

Tory leadership: why a tougher EU line would pay off

Tory activists are far more eurosceptic than Tory MPs - and the leadership contenders would be wise to recognise this fact

The one candidate for the Tory leadership who was prepared to contemplate “the admittedly unlikely” prospect that Britain might withdraw from the EU - Liam Fox - is out of the race. Of the remaining candidates, David Davis’s tone and record suggest that he is somewhat more eurosceptic than David Cameron.

Totemic Significance

The latter, however, has indicated that he would end the alliance between Tory MEPs and the European Peoples’ Party (EPP). This is a matter which is of totemic significance for those Tory eurosceptics who understandably feel that Conservatives should not be in bed politically with the most federalist-minded party in Europe. Mr Cameron, like Mr Davis, also says he would renegotiate aspects of Britain’s relationship with the EU. But in an interview with Alice Thompson and Rachel Sylvester of the *Daily Telegraph* on 22nd October he added: “*This isn’t an in or out question. I don’t think it would ever come down to leaving the EU*”. If one applies the law of marginal virtue one might conclude that, if chosen, Cameron would be a slight improvement on Howard who insisted that a Tory government would never leave the EU. Given Mr Cameron’s admiration for the most europhile Prime Minister since Edward Heath, and his insistence on the need for ‘inclusivity’ there would seem to be little reason to break open the

Bollinger.

The weakness of demanding renegotiation, while giving advance notice that you are not prepared to use the one weapon at your disposal has long been obvious. Those who attempt to do so are likely to be as effective as an armed bank robber who assures those he is holding up that he would never dream of using his gun.

A further weakness in the position of would-be European ‘reformers’ is pointed out in a letter from Anthony Scholefield (Page 6). There is a near consensus among British politicians that Brussels produces too much regulation. Like the Chancellor, Mr Cameron and Mr Davis both subscribe to this view and, if asked, would no doubt promise to do something about it. But, as Mr Scholefield points out, the right to initiate repeals and amendments to existing laws lies solely with the Commission. How then will Mr Cameron and Mr Davis halt or even reduce the on-going flood of regulation? (The really important question has to do with who should pass our laws, not with their volume, but let that pass).

General Inadequacy

We suspect that they are unable to answer this question and their failure in this regard points to a more general inadequacy. It is not just that when it comes to ‘Europe’ Mr Cameron and Mr Davis are light on policy. It is that there is a disturbing lack of serious

analysis of a kind which an earlier generation of Tories made use of and upon which the Tory revival of the 1980s was founded.

Tactical Reasons

We are not hopeful that matters will change. If the Conservative leadership contenders are to be persuaded to adopt a firmer line on ‘Europe’ it is likely to be for tactical reasons. For this reason we would remind them that the constituency that they must now address is very different from the Westminster constituency which has recently passed judgement on them.

We believe that a survey of party members, conducted by the Conservative MEP Geoffrey van Orden during the summer months, probably provides a close approximation of the views of party members generally and that Mr Cameron and Mr Davis would be wise to take account of it. Of those polled:-

- 93% believe that Europe remains an important issue, despite the referendum results for the Constitution in France and Holland
- 91% agree that Britain should renegotiate our EU relationship in the direction of the Common Market we thought we were joining in 1973
- 78% agree that the party should remain strongly eurosceptic
- 77% disagree that “the party

Continued on P. 2

EU sneaks in charter by back door

A further example of the way in which parts of the rejected EU Constitution are being introduced furtively has come to light. On 16th October the *Sunday Telegraph* revealed that a new EU edict - Document COM (2005) 172 - requires that the provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights which formed part of the Constitutional draft must be enshrined in all new legislation. This states: "This document sets out a methodology for ensuring that the charter is properly implemented in commission proposals." New laws proposed by Brussels will be subject to "systematic and rigorous monitoring" in order to ensure compliance.

As readers of *eurofacts* will be aware

the charter permits the right to asylum, potentially handing control of the UK's asylum policy to the EU courts. It also gives the right to strike to police and the armed forces in addition to creating new rights to social security, housing assistance, health care and environmental protection.

A footnote to the eight-page document reiterates the primacy of case law handed down by the European Court of Justice over national law. It accepts that the charter is not legally binding but states: "It contains the fundamental principles which have been held to be binding in case law as general principles of community law".

Despite the fact that the British Government never wanted the

inclusion of the Charter in the constitutional text and despite the fact that the Constitution has been firmly rejected by French and Dutch voters, the Foreign Office appears perfectly happy with fact that the Commission is now cherry picking.

"It is right for the Commission to ensure that anything it does, does not cut across the Charter of Fundamental Rights", said a spokesman. "The charter remains the most recent political declaration by the governments of European Union member countries about the rights of their citizens".

So that's all right, then.

Tax harmonisation: Chancellor inconsistent

Gordon Brown, on page 13 of his pamphlet "Global Europe: full-employment Europe" (see Page 3), says: "Neither the demands of the modern global economy, nor the principles of subsidiarity and political legitimacy can justify harmonisation of tax rates or bases at an EU level".

In reality EU tax harmonisation is

galloping ahead. The European Court of Justice has recently ruled in favour of EU-wide harmonisation of corporate taxes. VAT, an EU tax, has been harmonised as to bands and (almost) to bases for decades. Ditto for taxes on fuel. Customs duties on imports from outside the European Union - taxes - have been rigidly harmonised since

before the UK joined in 1973. Dawn Primarolo, one of Mr Brown's own ministers, has been chairing an EU-wide "Working Group on tax harmonisation" for years.

So what is the point of Mr Brown's assertion that tax harmonisation "cannot be justified"?

Can we have our politics back, please

"People want their politics back. Many citizens in many member states not only increasingly feel they are being forced to give up their national identity, they also feel they have been

robbed of their politics."

Hans Anker, an independent pollster who has extensively researched public opinion on the EU for different Dutch governments, commenting on Plan D -

the EU Commission's latest wheeze for winning public support for the European project.

(Quoted in *EUobserver* on 12th October).

Anyone seen Blair?

"Blair seems to have gone into European hiding. He seemingly has left the stage." Otmar Karas, an Austrian MEP quoted in the *Sunday Times* 23rd October 2005.

Continued from P.1.

Tory contenders: why a tougher line would pay

should stop talking about Europe and concentrate on other issues"

■ 76% disagree that "Britain's relationship with the EU is about right"

■ 69% say we should distance ourselves further from the

European Peoples' Party in the EU parliament, and develop a more autonomous grouping

Mr van Orden is to be congratulated on his initiative in organizing the survey, although it is symptomatic of

the present state of the Conservative Party that the one question he did not pose was:-

"Do you believe Britain should leave the EU?"

The Chancellor: EU membership costs 28 per cent of GDP a year

Very odd, this pamphlet. “*Europe’s in a deep hole and must reform*” is its message. But - inadvertently or deliberately - it’s really a cost-benefit analysis of UK membership of the EU: and Mr Brown’s numbers come out far worse than those of Minford or Milne.

Given the title of his pamphlet, could he have been secretly trawling through the *Global Britain* web-site? His critique of the EU economy certainly echoes that of *Global Britain*, and of course of *eurofacts*. Consider:

- “...Europe’s [he means the EU’s] founders...sought protection for particular aspects of their economies such as agriculture....this...it is estimated....could cost Europe’s consumers up to 7 per cent of GDP” (Page 3)
- “...increasing competition within the euro area to US levels could boost output by over 12 per cent” (Page 13)
- “...the regulatory framework in Europe inhibits the performance of EU economies....better regulation could raise levels of productivity by up to 6 per cent in many EU economies...” (Page 13)
- “...removing the remaining

Global Europe: full-employment Europe

By
the Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP

HM Treasury, October 2005;

available free at
www.hm-treasury.gov.uk

transatlantic barriers could generate one million more jobs....and bring permanent increases in per capita GDP of up to 3 per cent” (Page 15)

Adding up the percentages, that’s an amazing improvement of 28 per cent of GDP, or £326 billion a year in the case of the UK. Might there be a degree of double-counting here? Mr Brown doesn’t say.

The Chancellor’s moving plea for less EU regulation (this, remember, from the man who gave us tax credits) elicited a swift response from the German CDU MEP Thomas Mann. In a letter to the *Financial Times* he posed

the killer question: how can Mr Brown hope to convince the rest of Europe when he can’t even convince his own colleagues? “*Mr Brown*”, writes Herr Mann, “*pleads for less EU regulation: it is his Labour MEPswho are leading the campaign for more. He calls for a new social model: it is his MEPs who are demanding we preserve the old one*”. Good on you, Mann.

Elsewhere in the pamphlet is a diagram (Page 4) showing that EU-25’s share of global output is declining, from 26 per cent in 1980 to 22 per cent in 2003 to 17 per cent in 2015.

The Chancellor knows perfectly well that the EU is not going to “reform”. The only solution is for the UK to leave. So the question is: why did he cobble together this disjointed paper? What was its purpose? Unkind commentators have suggested it’s a sop to Rupert Murdoch to get the latter’s support in the forthcoming leadership battle. This reviewer has no way of knowing, but it seems as good an explanation as any.

Saved by public opinion

The political consensus which is essential to make the euro work in the long term is clearly fracturing, even in the founder-member states such as France and Holland, as the recent votes on the Constitution showed...

What then, should Britain do about the euro? The vast majority of the electorate in the UK now sees that we are better off outside the Single Currency than being part of it. There is no prospect within the foreseeable future of a referendum being held on the Single Currency and a positive vote being secured. We need to remember, however, how readily a decision to join might have been taken in Parliament but for the commitment to a referendum

in advance of such a step being taken and the growth of a vast amount of grass roots opposition to Britain joining the Single Currency. It was not the leadership of any of the governments which have been in power in Britain in recent years which stopped us joining the euro. It was public opinion which did this - a potent symptom in turn of the fundamental problem with the EU, which is lack of democratic legitimacy. Would the single currency ever have come about if its creation had been the subject of democratic debate and decision? The reality is that there were serious doubts about the merits of the Single Currency across the whole of the EU before it

came into being. Its establishment was forced through by the EU’s political elite against the grain of wide swathes of public opinion, though little of it was effectively represented among the dominant political parties in the EU. Opposition came from elsewhere. To counteract the strongly centralising bias among all the major EU institutions, the same determination to resist such trends will be just as pressingly important in future as it has been in the past.

September 2005 issue of the Labour Euro-Safeguards Bulletin.

Free Trade Agreements aren't the solution

says Anthony Scholefield, who argues that the UK should decide what sort of trading regime it wants before thinking about FTAs

The EU-sceptic cause had to start from a very weak position in the 1990s. Politicians were claiming absurd benefits for EU membership and all parties proposed further integration. Business as represented by the CBI was in favour of EU integration and membership of the euro. The idea of modifying or withdrawing from the EU had been branded by Margaret Thatcher as one of the 'extreme' policies of Michael Foot's Labour Party. The electorate was carefully kept out of any influence on, or knowledge of, moves to EU integration.

All of these handicaps have now been thrown off. British public opinion has woken up to the cost, bureaucracy and lack of benefit to the British people. The idea of modification or withdrawal from the EU is no longer treated as extreme, 'nationalistic' or 'racist'. The CBI has lost business support because of its euro enthusiasm and the City will not back the euro. The benefits of electoral success by UKIP and, to a lesser extent the Tory Party, are that any overt move to further political and economic integration is unlikely. That, of course, is why the pro-EU forces, heavily entrenched in Parliament and the EU organs, are now going about their work furtively.

This necessary emphasis on demolition work by EU-sceptics has meant that not enough serious attention has been paid to a post-EU Britain. Richard North correctly advised the Tory Party that, to be taken seriously, 'we need to paint a picture in very clear detail of what sort of Europe we want'. Among these details, more effort must be made to analyse the economic effects of withdrawal and the various options available. In recent months more data and interesting proposals have been put forward both by Ian Milne of *eurofacts/Global Britain* and Patrick Minford and his associates at the Cardiff Business School; and on 20th October last *Open Europe*

published similar proposals.

How to replace membership of the EU customs union?

How do genuinely eurosceptic politicians propose to replace the EU customs union membership?

Daniel Hannan MEP recently called for Britain's membership to be replaced by 'bilateral free trade agreements'. UKIP's 2004 Manifesto called for 'Full withdrawal from the European Union in favour of a Free Trade Agreement similar to those enjoyed by other non-EU states, including Switzerland, Norway, Iceland and Mexico'. The Veritas Manifesto for the 2005 election also called for 'a Free Trade Agreement with the EU similar to the ones Norway and Switzerland have'. All these proposals appear broadly the same.

Clearly the idea of free trade agreements now has traction at least among those who are minded to consider withdrawal or new forms of association with the EU. The main advantage of Free Trade Agreements - which, incidentally, are not favoured by the WTO which seeks free world trade - is that they enable politicians to argue that the electorate would not be 'isolated' in the post-EU world. For whatever reason most EU-sceptics are not prepared to jump immediately to unilateral free trade from a customs union security blanket.

There are certain difficulties with the idea of bilateral free trade agreements. Patrick Minford puts a powerful case against them. Ian Milne is sceptical of trade agreements in the modern world of low tariffs and WTO arrangements.

If we divide trade into sectors such as services, industrial goods, public procurement and defence procurement, agriculture and fisheries, it is worth pointing out that services are already virtually freely traded. It is notable that UKIP promises substantial financial support for agriculture and it is likely

that this policy would attract support from other EU come-outers. It would, of course, be possible to combine this with imports at world prices but would require effective state determination of the quantum and prices of agricultural production. There have been considerable pressures not to go down the free trade route in public procurement and defence procurement as well. So, in practice, it is likely that any Free Trade Agreement (FTA) would revolve around industrial goods, like most other FTAs. In order to simplify the arguments the rest of this article only considers industrial goods.

How would an FTA actually work?

To begin with it should be noted that an FTA is partly a contradiction in terms. While an FTA may allow the two parties free trade in each other's home markets, it also assumes a measure of discrimination against goods purchased from a country not party to the agreement.

The analysis of an FTA's advantages depends on what sort of trading regime an independent Britain chooses to have. To call for an FTA prior to this basic decision is to put the cart before the horse.

Broadly, Britain would have three choices.

First, it could declare for unilateral free trade, as favoured by Patrick Minford. Second, it could retain the tariffs and protective trade regime of the EU as presently constituted, with the regime administered by Whitehall and the proceeds of tariffs going to the UK Treasury instead of Brussels. Third, it could introduce a modified controlled trade regime with fewer restrictions than presently organized by Brussels but administered by Whitehall.

Minford points out the benefits for the UK of declaring unilateral free trade. These are that the UK would now buy all its goods at world prices.

Continued on P.5

FTAs are not what Britain needs

Not only would EU manufacturers, who sell far more industrial goods to Britain than vice versa (a net deficit of £20 billion p.a. for the UK), be forced to compete with manufacturers outside the EU, which would reduce prices, but also the hidden price rises through actual and threatened anti-dumping and other restrictive mechanisms of the EU, which do not necessarily show up in the trade figures, would be got rid of. In other words, declaring free trade in industrial goods would be similar in its effects to leaving the CAP.

The second advantage is the general economic point that free trade corrects misallocation of resources in the UK, a basic point in economic theory.

Preferential Access

Minford concludes that if Britain declared unilateral free trade there would then be no possibility of an FTA. Why? *"This is to miss the point of a customs union in which there is horse-trading between the producers of different countries paid for by the consumers; if a country refuses to trade by penalizing its consumers, it has nothing to offer"*. He adds, *"Were the UK to be outside and let its consumers receive world prices, continental EU countries would be mad to let UK producers have access to their markets at preferential customs union prices; this would amount to asking their own producers to transfer profits to UK firms with no quid pro quo"*.

So if it is impossible to have an FTA in the event of Britain declaring unilateral free trade, what is the relevance of an FTA under the other scenarios?

The Other Scenarios

The two other scenarios are that

Britain retains the Brussels' industrial goods regime either wholly or partly under pressure from commercial interests. It should be noted that if Britain administered its own trade regime from Whitehall it would make three undoubted gains. First, all duties would accrue to Britain not Brussels. Second, it could eliminate dumping and even more the threat of dumping rules, voluntary restraints and all the rest of the Brussels panoply which push up prices. These are the equivalent of the effects of the CAP in pushing up costs to the consumer when buying food. The third effect is more subtle. Basically, the wider the area of a customs union the larger number of producers and special interests which are created, all of whom press for anti-dumping duties, tariffs and trade restrictions. At present UK consumers may pay higher prices for goods in which there is little or no UK production because we are in a customs union with EU countries that do have producers keen to protect their own markets. By contracting the size of the EU customs union to the UK, the number of special interests pressing for protection is substantially reduced.

Should an FTA then be concluded with the rest of the EU? Of course, FTAs come in different shapes with different trade products covered in different ways.

The main point to note is that Britain has a long-term structural deficit in industrial goods with the rest of the EU of about £20 billion p.a. A fairly negotiated FTA in industrial goods would entrench this surplus which, insofar as it relates to goods which could be obtained more cheaply elsewhere, transfers wealth from UK consumers to EU manufacturers. EU manufacturers would be able to export industrial goods to the UK and get the same prices as UK manufacturers but

better prices than countries without an FTA. Of course, Britain would do the same with the rest of the EU but the structural surplus which is in favour of the EU could well increase as EU countries (such as France) maintain their industrial base by protectionism.

No Sense

It therefore makes no sense for Britain to have an FTA with the rest of the EU on withdrawal under any of the scenarios outlined above. We should, however, be mindful that Switzerland has a similar economic profile vis-à-vis the EU as the UK. It has a permanent deficit in its EU trade which reached (visibles) in 2003, 12.5 billion euros, but it has an FTA. Our analysis shows that Switzerland would be economically better off without this FTA. It is impossible to say how much of the EU surplus would disappear if Switzerland opted for unilateral free trade but there is at present a transfer of wealth from Switzerland to the EU under the FTA regime.

The reasons for Switzerland agreeing to an FTA and for British eurosceptics to advocate an FTA for the UK are undoubtedly political. To withdraw from the EU without an FTA is considered in some quarters to be a step too far. An FTA might offer a political "comfort blanket" to that part of the electorate that feels the UK would be "isolated" but it is expensive and not economically justified. The analysis also shows the necessity of deciding what sort of trading regime there would be in post-EU Britain before making decisions about Free Trade Agreements.

Straight from the horse's mouth

"Europe has been built in a St. Simonian way from the beginning; this was Monnet's approach. The people weren't ready to agree to integration,

so you had to get on without telling them too much about what was happening".- Pascal Lamy, Chef de Cabinet to Commission President

Jacques Delors, July 1992, in G. Ross, *"Jacques Delors and European Integration"*, Policy Press, Oxford and Cambridge, 1994.

LETTERS

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

Should Canada quit NAFTA?

Dear Sir,

We 'withdrawalists' usually refer to "replacing membership of the EU with a Free Trade Agreement" - as in the current UKIP/ID Group referendum petition now collecting signatures.

Your articles (7th October) about Canada's unhappiness with NAFTA and the sound arguments for withdrawal and independence seem to support John Kissin's letter (29th April) arguing against negotiating a 'new relationship' with the EU after we have left it. I am sure the promise of a FTA with the EU is mainly said in public in order to sugar the pill of complete withdrawal but given low tariffs generally and the WTO as trade

referee would we not be better off without one? FTAs seem to carry a lot of cross-border interference and legal baggage.

SIR GEORGE EARLE

Devon

Typical EU

Dear Sir,

Typically, we are now being told that the European Union "comes into its own" over a problem like bird flu.

Exactly the opposite is true. Faced with the threat of a global pandemic, we find that effective international co-operation does not, and indeed cannot, depend upon all the participants making a prior commitment to merge

their countries in "ever closer union".

Dr D R COOPER

Berkshire

Commission Powers

Dear Sir,

It is quite correct for Daniel Hannan MEP to state that only the Commission can propose new laws which are then enacted by the Council/Parliament. What is often overlooked is that the legislators (Council/Parliament) cannot initiate amendments or repeals of existing legislation. Only the Commission can do this, not national governments. This is likely to be highly relevant in future because of the pressure to reduce the number of EU laws.

ANTHONY SCHOLEFIELD

London

How the passengers unhooked the EU-train

After Nice the forces of political Europe joined others in stoking the fire. The Commission, the Parliament, the federalists, French proponents of integration, the media, all found Nice too 'intergovernmental'. Together, they imposed the idea that Nice was a disaster, that we urgently needed a new treaty. Soon a 'new treaty' wasn't enough. It had to be a 'Constitution', and little did it matter that it was legally inappropriate.

When the time came, the result had to be ratified. What tiny national parliament, what people, would then dare to stand in the way of this new meaning of history? The results of the Convention, at first deemed insufficient by maximalists, became the holy word when it was realised that selfish governments might water it down.

At every stage of this craze, from 1996 until 2005, a more reasonable choice could have been made, a calmer

rhythm could have been adopted, that would not have deepened the gap between the elites and the population, that would have better consolidated the real Europe and spared us the present crisis. But in saying this, I underestimate the religious fervour that has seized the European project. For all those who believed in the various ideologies of the second half of the 20th century, but survived their ruin, the rush into European integration became a substitute ideology.

They planned urgently to end the nation state. Everything outside this objective was heresy and had to be fought. This was in the spirit of Jean Monnet, the rejection of self and of history, of all common sense.

'European power' was a variation, the code name for a counterweight to America that excited France alone for years and towards which the

'Constitution' was supposed to offer a magical shortcut. And let us not forget the periodic French incantations for a Franco-German union.

As the train sped on, these two groups, instead of braking the convoy, kept stoking the locomotive, some to enlarge and others to integrate, deaf to the complaints coming from the carriages. Since we had to ask for confirmation from time to time, the recalcitrant peoples were told they had no choice, that it was for their own good, that all rejection or delay would be a sign of egotism, sovereignty, turning inward, hatred of others, xenophobia, even Le Penism or fascism. But it didn't work. The passengers unhooked the carriages.

Hubert Vedrine, French Foreign Minister 1999-2002, *Irish Times*, 8th August 2005.

A post-democratic future?

"We should not Europeanise issues but fight for the preservation of basic civil, political and economic liberties The alternative is a non-state, post-democracy and administered society".

Vaclav Klaus, President of the Czech Republic in an interview with the *EUobserver* on 21st October 2005.

MEETINGS

UK Independence Party
(Salisbury Branch)
01722 790839

Monday **7th November 2005**, 7.30 pm

“Let the People Decide”

Christopher Gill, *Freedom Association*
Nigel Farage MEP, *UKIP*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Guildhall, Market Square, Salisbury
Admission Free

The Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

International Conference

Saturday **19th November 2005**
10.30 am to 6.15 pm

Speakers include:

Christopher Booker
Marc Glendening
Daniel Hannan MEP
Lindsay Jenkins
Ruth Lea
John Midgley
Professor Kenneth Minogue
Dr Richard North

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
The Great Hall, King's College, London
Admission £20
(Includes lunch and refreshments)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **29th Nov. 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Modernising Parliament: Reform of the Lords”

Professor Vernon Bogdanor CBE
FBA, *Gresham Professor of Law*

Many regard the unelected House of Lords as an anachronism. In 1999 all but 92 hereditary peers were removed. Since then it has been a thorn in the government's side. What is its proper role in a modern democracy?

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

The Campaign for
United Kingdom Conservatism

One Day Conference

Saturday **26th November 2005**
10.00 am to 5.00 pm

Speakers include:

Rodney Atkinson, *Author*
Reverend Dr Alan Clifford, *Pastor, Norwich Reformed Church*
Tim Congdon, *Economist and Former member of the Treasury Panel*
Gerald Howarth MP, *Shadow Defence Minister*
Dr Beat Kaufmann, *Head of Economics Section, The Swiss Embassy, London*
Mrs Lynn Riles, *Co-Founder, The British Declaration of Independence*
Rt Hon The Lord Tebbit, *Former Chairman of the Conservative Party*

ONE DAY CONFERENCE

Oxford Brookes University, Oxford
Admission £32

(Includes lunch and refreshments)

Tickets:

Campaign for UK Conservatism, St Omers House, St Omers Road, Gateshead NE11 9EL

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **30th Nov. 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and Change: Prime Ministers in the Post-War World - Macmillan”

Richard Thorpe

Response

David Faber

Tuesday **24th January 2006**, 6.00 pm

“The referendum: direct democracy and the Constitution”

Professor Vernon Bogdanor CBE
FBA, *Gresham Professor of Law*

PUBLIC MEETING

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **8th Nov. 2005**, 4.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The Merits of Statutory Instruments* from;
a) Mr Alan Pawsey, Head of Publishing Services, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, Cabinet Office and
b) officials from the Department of Trade and Industry.

Wednesday **9th Nov. 2005**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Parliament and the Legislative Process* from the Rt. Hon. the Lord Falconer of Thoroton, Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs.

Tuesday **22nd Nov. 2005**, 4.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Parliament and the Legislative Process* from representatives from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005

ECOFIN meeting **8th November**

GAERC meeting **21-22nd November**

ECOFIN meeting **24th November**

ECOFIN meeting **6th December**

GAERC meeting **12-13th December**

2006

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

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

2007

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

Accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union **1st January**

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.

A Throne in Brussels

by Paul Belien. **Hdbk £25.00**

A penetrating historical analysis which warns that the EU is heading the way of Belgium.

The Case for Commonwealth Free Trade

by Brent Cameron. **£11.26**

The Canadian author explores at length the pros, cons and practicalities of a Commonwealth Free Trade Area.

The Great Abdication

by Alexander Deane. **£8.95**

The strap line explains all: "Why Britain's decline is the fault of the middle class".

The Syndicate

by Nicholas Hagger. **£11.99**

Why a European state is unworkable and how in the end it will destroy parliamentary democracy.

Britain and the EU: Time to Move On

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

The EU malaise and the cure.

The ECB and the Euro:

The First Five Years

by Otmar Issing. **£10.00**

An upbeat assessment of the euro by a member of the European Central Bank.

Disappearing Britain

The EU and the death of Local Government

by Lindsay Jenkins. **£14.99**

The author reveals the detailed Brussels agenda for the break-up of the United Kingdom.

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? 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**

Roger Liddle was the Prime Minister's policy adviser on Europe 1997-2004.

Who's Afraid of a European Constitution?

by Neil MacCormick. **£8.95**

This book by a member of the European Convention on the Future of Europe and former MEP describes the nature and purpose of the European Convention.

Should Britain Leave The EU?

by Patrick Minford, Vidya Mahabare and Eric Nowell **£15.95**

An economic analysis of the EU/UK relationship.

Alarming Drum

Britain's European Dilemma

by Peter Morgan. **Hdbk £19.95**

An analysis of Britain's relationship with the EU. Director-General of the IoD (1989-1994) proposes alternatives to current failing EU.

Plan B For Europe - Lost

Opportunities in the EU Constitution

Edited by Lee Rotherham **£7.00**

A collection of key Eurocritical papers and speeches, which mark the path to an alternative Treaty for Europe.

Send Payment to

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

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@junepress.com

WEB SALES 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
CIB	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	
Open Europe	0207-197 2333

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