

Oui or non: the creation of the European state will go on

Eurosceptic goals are most likely to be served if British voters are not prevented from having a say in their own political destiny

Will the eurosceptic cause be best served by a yes or by a no vote in the French referendum on the European Constitution on 29th May? To some the answer is obvious: the French are co-architects of the European project, and Giscard d'Estaing, the author of the constitutional text is not merely a senior French political leader but one who exemplifies the values of a political class that has made the creation of a unitary European state its most urgent task. It follows, or would seem to follow, that a French *non* would be far more damaging to the European cause than a British no, and should therefore be warmly welcomed.

However, the matter is a little more complicated than that. It is already clear that a French non will not mean a return to the political drawing board. There is no Plan 'B' 'C' or 'D', and no intention to provide one. Work to achieve a number of the objectives set out in the Treaty document - for example the creation of an EU diplomatic service and the creation of the European Defence Agency - have begun ahead of ratification and will continue; other federalist objectives are proceeding outside the framework of the treaty document. Inevitably, it will be hard to stifle a degree of pleasure in observing the discomfiture of the French political elite, but the almost certain consequence of a no vote will be the continuation of federalism by other means. A second French referendum is just thinkable in the event of a wafer-thin victory for the

French no camp; much more likely is the private resolve of political leaders in France (and elsewhere) never to allow the electorate a say in such an important matter. Jacques Chirac, like Tony Blair, was extremely reluctant to call a referendum; he is very unlikely to risk making the same mistake twice.

Nor would a French non represent a victory for forces identical to those that would celebrate a British rejection of the treaty. Some French opponents of the Constitution believe that it does not go far enough or even that it represents a victory for the political and economic values of the hated anglo-saxons; some are simply expressing their dissatisfaction with the French president or the dismal performance of the French economy. More generally, as Daniel Hannan has suggested, there is widespread hatred of the entire French political class which is viewed much as if it were an occupying power; disaffection with politics in Britain has not gone quite that far.

Heavy Odds

However, the biggest reason for not cracking open the champagne is that a French non would in all probability deny the British an opportunity to express their views on the on-going process of political integration. The Irish, Portuguese and Dutch governments have insisted that referendums will take place in their countries whatever happens elsewhere. But it seems inconceivable that our lame-duck Prime Minister would stick

to his promises to disregard the results in other EU countries and proceed with a plebiscite in 2006 with the odds so heavily stacked against him.

The British Prime Minister sounded distinctly less than enthusiastic about a referendum than formerly when he was quizzed on the subject on *Breakfast with Frost* on 1st May. Asked whether a French no would mean the end of the constitution, he replied: "I honestly don't know. My feeling is that people will try to find a way round. Whether it is possible to find a way round it, I don't know."

Britain's EU allies no doubt want Tony Blair to find "some way round it" - i.e. to find a way of salvaging the treaty in some form during the British presidency starting in July, no doubt fearing that the credibility of the EU will be left in tatters if he fails. That is the last thing that eurosceptics will want him to do.

If, however, the French vote yes on 29th May, a British referendum seems likely even if the Netherlands votes against two days later, on 1st June.

It is about time that the British were allowed a say in their political destiny. Substitute the word "Britain" for "England" and the following lines from Chesterton seem apt:

It may be we are meant to mark with our riot and our rest

God's scorn for all men governing. It may be beer is best.

But we are the people of England; and we have not spoken yet

Smile at us, pay us, pass us. But do not quite forget.

Gender equality directive could damage elderly, sick and poor

We have already pointed to some of the absurd consequences of the EU directive to outlaw discrimination between men and women in the pricing of insurance*. One of these is that young women will be forced to pay the same premiums as young males for motoring insurance - despite the fact that statistics show that the latter are more likely to have accidents.

It is now clear that the consequences are likely to be more profound than we realised, not least in terms of the impact on health and pension provision, as a penetrating article by Paul MacDonnell in the March issue of *Economic Affairs*, the journal of the Institute of Economic Affairs, makes clear.

The dangers arise, says Mr MacDonnell because Europe's problems in the area of healthcare and pensions are so daunting that the only way in which individuals will be able to save for retirement and healthcare will be through private saving and by purchasing private health care. But the impact of the directive, one of the first in a series of expected attacks on private insurance, will be to introduce the problems of the failed state sector into the private sector.

Given the scale of the disaster in state pensions and the looming crisis in state healthcare the Commission's interest in outlawing gender could be described as irrational and feckless, he says. Viewed from the perspective of public choice economics it can be seen that the move confers considerable powers to the Commission and to regulators.

But far from helping private insurance to take the strain from state systems the directive is likely to import problems from the public sector.

The aim is to achieve wealth distribution, but in many cases the outcome will be the opposite of that intended by transferring wealth from the poor to rich. For example, young men considering starting a family, already in the sole low-income breadwinner category will be asked to pay higher pension contributions so that relatively middle-class women can lower their premiums below what the market would charge them. These men will be less able to afford a pension than before.

Public Confidence

Mr MacDonnell concludes: "I believe that if it is successful in outlawing the use of gender in insurance premiums, the Commission will follow up with other measures such as a provision to outlaw the use of age. The gender directive and any subsequent proposal outlawing the use of age will undermine public confidence in private insurance and destroy what may be the only way of paying for its old age and healthcare: private savings and investment."

The reasoning behind the Commission's proposals to abolish gender as a factor in calculating insurance premiums is both interesting - and fallacious.

In the main this depends on the assertion that no one can prove exactly why gender causes certain outcomes.

This tends to make the spotlight on gender more arbitrary and is followed by the suggestion that gender is really a 'proxy' for other factors such as 'lifestyle,' 'social class' or 'the environment'.

But, as Mr MacDonnell points out, actuaries do not assume a causal relation between gender and certain outcomes when calculating premiums; they merely establish a correlation based on experience.

"The truth is that by the highly permissive logic of confusing cause with correlation any factor can be held to be a proxy for any other", he says. The consequence of the Commission's initiative is clear: it is to make the insurance industry less efficient, to drive up premiums and, if taken further, to encourage those looking for insurance to shop outside the EU for their cover.

As in so many other areas, the EU bureaucracies appear to be at war with reality. Part of the explanation lies in the pervasive creed of political correctness, but Mr MacDonnell is surely right to suggest a more fundamental cause is the pursuit of economic and political self-interest by an elite whose privileged access to health and pension provision isolates them from the consequences of their ill-conceived actions.

**Proposal for a Council Directive implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services, EU Commission 2003.*

Germany: eighty per cent of laws EU-made

A research report by the German opposition CSU has found that of 23,167 laws and regulations passed by the Bundestag between 1998 and 2004, roughly 19,000, or just over 80 per cent, come from the EU.

How to define 'a European'

"One cannot be a European and vote 'no,'" Jacques Chirac, the French President, taking part in a televised debate on the Constitution on 2nd May.

More evidence that the Government has tried to fix the referendum

When genuinely neutral questions are put to voters the evidence suggests that opposition to the Constitution is still growing

Further evidence that the apparent upsurge in public support for the Constitution reported earlier this year was entirely due to the manipulation of the media by the Government (see *eurofacts* for 11th and 25th February and 11th March), is provided by a new survey of opinion from MORI.

Until January of this year surveys regularly showed that the number of those opposed to the Constitution was almost double the number of those in favour. But following the publication of the European Union Bill (which contains the question that the Government actually intends to put to voters) on 26th January, most pollsters adopted the Government's wording.

This misstates the terms of the constitutional treaty in order to give the impression that its purpose is to control the institutions of the EU, exploits the so-called 'yea-saying factor', and rather gives the impression that Europe is a remote entity whose constitution will not impact on British laws and constitution. As one *eurofacts* reader pointed out, the difference between the Government's chosen wording and a genuinely neutral question is rather like the difference between the following questions: "Do you approve of the wedding of Prince Charles to

Mrs Parker Bowles?" and "Would you like to be married to Mrs Parker Bowles?"

Once the Government question was put there was a dramatic overnight change in the poll findings with opposition and support for the Constitution apparently divided equally.

However, the latest MORI survey - in which members of the public were asked to say which of a number of possible responses best described their attitude to the constitution - demonstrates that, if anything, opposition to the constitution is even greater than it was six months ago (*Observer* 3rd May.) It shows that 63 per cent are opposed and 29 per cent in favour of the constitution (of whom only nine per cent say that they strongly support it).

eurofacts would like to acknowledge the support of those readers who wrote to the Electoral Commission to back our complaint that this public watchdog should not have endorsed such an obviously biased Government question, especially as this appears to violate the Commission's own guidelines.

Readers who did so met with the same response - the Commission failed

to answer the specific criticisms which were raised and simply replied by sending copies of its Assessment and Guidelines. When one reader had the temerity to write a second letter pointing out that the question which it had endorsed violated the Commission's stated principles he was grandly informed by Sam Younger, the Commission chairman that these did not amount to "rigid criteria" and that the Commission's task was to assess the question "in the round".

The Commission's behaviour strongly suggests that when confronted with informed criticism it is incapable of defending itself and that it is also incapable of standing up to the Government, whether on the referendum, postal voting, or, for that matter, any issue relating to the integrity of the democratic system.

Fortunately, the European Union Bill did not complete its passage through parliament prior to general election; it will now be reintroduced. We suggest that readers who feel as strongly about this matter as we do should raise the issue with their MPs while linking their complaints to a protest about the supine conduct of the Electoral Commission.

One in four young people unemployed

Euro-zone seasonally-adjusted unemployment stood at 8.9% in March 2005, compared to 8.8% in February, reports Eurostat, the Statistical Office of the European Communities. It was 8.8% in March 2004. The EU25 unemployment rate was 8.9% in March 2005, unchanged compared to February. It was 9.0% in March 2004.

In March 2005, the lowest rates were registered in Ireland (4.3%), Luxembourg (4.5%), Austria (4.6%),

the United Kingdom (4.7% in January) and Denmark (4.9% in February). Unemployment rates were highest in Poland (18.1%), Slovakia (15.9%), Greece (10.2% in December 2004) and Spain (10.2%).

In March 2005, the unemployment rate for under-25s was 19.2% in the euro-zone and 19.1% in the EU25. In March 2004 it was 18.2% and 18.9% respectively. The lowest rates for under-25s were observed in Denmark (7.1% in February), Ireland (8.0%) and

the Netherlands (9.1% in February) and the highest in Poland (36.4%), Slovakia (27.6%), Greece (26.2% in December 2004) and Italy (24.0% in December 2004).

Eurostat estimates that, in March 2005, 12.8 million men and women were unemployed in the euro-zone and 19.1 million in the EU25.

In March 2005, the US unemployment rate was 5.2% and the Japanese rate was 4.5%.

Britain and the European Union: three possible futures

By Ian Milne

All three of the authors of this beautifully-produced book have long track-records in carrying out and publishing meticulous and rigorous research on the economics of the relationship between the UK and the EU. Their latest effort, *Alternative Futures*, builds on their previous work and is an exemplary fact-based analysis of where we in the UK are today, where the rest of the EU is and what we in the UK should do about it.

The first part of the book reviews the historical cost of the UK's EU membership, covering trade, the CAP, the EU budget, the Single Market, the CFP, the cost of ERM membership and - most important of all - the loss of democratic self-government. "The UK's membership of the EU to date has proved extremely damaging" conclude the authors, "both economically and politically these costs are not simply a one-off payment borne in the past; they exert an annual burden that will continue indefinitely".

The authors demonstrate conclusively that there is no theoretical or empirical foundation to the various claims trotted out by ministers and others to the effect that the UK "couldn't afford to leave the EU". On the wondrous "benefits" we are alleged to enjoy from the Single Market, the authors have this to say: "Why have British exports to the EU been growing more slowly than to the rest of the world? Why did the UK incur a cumulative current account deficit of £64 billion with the EU between 1992 (the inception of the Single Market) and 1997, whilst achieving an aggregate surplus with the rest of the world over the same period? Such trends imply that any benefits from the Single Market would hardly compensate for the costs of EU membership".

The second part diagnoses the design faults of the Single Currency - which,

Britain and the European Union: Alternative Futures

By Mark Baimbridge, Brian Burkitt & Philip Whyman

Campaign for an Independent Britain,

April 2005 Paperback 140 pp
Available from *The June Press*

Price £7.50 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 0-9519642-5-9

lest it be forgotten, it is still government policy to join as soon as they can safely swing it. How ironic that, over six years after its creation, economic commentators throughout the euro-zone, particularly in France and Germany, are now - with a growing sense of despair - concluding that the euro's a bad idea. Too late: they should have heeded the warnings the authors and others were delivering over a decade ago.

The core of Baimbridge, Burkitt and Whyman's book is the chapter on "Alternative relationships between Britain and the EU". They consider the option of the status quo, in which the UK tries to fend off the effects of the more lunatic policies thought up by "Brussels" and its "partners", but find it unattractive long-term, even if British politicians might find it convenient short-term. Next, the authors look at the Conservative Party's current stance on the EU: "renegotiation" of certain bits of the treaties. They conclude, unsurprisingly, that "implicit to the renegotiation approach is the achievement of a compromise, that, inevitably, means that Britain will not secure all its preferred objectives" A variant on the renegotiation scenario, also examined

by the authors, is the idea put forward by Bill Cash MP: the creation of an Associated European Area (AEA), which would involve "changing the EU rules" to favour a multi-speed Europe in which countries that wanted to go the full federal hog would do so, while others would opt-out of, say, the euro, the single army and the *acquis communautaire*.

The authors then examine options for the UK following complete withdrawal from the EU - essentially the so-called Norwegian and Swiss Options. The Norwegian one involves the UK re-joining EFTA and putting up with quite a lot of the *acquis*, while the Swiss one involves a much more arms-length, *à la carte* deal via sectoral bilateral agreements. The Swiss precedent indicates that the UK post-withdrawal could negotiate agreements with the rump-EU in whichever areas it chose.

Finally, the authors contemplate an "independent global Britain" in which the UK sets its own path in the world economy. They consider the attractions of joining NAFTA, of developing Commonwealth trade and of re-joining an EFTA revitalised by other former EU members (from amongst the accession countries for example) which might decide to join the UK in the rush for the exit.

It won't happen (yet), but the top 50 Foreign Office mandarins should be locked up for a weekend, each with a copy of this book, then examined on its contents by, say, Jeremy Paxman and John Humphrys. Those who failed would be fired. The case the authors make is so clear, so straightforward, so incontrovertible that the indicated action is inescapable. Readers of *euro-facts* got there long ago; now it's time for what is sometimes amusingly called the "British elite" to make the same journey.

UK Government Projections for Taxes and Spending

Gordon Brown, in delivering his two most recent budgets on 16th March 2004 and 16th March 2005, issued projections of government expenditure and taxes to be raised in the following tax years. As a guide to readers, *eurofacts* publishes below a comparison of those two sets of projections.

UK Government Expenditure in £ bn: Projection			
	2004/5	2005/6	Difference
Social Spending	138	146	+6%
NHS	81	90	+11%
Education	63	68	+8%
Law & Order	29	31	+7%
Defence	27	28	+4%
Debt Interest	25	26	+4%
Other social services	22	23	+5%
Industry, agr. & employment	20	20	-
Housing & environment	17	16	(6%)
Transport	16	20	+25%
Other (inc. transfers to EU)	49	49	-
TOTALS	488	519	+6%

UK Government Taxes to be Raised in £ bn: Projections			
	2004/5	2005/6	Difference
Income Tax	128	138	+8%
National Insurance	78	83	+6%
VAT	73	76	+4%
Excise Duties	40	41	+2%
Corporation Taxes	35	44	+26%
Council Tax	20	21	+5%
Business Rates	19	19	-
Other ¹	62	65	+5%
Totals	455	487	+7%
Excess of Exp over. Tax	33	32	
¹ inc. capital & stamp duties, vehicle excise duties			

Note that Debt Interest is costing us almost as much as the entire Defence Budget; and that spending on Transport is projected to go up by 25 per cent.

Source: *Summary Leaflets, Budget 2004 and 2005, HM Treasury, www.hm-treasury.gov.uk*

No policy area outside Brussels' control

'From the business point of view, there is hardly any important policy area outside the control of Brussels,' Sir Digby Jones, Director General CBI in his pamphlet, *UK Parliamentary Scrutiny of EU legislation*, published by the Foreign Policy Centre on 4th April 2005.

LETTERS

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

Back not Forward

Dear Sir,

What would you like the government to spend your taxes on?

More urgently needed money for the NHS to cut waiting lists or to tackle the MRSA killer bug, mental health care in the community or drug rehabilitation?

Maybe education, more teachers, smaller classes, more equipment or improved school meals?

More police on the streets to tackle rising crime in our communities instead of sitting behind desks doing endless paperwork?

More affordable housing for young people to rent or buy so they can at least have the hope of an independent future?

Maybe defence is where you would like your taxes spent or improved roads or public transport ,especially in rural areas?

Increased pensions or improved care for the elderly who were today's young generation once?

The list is endless and we all have our own views on where we would like our taxes spent. However would it be a shock to learn that this government spend 1.3 million pounds AN HOUR 365 days a year of UK taxpayers' money subsidizing people and projects in 24 European countries through its costly membership of the European Union?

Staggering isn't it?

How the British government could use that money to benefit the people of the UK!

Surely it is time to go BACK to being an independent nation and not FORWARD into a United States of

Europe?
Mrs JOSEPHINE ALLEN
Norwich

Hurrah for the Cowgills!

Dear Sir,

From the tone of William Hall's letter (*eurofacts* 15th April), I must assume that he was reading the UK Government's tardy publication of the draft EU "Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe".

He should have bought the "Analysis and Review" of the Treaty published promptly by Anthony and Andrew Cowgill of the British Management Data Foundation (at half the cost of the Government's version) and followed that with "The Essential Guide to the European Union" by Ruth Lea of the Centre for Policy Studies.

There are none better than the Cowgills and Ruth Lea at making complex matters intelligible even to this non-academic octogenarian and, come the referendum, I shall confidently vote NO.

GLORIA HOBDDAY
Kent

Campaign Tool

Dear Sir,

William Hall is absolutely right that when debating the EU constitution treaty, we need succinct ripostes (*eurofacts*, letters 15th April). Sexton's Guide (see back page) provides just such an approach.

By all means start reading the 500 pages of the treaty text, but you need to get no further than Article 1 - 6. This clearly states for the first time that law defined by the Union overrides national law. In other words, Westminster can no longer make law binding in Britain! Surely this is

fundamental! Do we really want this absolute transfer of power from Westminster to the EU? And pay £bns for it!

I should be interested to hear of other counterstrokes that people find effective.

ROBYN GRANT
Surrey

FO's version of the Treaty

Dear Sir,

Last year I obtained a free copy of the EU Constitution from the European Parliament in London. I phoned again earlier this year and was told that no more copies were available. I asked whether more copies could be ordered but was told that only the Government could request this. I then wrote to the Prime Minister and my letter was forwarded to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office which informed me that copies of the Constitution could be obtained from its offices.

This version of the Constitution contains a 'Commentary' produced by the FO in consultation with other government departments. This is supposed to be an analysis of the Treaty, explaining its significance. The original copy of the Treaty does not make easy reading, but this version is worse, and my advice would be to ignore the 'Commentary' and just read the actual Treaty. My worry is that most of the proposals in this document are being introduced into our legislation piece by piece, without most people being aware of it, so that if we get a referendum on the Treaty, the 'Yes brigade' will be able to say 'we already do all these things, so there is nothing new to object to!'

PATRICIA ROOD
Somerset

And another reason for rejecting the constitution

"Will rejecting the constitution enable me, as Europe's trade commissioner, to deploy Europe's strength better? No it won't. It will weaken me and my role in the world." Peter Mandelson interviewed in *The Washington Times*, 28th April.

MEETINGS

London Swinton Circle

Wednesday **18th May 2005**, 7.00 pm

“The tactics being used to undermine Gibraltar”

Peter Pepper, *Chairman, Falkland Islands Association*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Clarence, 53 Whitehall, Westminster, London SW1

Admission Free

Gresham College

020 7831 0575

Wednesday **25th May 2005** 6.00 pm

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

[During the immediate post-war period, the United States used the promise of Marshall aid to force the countries of Western Europe to take the first steps towards integration. Britain opted out, then spent the subsequent twenty years trying to get in. Once in, she toyed with various plans and made various attempts to be both in and out. This may be a play with a long run.]

Professor Kathleen Burk, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

Right Now

08456 01 32 43

Saturday **28th May 2005**,

10.30 am to 4.00 pm

Philip Claeys MEP

Christopher Gill, *Chairman, Freedom Association*

Ashley Mote MEP

Further details to be announced

ALL DAY CONFERENCE

The Mark Masons Hall, 86 St James's Street, London SW1

Admission by Ticket £45 (Includes refreshments and buffet luncheon)

From Right Now, PO Box 361, 78 Marylebone High Street, London W1U 5AP

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Democracy Campaign

www.britishdemocracycampaign.com

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.poptel.org.uk/against-eurofederalism

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.cibhq.co.uk

Congress for Democracy

congressfordemocracy.org

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

Democratic Nations in Danger

freenations.freeuk.com

EU Referendum

<http://eureferendum.blogspot.com>

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Facts, Figures & Phantasies

www.eufactsfigures.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Freedom UK

www.taylor.co.uk/eu/

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Save Britain's Fish

www.savebritfish.org.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Vote No

www.vote-no.com

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020 7219 3000

Wednesday **18th May 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 on European Constitution **29th May**

Dutch referendum on European Constitution **1st June**

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

Luxembourg referendum on European Constitution **10th July**

ECOFIN meeting **12-13th July**

GAERC meeting **18-19th July**

Danish referendum on European Constitution **27th September**

ECOFIN meeting **11th October**

GAERC meeting **14-15th October**

ECOFIN meeting **8th November**

GAERC meeting **21-22nd November**

Portugal (Possibly) on European Constitution **December**

2006

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

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

**Britain and the European Union:
Alternative Futures**

by Mark Baimbridge, Brian Burkitt and Philip Whyman. **£7.50**

A critical analysis of UK membership, with credible alternative options.

Germany's Four Reichs

by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Idiosyncratic history of Germany by Englishman, El Alamein, Burma, Bletchley (codebreaker).

**The Great Deception:
The Secret History of the
European Union**

by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£12.99**

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.

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 New Case for Europe:

The Crisis in British pro-Europeanism and How to Overcome it
by Roger Liddle. **£6.95**
The strap line tells it all.

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 in simple language the essentials of the Treaty.

CD

EEC Entry Campaign 1970-72

by Independent compiler **£2.00**

Free Educational CD (charge is for handling). Shows how the Heath Government and others tried to deceive the people into supporting entry into the EEC. You will need a pdf reader such as adobe acrobat.

Send Payment to

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

Tel: 08456-120175

Fax: 08456-120176

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	
Veritas	020-7631 3757
Robert Kilroy-Silk MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771 361 413006