

Refuting the biggest myth about leaving the EU

Figures from the European Central Bank demonstrate that Britain would have huge leverage in negotiating a new relationship with the European Union

It is frequently alleged that if Britain sought to establish a new relationship with the EU outside the existing political structures we would be outgunned and outmanoeuvred. Further, we are told constantly that in the negotiations following a decision to go our own way the UK would lack leverage and we would consequently be left isolated and disadvantaged. The figures contained in the tables below are from the European Central Bank; they provide irrefutable evidence that the reverse is true, namely that in such negotiations Britain would have enormous leverage and that such is the pattern of trade between Britain and the eurozone the latter would have no incentive to punish the UK

by seeking to limit the imports of good and services from this country. Indeed, the figures demonstrate quite clearly that eurozone countries could only do so at the risk of damaging themselves.

The Eurozone consists of the twelve EU countries which have adopted the

euro: Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Holland, Belgium, Austria, Greece, Finland, Ireland, Portugal and Luxembourg.

Between them, Germany, France and Italy accounted for 69 per cent of

single customer is the UK, which absorbs a fifth of all Eurozone exports. The Eurozone's second biggest customer is the USA, with 17 per cent of all Eurozone exports.

The UK is the Eurozone's biggest customer in each of the main categories of trade. In goods, the UK absorbs 18 per cent of the Eurozone's exports; in services, 26 per cent; in income, 25 per cent; in transfers 11 per cent.

Table 2 shows that the UK and the USA are also the Eurozone's biggest suppliers, with 17 and 15 per cent respectively.

Overall, the Eurozone was in modest surplus on its trade with the world: 44 bn in the period concerned.

However, with the UK the Eurozone surplus overall was 67bn; within that figure the Eurozone surplus in goods alone was 59bn. Worse, from the UK's point of view: the Eurozone also had a big surplus with the UK in services, of

Continued on P.2

Table 1: Geographical Breakdown of Eurozone Exports: Percentages

To:	Goods	Services	Income	Transfers	All Categories
UK	18	26	25	11	20
USA	15	20	23	9	17
Accession States*	11	5	4	1	8
Switzerland	6	10	8	7	7
Rest of World	50	39	40	72	48
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Total in € bn	1104	344	237	82	1767

Source: ECB: www.ecb.int; 12 months Oct 2003-Sep 2004

* The ten mainly East European States which joined the EU in May 2003

Table 2: Geographical Breakdown of Eurozone Imports: Percentages

From:	Goods	Services	Income	Transfers	All Categories
UK	14	21	27	6	17
USA	11	23	23	7	15
Accession States*	10	5	1	1	7
Switzerland	5	8	12	4	7
Rest of World	60	43	37	82	54
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Total in € bn	990	322	275	136	1723

Source: ECB: www.ecb.int; 12 months Oct 2003-Sep 2004

* The ten mainly East European States which joined the EU in May 2003

Eurozone GDP in 2003, and Eurozone GDP itself accounted for 94 per cent of EU-14 GDP (EU-14 consisting of the fifteen "old" GDP members less the UK).

Table 1 shows that, considered as an economic bloc, the Eurozone's biggest

We have ways of breaking people like you, EU told chief auditor

The EU accounts system may be 'sordid', but its treatment of whistle-blowers and critics is still more reprehensible.

The *Daily Telegraph's* excellent European Business Editor Ambrose Evans-Pritchard is to be congratulated for his exclusive story about a leaked e-mail that shows that the EU still has a "chronically sordid accounting system" and that it sets out to trash any official who dares to question its method (*Daily Telegraph* 15th March).

The e-mail was written by the former director general of the Commission's Internal Audit Service, Jules Muis who retired last year. It says that the directorate was "in persistent denial of the real nature and depths of the problems" it faced, choosing "cavity filling solutions when root canals were called for".

Mr Muis also robustly defends Marta Andreassen, the Spanish former chief accountant who was dismissed after she refused to sign off on the 2001 accounts and made her concerns publicly known.

In the e-mail, dated September 4th 2004 Mr Muis described her as "a focused and determined professional who asked the right questions". Her sacking was the last administrative act of Neil Kinnock, the former EU vice president who was supposed to clean

up fraud and corruption, but succeeded only in sacking more whistle-blowers than fraudsters.

Most of the comment about Mr Muis's e-mail has centred on the persistent failure to produce honest books, and even the *Daily Telegraph* confined the story to the business pages. But one of the most striking things about the episode is that those responsible for the brutal treatment of Mrs Andreassen should not only have escaped disciplinary action, but have also escaped public censure.

Although standards in public life may have fallen in recent decades, if a senior British minister had sought to punish a senior official who had shown great courage and determination in bringing to light a major public scandal the minister would not have lasted in office very long. Once the details of the scandal became known the BBC, along with a substantial section of the British press, would have harried the government and demanded an explanation.

If Mrs Andreassen had not possessed such a strong character she could have been badly damaged by the treatment meted out to her, possibly destroyed. And that indeed was the intention. As

Mr Muis's e-mail states, Mrs Andreassen's trial sent a signal that disputes would "be resolved based on power politics only". He had himself been threatened for stepping out of line, being warned "we have ways of breaking people like you".

But when Mr Muis's e-mail confirmed what many believed to be the case there was no revisiting of the controversy by the *Today* programme, nor did any national newspaper doorstep Mr Kinnock - despite the fact that the former EU vice-president would most certainly have seen Mr Muis's e-mail before shamefully sacking her. And, as far as we are aware, no one has attempted to name individual officials responsible for hounding Mrs Andreassen and Mr Muis.

Senior EU officials are already immune from prosecution; still more remarkable is the ease with which they can escape media criticism for their single-minded ruthlessness in attempting to crush those who seek to protect the public interest. The EU accounts may indeed be "sordid" but their behaviour towards individuals who speak out is more sordid still.

Continued from P.1.

Refuting the lies about leaving the EU

23bn, though a sizeable chunk of that was due to more The british taking holidays on the Continent than Continentals taking holidays *chez nous*. The only trade category in which the UK had a surplus with the Eurozone was in income. What that means is that UK revenues (in the form of dividends, interest and fees) from its companies' investments in the Eurozone exceeded the revenues of Eurozone companies from their investments in the UK.

The Eurozone was also in substantial

surplus with its second biggest customer, the USA, especially in trade-in-goods. It is worth noting that the USA, despite not being an EU country, not having a free trade agreement with the EU (and therefore having to export to the EU over a tariff barrier) exports almost as much to the EU as does the UK, which enjoys - if that's the word - the wondrous benefits of being part of the EU customs union/single market.

The statistics are from the Eurozone's central bank*. They highlight the powerful leverage that the UK

possesses in any renegotiation of its relationship with the EU. Even the Eurocrats won't be stupid enough to mess around with their single biggest customer - with which, to cap it all, they happen to be in massive surplus, especially in trade-in-goods.

*In an article in the February 2005 *ECB Monthly Bulletin*: "Euro Area Balance of Payments and International Investment Position vis-à-vis Main Counterparts"; www.ecb.int

Common Foreign and Security Policy: the EU juggernaut rolls on

The Secretary of State is acquiring new powers to override Parliament completely for the sake of the EU's foreign policy

By Helen Szamuely

Resistance to European political integration understandably focuses on the European Constitution. It is consequently easy to lose sight of the fact that European political integration is proceeding on a variety of fronts, and that this trend is likely to continue even if the Constitution is defeated.

For that reason there are aspects to the European Union Bill, which recently completed its second reading in the House of Commons, that deserve more attention than they have received. For instance, there has been very little discussion of Part 2 which deals with the Common Foreign and Security Policy.

Extra Legislation

Foreign Secretary Jack Straw has explained correctly that the common foreign and security policy is not something that was invented for the purposes of the Constitution. It was an integral part of the project from the beginning but was abandoned because of its unpopularity.

The process of formulating a common foreign and security policy or, at least, the structures of it, as the content still eludes our great statesmen, began with the Treaty of Maastricht and proceeded with every subsequent treaty.

To a great extent the concept will be finalized in the Constitution but, clearly, it was felt necessary to introduce extra legislation to deal with the subject.

Section 5 is entitled "Implementation of common foreign and security policy" and tells us that;

"(1) The Secretary of State may by regulations make provision for one or more of the following purposes -

a) Implementing an obligation of the United Kingdom created and arising by or under the common foreign policy provisions or a related agreement, or

enabling such an obligation to be implemented;

b) Enabling the exercise of rights enjoyed or to be enjoyed by the United Kingdom under or by virtue of those provisions or such an agreement;

c) Dealing with matters arising out of, or related to, such an obligation or such rights.

(2) The powers conferred by this section include power to amend enactments or subordinate legislation."

The section goes on to deal with the creation of summary new offences and the methods whereby the Secretary of State may make regulations. These are our old friends the Orders in Councils, otherwise known as Negative Statutory Instruments.

Virtual Impossibility

Negative SIs are published by order of the relevant Secretary of State and placed before each House, where they lie for 40 days unless somebody manages to initiate a debate and win it to reverse the Order.

This process is virtually impossible in the House of Commons, where even if such a motion is passed the Instrument goes to the relevant Standing Committee, where it is dealt with summarily, committees being filled in proportion to the number of MPs each party has in the House.

In the Lords there is a possibility of praying against an Order and debates do happen. They rarely lead to anything. There have even been occasions when the government lied quite blatantly, saying that one House annulling an Order was inadequate and, therefore, the vote was ignored.

In certain cases, as provided in the relevant section of the European Union Bill, the Secretary of State can avoid the distinctly non-onerous procedure altogether, if he can insert a "declaration ... that the urgency of the

matter makes it necessary for the regulation to be made without [Parliamentary] approval".

Extraordinary Structure

The argument here would be that there are certain occasions, for example, an attack on the country when the government has to act fast and cannot wait for 40 days. In fact, this is a little disingenuous. There is nothing in the rules that prevents the government to implement the Order in Council, while it is still before the two Houses. It's just that someone might try to annul it.

But the more important point is that this extraordinary structure is being put into place in order to implement obligations arising out of the common foreign policy or related agreements. In other words, the Secretary of State is acquiring powers to override Parliament completely for the sake of the EU's foreign policy. One wonders whether the United States Congress would ever pass a law like that.

When one turns to the explanatory notes to the Bill, one finds that related agreements may well refer to;

"... treaties entered into by the UK or the EU on the basis of the CFSP provisions of the Constitutional Treaty."

It is also worth remembering that Article I-41 of the Constitution for Europe, which deals with specific provisions relating to the common security and defence policy starts with the following sub-section:

"The common security and defence policy shall be an integral part of the common foreign and security policy. It shall provide the Union with an operational capacity drawing on civil and military assets. The Union may use them on missions outside the Union for peace-keeping, conflict prevention and

Continued on P.4

Who needs the EU?

The table highlights the problems of the Continental EU. Of Europe's top ten companies by market capitalisation, five-and-a-half are British (counting Shell as 50/50 British/Dutch); two are Swiss and two are French. Amazingly, not a single German company figures in Europe's top ten, despite Germany being Europe's biggest economy. Looking at it another way, 60 per cent of the combined market capitalisation of the top ten companies is British (again, counting Shell as half British).

Top Ten European Companies by Market Capitalisation

Country	Rank	Company	Market Cap. \$ bn
UK	1	BP	231.8
UK/NL	2	Shell	221.9
UK	3	HSBC	187.0
UK	4	Vodafone	170.2
F	5	Total	151.1
UK	6	GlaxoSmithKline	140.4
CH	7	Novartis	134.3
F	8	Sanofi	113.1
CH	9	Nestlé	112.4
UK	10	Royal Bank of Sc.	107.9

Source: *Financial Times*, 8.3.05. Mkt Cap @ 28.2.05

A little something Tony forgot to mention

The head of NATO has suggested that the EU's battle groups could be used for going to war.

In an interview with *El Pais* on 10 March, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer indicated he did not believe that the battle groups - the first of which are due to be operational in 2007 - would

only be used for peacekeeping, as EU officials suggest.

"Why is the EU creating battle groups? It is not just to help rebuild a country".

"It may be, that to keep the peace, combat is necessary. If the EU creates battlegroups and NATO a rapid-

reaction force, I would say we shouldn't think the EU is for soft power and NATO for tough power", said Mr de Hoop Scheffer.

According to EU plans, the 13 battle groups will contain 1,500 soldiers each and are to be mobilised within 10 days to trouble spots around the world.

No one can spin it like Denis!

All the founding members of the great kingdoms of the United Kingdom were fine Europeans ... it is for the Government of the day to take a lead on this issue. No sensible British citizen, business or voluntary

organisation that reads this short but powerfully written [EU constitutional] treaty will want to do anything other than endorse it wholeheartedly.

Denis MacShane, the Minister for

Europe, speaking in the House of Commons on 1st March. As the NO Campaign was quick to point out, complete with with declarations and protocols, the treaty is 731 pages long.

Continued from p.3

Foreign policy: the juggernaut rolls on

strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. The performance of these tasks shall be undertaken using capabilities provided by the Member States."

There is plenty more in the Article about the various obligations, none of

which will have to be debated in Parliament if the European Union Bill becomes law.

Nor is it quite clear whether anything will be different if the referendum votes the Constitution out, as a great many of the provisions of the common foreign and security policy have been

agreed on outside its framework. More can be agreed on during jolly ministerial meetings, if necessary.

Whatever the fate of the EU Constitution, the process of European political integration is likely to continue.

Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad...

At first your correspondent thought April Fools' Day had arrived early. An op-ed article in *Figaro* on 3rd March 2005 proposed that the EU should have its own single language. Not French; not English; not Estonian. No, the big idea is: Latin.

The article's author, Jean-Philippe Vincent, is a graduate of ENA, the prestigious (and much-loathed in France) post-graduate college which prepares the brightest French intellectuals for careers in government. He's also director of studies at the equally prestigious Institut d'Etudes Politiques in Paris. It must be assumed that he's serious.

He's obviously pessimistic about the future of the EU. "*Our Europe is a 'virtual' continent, because we don't have a single language.....Europe's linguistic cacophony risks becoming unmanageable.*" So far so good. "*There's no question of choosing as the EU's single language the national*

language of a member state." Even when, in practice, the EU already possesses a single language: English? Apparently not: M. Vincent has managed the impressive feat of writing his whole article without once mentioning the sole global lingua franca, English. At this point, doubt crept into your correspondent's mind as to whether M. Vincent was inhabiting the same planet as the rest of us.

Two Candidates

There are, he says, only two possible candidates for a single European language: Ancient Greek and Latin. He dismisses the first because its alphabet is different from all EU countries' alphabets (except of course the modern Greek). So that leaves Latin.

He argues that dead languages can be revived, citing the example of Hebrew. He recognises that the Latin taught in

EU high schools is of the difficult recondite literary form. No matter, he says: we'll just have to teach a demotic form, the sort you might find in graffiti at Pompeii. M. Vincent seems to have forgotten that all EU educational establishments have spent the last half century downgrading Latin to make room for more "modern", trendier subjects - including English, the passport on the Continent to even lower-management jobs.

On the face of it, making the citizens of 'Europe' speak and write a single language, Latin, seems to be completely absurd. But then making them use a single currency, the euro, was (and still is) an absurd idea, as are many of the projects which leave the EU drawing board. One must never underestimate the ability of europhiles to do precisely the wrong thing in pursuit of their utopia.

Illegal immigrants: Spanish amnesty attracts thousands

During the first 16 days of Spain's amnesty for illegal immigrants, 48,287 applied for the rights of residency, the Spanish work and social affairs minister Jesus Caldera has announced. Mr Caldera said he expects 255,000 candidates for amnesty if the applications continue at the same pace until the amnesty ends on 7th May. At least 800,000 immigrants work illegally in Spain.

British ministers have not commented on the Spanish amnesty but officials in Germany and Holland have expressed anger at the move - which is perfectly legal under existing EU treaties - because they fear that the immigrants will use the opportunity to live and work in the EU country of their choice.

EU spokesmen have responded to

their concern by suggesting the creation of an early warning system which would require countries contemplating an amnesty for illegal immigrants to alert other EU members of their intentions.

The Commission has no rights in the area of legal immigration and a spokesperson for the Commission said that member states "should be able to decide how many legal immigrants they want - but if they decide to bring in immigrants...then we are suggesting that this could be better done in a harmonised way". He added that Brussels remained in favour of "a comprehensive legal immigration strategy". (*euobserver* 24th February)

Explaining the reasons for his decision to the Spanish parliament on 24th February, the Spanish Prime

Minister José Rodríguez Zapatero said that the amnesty was "a preventive measure because a controlled immigration detracts from illegal immigration".

euofacts does not grasp the logic of Mr Zapatero's argument: an amnesty may well have the opposite effect of increasing the flow of illegal immigrants since those contemplating entering a country to work illegally may conclude that it will only be a matter of time before their position is normalised through a further amnesty. Both Italy and Belgium have granted amnesties in recent years - but neither could claim that such moves have staunched the inflow of illegal workers.

LETTERS

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

The BBC's Mindset

Dear Sir,

C. Francis Warren (letter, 25th February) comments on a fixed mindset of the BBC which assumes that the EU is above criticism.

In this context it is relevant to note a quotation in the *Scotsman* of 25th February from Jesse Cleverly of the BBC's children's drama department concerning Robert Louis Stevenson's *Kidnapped*, a boy's adventure story set in the Scottish Highlands in the 18th Century.

The BBC's adaptation of the story featuring an all-star cast appears in a prime time family viewing slot and is aimed at 8-12 year olds.

According to Mr Cleverly, *Kidnapped* "...is a metaphor for modern Europe. This is a huge issue for us in Europe...What makes individual countries idiosyncratic and wonderful, and how do you balance that with the advantages or being part of a more homogenous administrative whole?"

Clearly the mindset extends beyond adult programmes.

MARY ROLLS
Dumfriesshire

Can we Expect Honesty?

Dear Sir,

To be a fair referendum question, as Sam Younger, Chairman of the

Electoral Commission knows, it has to contain the kernel of the issues at stake. That condition would be met if the question to be put to all those eligible to vote were to be:

"Do you wish to replace our existing Constitution with the proposed Constitution for the European Union?"

This would make it crystal clear to all just what it is they are voting for.

Can we expect such honest and transparency from our present administration?

BILL WOODHOUSE
Dorset

The Importance of Words

Dear Sir,

Everyone knew about the 'yea factor' yet we decided to call our campaign to keep democracy alive 'Vote-no'. After the wording for the question is published we start throwing up our arms because the question requires a yes or no answer! We cannot afford to make these basic mistakes; we should post a notice above our desks saying 'It's all about words - stupid'. We could have called our campaign 'SOS Democracy'.

JULIAN WILLIAMS
Pembrokeshire

Phoney Resistance?

Dear Sir,

Just as there are days that are good for

burying bad news, it can be convenient to introduce controversial legislation during urgent crises that may occur by accident or design. I contend that this was the case underlying the government's panic requirement to introduce their recent anti-terror bill.

Since the introduction of the European Arrest Warrant, first Blunkett and now Clarke have been stealthily introducing the European corpus juris system of justice and it may have been decided that this was the ideal opportunity to make a more direct assault on our system of Common British law with its pillars of habeus corpus, trial by jury and presumption of innocence.

The media depicted this legislation as an irresistible force (Government) meeting an immovable object (Tory and Lib Dem) with the help of the House of Lords. After much high drama all was suddenly resolved at the eleventh hour. They all announced that they were victorious and congratulated themselves! They had run a bulldozer through hundreds of years of history and the basis of much of the system of law of the free world.

Was the resistance by the Tories/Lib dems just a ploy?

JOHN HORROCKS
Devon

What would De Gaulle have thought of the Constitution?

"This outstanding role in the midst of the [1940-45] storm is owed not only to your profound national qualities but also to the value of your institutions.....With self-assurance, almost without being aware of it, you operate in freedom a secure, stable political system. So strong are your traditions and loyalties in the political field that your government is quite

naturally endowed with cohesion and permanence; that your parliament has, throughout each term of office, an assured majority; that this government and this majority are permanently in harmony; in short, that your executive and legislative powers are balanced and work together.....

Thus, lacking meticulously worked-out constitutional texts, but by virtue

of unchallengeable general consent, you find the means, on each occasion, to ensure the efficient functioning of democracy....."

General de Gaulle, addressing the combined Houses of Parliament, Westminster Hall, 7th April 1960 (bolding added).

Of course, we hadn't joined the Common Market then.

MEETINGS

**United Kingdom
Independence Party**
01962-711112

Friday **1st April 2005**, 7.30 pm

“Don’t be FOOLED by the EU!”

Dr David Abbot, *UKIP PPC for
Winchester*
Nigel Farage MEP

(Questions and Answers)

PUBLIC MEETING
(April Fools Day)
Guildhall, Broadway, Winchester
Admission Free

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

**Democracy Movement
Southeast Sussex Branch**
01424-848964

Tuesday **5th April 2005**, 7.30 pm

Roger Helmer MEP, *Conservative*
Bryan Smalley, *Former submarine
Commander, independent analyst and
writer.*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Manor Barn, Junction of Upper Sea
Road with De la Warr Road, Old Town,
Bexhill-on-Sea, East Sussex
Admission Free

Institute of Economic Affairs
020-7799 8900

Wednesday **6th April 2005**, 6.30 pm

“Does the Government Intend to Rig the
Referendum?”

Gerald Frost, *Editor of eurofacts,
journalist*

EVENING TALK
2 Lord North Street, Westminster,
London
Admission Free

**United Kingdom
Independence Party**
01243-604186

Thursday **7th April 2005**, 7.30 pm

“We Want our Country Back”

Douglas Denny, *UKIP PPC for
Chichester*
Nigel Farage MEP

(Questions and Answers)

PUBLIC MEETING
The Assembly Rooms, North Street,
Chichester, Essex
Admission Free

**Democracy Movement and
Campaign against Euro-Federalism**
020-8340 0314

Saturday **9th April 2005**
10.00 am - 5.00 pm

“No! to the EU Constitution”

Bill Cash MP
John Cryer MP
Bob Crow
Damian Hockney
Brian Denny
Ulla Klotzer
Majbrit Berlau
Neil Herron
Jens-Peter Bonde MEP
Thomas Rupp

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London
WC1
(nearest tube Holborn)
Admission Free

**UKIP Cities of London and
Westminster Association**

Thursday **14th April 2005**, 12.30 am

“EU Membership - A Cost Too Far?”

Ian Milne, *Chairman, eurofacts,
Director, Global Britain and autho of
“A Cost Too Far?”, former merchant
banker*

PUBLIC MEETING
St Olave’s Church Hall, Mark Lane,
London EC3
(close to Fenchurch Street Station)
Admission Free

**Campaign for an Independent
Britain**
020-8340 0314

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

“Vote No to the European Constitution”

John Cryer MP
Nigel Farage MEP
Daniel Hannan MEP

PUBLIC MEETING
The Emmanuel Centre, 9-13 Marsham
Street, London SW1P 3DW
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Wednesday **6th April 2005**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Energy
Efficiency* from Mr Steve Nancarrow,
Managing Director, Inspector Homes; Mr
Nick Gooderson, Head of Standards and
Qualifications, CITB Construction Skills;
Mrs Lindsay Gilesie, Development
Director, Summit Skills.

Wednesday **6th April 2005**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard by the
Constitution Committee from witnesses to
be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005
French referendum **29th May**
on European Constitution

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 Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union
by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£11.99**

A comprehensive history of the European Union project. In paperback.

The European Constitution In Perspective
by British Management Data Foundation. **£27.50**

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

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.

The Freedom Audit

by The Freedom Association. **£3.00**
Details the extent of the Government's assault on fundamental freedoms and the democratic system.

Voting on the Constitution: What Britain should know about the consequences
by Daniel Hannan. **£7.00**

The implications of a British 'No' vote on the proposed European Constitution.

The ECB and the Euro: The First Five Years
by Otmar Issing. **£10.00**

Provides an upbeat assessment of the euro by a member of the ECB.

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.

A Guide to the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe
by Stuart Sexton. **£5.00**

A layman's guide explains the essentials of the Treaty in simple language.

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)
20% for Europe 30% Rest of World

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-1@globalbritain.org
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



9 771 361 413006