales and Scotland are regions, England will be abolished and split into nine regions all ruled from Brussels.

With all this in mind, if we stay in the EU, isn't the forthcoming election a bit irrelevant?

EDWIN BATEMAN
Cumbria

MEETINGS

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005

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

2006

Austria takes over **1st January**
EU presidency

New Britain
0207-247 2524

Sunday **30th January 2005**

Australian/New Zealand Celebration

2.00 pm Assemble at the statue of Admiral Arthur Phillip, Watling Street behind St Paul's Cathedral. Wreath will be laid, followed by a march through the City of London

3.00 pm Service at St Olave's Church

The Rt. Hon the Lord Mayor of London, Alderman Michael Savory, will attend

CELEBRATION & RECEPTION

Further details, phone 0207-247 2524

Admission £5 for reception

(includes a glass of wine)

nearest tube to St Olave, Tower Hill

**Bruges Group
and
Democracy Movement**
01300-341788

Thursday **3rd March 2005** 7.30 pm

"The European Constitution - Why Britain should say NO"

Marc Glendening, Democracy Movement, Campaign Director

Rt. Hon Oliver Letwin MP, Conservative, Shadow Chancellor

Cllr. Steve Radford, Liberal Party, President

PUBLIC MEETING

Town Hall, Corn Exchange, High East Street, Dorchester DT1

Admission Free

The Freedom Association

01746-861267

Saturday **19th March 2005**

10.30 am - 4.00 pm

Spring Conference

Speakers to be announced

SPRING CONFERENCE

The Burlington Hotel, Birmingham (Adjacent to New Street Railway Station)

Admission £40 before 31st January - £50 thereafter

(Includes morning coffee, two-course lunch and afternoon tea)

Gresham College

020-7831 0575

Tuesday **5th April 2005**, 6.00 pm

"Devolution and the territorial Constitution"

Professor Vernon Bogdanor FBA CBE, Gresham Professor of Law

Wednesday **25th May 2005** 6.00 pm

"The integration of Europe: Britain out, Britain in, Britain on the fence"

Professor Kathleen Burk, Gresham Professor of Rhetoric

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

Campaign for an Independent Britain

020-8340 0314

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

"Defeating the EU Constitution"

Speakers to be announced

The Emmanuel Centre, 9-13 Marsham Street, London SW1P 3DW

Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **1st February 2005**, 3.45 pm

Evidence will be heard on *The Economics of Climate Change* from Professor Bjorn Lomborg; and Dr Rajendra Pachauri, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Wednesday **2nd February 2005**, 3.45 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Proposed European Union Action Programme for Life-Long Learning* from Julie Winyard, Head teacher, Benhall St Mary's, Suffolk, and others.

Wednesday **2nd February 2005**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *European Contract Law: The Way Forward* from the CBI.

Thursday **3rd February 2005**, 10.45 am

Evidence will be heard on *EU Strategy on non-proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction* from: Representatives from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

Wednesday **9th February 2005**, 3.40 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Energy Efficiency* from Martin Wyatt, CEO, Building Research Establishment; and David Strong, Managing Director, BRE Environmental.

Wednesday **2nd February 2005**, 3.45 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Proposed European Union Action Programme for Life-Long Learning* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **9th February 2005**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *European Contract Law: The Way Forward* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **9th February 2005**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *The Hague Programme* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **23rd Feb. 2005**, 3.45 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Proposed European Union Action Programme for Life-Long Learning* from Julie Winyard, Head teacher, Benhall St Mary's, Suffolk, and others.

Note:

Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning

Germany's Four Reichs
by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Idiosyncratic history of Germany by Englishman, El Alamein, Burma, Bletchley (codebreaker), who knew Adenauer well.

The European Constitution In Perspective

by *British Management Data Foundation*. **£27.50**

Analysis and Review of 'The Treaty Establishing A Constitution for Europe'.

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.

EUSSR The Soviet Roots of European Integration

by *Vladimir Bukovsky & Pavel Stroilov*. **£4.75**

Reveals secret discussions between Western and Soviet Union leaders.

Saving England

The Case for Independence: Why England Should Declare UDI
by *Vernon Coleman*. **£8.99**

Coleman, inimitably and deadly accurately spells it out in 85 short chapters.

Voting on the Constitution: What Britain should know about the consequences

by *Daniel Hannan*. **£7.00**

The implications of a British 'No' vote.

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.

The Missing Heart of Europe

Does Britain hold the key to the future of the Continent?
by *Thomas Kremer*. **£11.99**

Can nation states flourish in an integrated Greater Europe? A European businessman's view of the likely impact of divergent national cultures.

The Essential Guide to the European Union

by *Ruth Lea*. **£12.50**

A detailed yet accessible picture, right up to date, of how the European Union works now and in the future.

EUROPE A Concise Encyclopedia of the European Union
by *Rodney Leach*. **£14.99**

The fourth update of this highly informative and necessary directory.

A Cost Too Far?

by *Ian Milne*. **£8.50**

A fully worked out cost/benefit analysis of Britain's EU membership.

Galileo - The Military and Political Dimensions

by *Dr Richard North*. **£4.00**

A European satellite positioning technology that has hidden implications for the whole world.

The Need for Nations

by *Roger Scruton*. **£8.50**

Why the nation states of Europe need to regain their sovereignty, to keep peace, prosperity and defend human rights.

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"

European Commission	020-7973 1992
European Movement	020-7940 5252
Federal Trust	020-7735 4000

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	020-7808 7772
----------------------	----------------------

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
Roger Knapman MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006