

Falling out of love with 'Europe'

*The Commission's own survey of opinion reveals deepening public disaffection
with all aspects of the European Union throughout the EU*

Two trends are discernible in 'Europe' today - and they are running in diametrically opposite directions with potentially explosive consequences. The first might be described as euro-creep, that is the process by which European political integration is advanced furtively by those who are seeking to introduce parts of the EU constitution even though it has been rejected by voters in France and Holland. Over the last three months we have pointed to many such examples.

There is, however, another trend, which exists at the level of opinion and which is beginning to assert itself politically.

Squalid Deal

Here is one small and parochial example. A year ago Liam Fox, then co-chairman of the Conservative Party threatened eurosceptic Conservative MEPs with expulsion unless they signed up to a squalid deal with the European People's Party (EPP), a grouping which, as *eurofacts* readers will be aware, includes some of the most integration-minded parties in Europe. During the present Tory leadership contest Mr Fox promised that he would take the MEPs out of the EPP, a commitment subsequently repeated by David Cameron.

This process by which moderate - some would say timid - eurosceptics become bolder and support for integration falls away is now Europe-

wide.

It is especially noticeable among new members. These once looked upon EU membership as the privileged access to a rich man's club and a symbol of political status. It now seems possible that several may now choose not to join the euro while confidence in the EU generally is falling rapidly in both old and new members, as the latest EUbarometer, the EU's own survey of opinion, reveals.

Dramatic Change

Estonia, Lithuania and Slovenia have targeted 2007 as the date on which they wish to join the euro while Cyprus, Latvia and Malta plan to join in 2008. But the EU survey shows that 46 per cent of those in the new EU countries believe that membership of the euro will have negative consequences for their country, while only 38 per cent think that it will have positive consequences - representing a quite dramatic change of opinion since only a year ago when Central and Eastern European countries continued to regard EU membership as a dream come true.

The gap between those in new EU member states who are "unhappy" about their national currency (53 per cent) being replaced by the euro and those who are "happy" (37 per cent) is getting wider. Significantly, the most prosperous and go-ahead countries are the most unhappy: these include Lithuania (69 per cent), Estonia (64 per

cent), and Latvia (64 per cent).

Moreover, Poland, the largest of the new members will "definitely" now hold a referendum on the adoption of the euro, the country's newly elected president Lech Kaczynski has said. Mr Kaczynski, a conservative, made his comments on 24th October, one day after his second-round victory over liberal presidential candidate Donald Tusk. According to an AP report, Warsaw's new president said: "Getting rid of one's own currency is a very serious limitation of one's own sovereignty."

Such has been the profound change of attitudes towards the EU generally that only 10 of the EU '25' now say that they have a "positive image" of the EU. According to the survey, only 28 per cent of those in Britain have a positive attitude towards it. And only a third of British respondents see benefit in continued membership

Severe Downturn

The pollsters who carry out the survey, Taylor Nelson Sofres say that the poll data represents the most severe downturn in support for the EU since records began in 1975.

The widespread disaffection with the European project is now resulting in a major shift in the EU public diplomacy drive. This is apparent from remarks by the new EU representative to London, Reijo Kemppinen, a Finn who, in his first interview with

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: A gravy train for the very rich p.2 - Constitution 'still on the table' - Poettering p.2 - New EU law will jeopardise major advances in health care p.3 - European issue is top Tory priority - Davis p.3 - Inching towards the inevitable p.4 - French equivalent to eurofacts p.4 - Review - "The Wrong Side of the Hill" p.5

A gravy train for only the very rich

For decades French governments have defended the CAP on the grounds that it supports the small French farmer and a unique way of life. For some time there has been reason to doubt this, not least because prominent economists have suggested that there is little actual evidence to demonstrate that the CAP has put a brake on the decline in farm wages or restrained the drift of population to the cities - a fundamental policy goal. But now the cat is truly out of the bag. Figures published by Oxfam reveal that the top 15 per cent of French farming companies consume 60 per cent of the direct payments from the CAP.

Small French farmers, many of whom have second and even third jobs, receive only 17 per cent of the subsidies.

According to Oxfam the figures are based on data provided by the Commission - a further sign that relations between the Commission and

the French Government are at an all time low.

"The CAP is a gravy train for Europe's biggest, richest farmers", said Celine Charveriat, Oxfam's trade campaigner when the figures were released.

Their publication follows a campaign for greater transparency about EU finances and end-beneficiaries. As the result of pressure from the media and non-governmental organisations, Denmark, Estonia, the UK, the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland Slovenia and some Spanish provinces have revealed where their income from the CAP goes. As in France the lion's share goes predominantly to agribusinesses and large landowners. But although France is the biggest recipient taking around 20 per cent of the CAP hand-outs the French Government has been as obdurate in refusing to give information about where the money goes as it has been in defending the

CAP.

The Commission has now joined the campaign for greater openness - at least in the affairs of member states.

It has recently emerged that the Dutch agriculture minister Cees Veerman, who had earlier opposed publication of the figures, received around 190,000 in respect of farms in Holland and France during 2004.

On 4th November *The Times* reported that Prince Albert II of Monaco, whose fortune is estimated at 2 billion (£1.4 billion), received 287,308 in subsidies from the CAP last year.

French reticence in furnishing detailed information about where the money has gone has inevitably encouraged many in France and elsewhere to speculate about which French ministers, MPs and MEPs (or their families) are recipients of CAP payments or have links to the agribusinesses. And to wonder whether some of the cash has been siphoned off for other purposes.

Constitution 'still on table' says Poettering

Hans-Gert Poettering is Chairman of the European People's Party (EPP), the Centre-Right grouping in the European Parliament which includes the British Conservative MEPs. Here are his views on what should be done following the French and Dutch rejection of the

Constitution:

"This Constitution is still on the table...all those who think that this Constitution is no longer topical are wrong... it will not be able to be applied in days, or in the coming weeks, but we hope that after the French presidential election we will be

in a new situation... I am perfectly convinced that the only way that we will be able to react to this crisis of identity is if we affirm the values which unite us, in the European Constitution."

Agence Europe 9th October 2005.

Continued from P.1

Falling out of love with 'Europe'

journalists announced that he did not love the EU and shared many criticisms of it. *"I don't love Europe. I love my family. I love my children. I love my dogs. But I don't love Europe."*

A man who says his affection for his cocker spaniel is greater than for Brussels is plainly smarter than those of his colleagues who behave as if it is

business as usual. But he is adopting a fall-back position from which a further retreat is more likely than a counter attack.

All over Europe politicians with an ear to the ground are making concessions to the new mood, and the process will continue. As the former Israeli foreign minister Abba Ebban

once said, democratic politicians can always be relied upon to take the wise and prudent course - once all other opportunities have been exhausted. One by one those opportunities are being exhausted. Pushing ahead with integration can only fuel public resentment and make future adjustments more painful.

New EU law will jeopardise major advances in health care

The Physical Agents Directive will put the lives of heart patients and small children at risk without producing any offsetting benefits

One of the most important breakthroughs in medical care in recent decades has been the development of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) to diagnose disease and treat patients. MRI has brought huge advances in the treatment of brain tumours and of children with heart abnormalities. It has a critical role in imaging the spine, joints, heart and abdomen, showing up tumours and lesions that are not detectable by other means. But there is now widespread concern among doctors that the EU Physical Agents Directive (PAD) threatens to reverse pioneering advances in the use of MRI and to make many MRI procedures illegal while also making it difficult for hospitals to use the most modern state-of-the-art MRI scanners. The diagnosis and treatment of anaesthetised, frail or anxious patients will be particularly affected. Moreover, the cancer risk to staff and patients is likely to be greater if hospitals are forced to use X-rays instead of MRI scanners.

On top of that doctors say that the Directive will reduce the value of recent NHS investment, damage British industry (which leads the way in the design and manufacture of the magnets that are at the core of all MRI systems) and undermine important clinical research.

Extraordinarily, the Government now appears to accept that the scientific evidence on which the Directive is based may be flawed.

Asked in the House of Lords on 25th October by Lord Patel whether he agreed that the Directive was "based on inadequate if not poor scientific evidence", Lord Hunt, the Deputy Under Secretary for Work and

Pensions virtually conceded that it was. He replied: "My Lords, I know that it is the view of some of the medical profession that the scientific evidence on which the evidence is based is not as robust as they would wish. The limits have come from the scientific review process...Part of our conversation with the HSE [Health and Safety Executive] is about ensuring that we continue to commission research in this area".

Lord Hunt said the aim must be to ensure a balance between the interests of staff and patients. But according to Sense about Science, an independent scientific research organisation, there are no known risks attached to the use of MRI which in its view has an "excellent" safety record.

Real Hazards

A spokesman for the organisation said: "The Directive, which was drawn up without proper regard for the concerns of the medical community, will lead to real hazards in its efforts to avoid hypothetical risks. The effects on patient care, particularly on vulnerable groups such as children with heart problems, and on employee safety, are intolerable".

She said that the Directive - which is due to be incorporated into British law by 2008 - would jeopardise the use of several long awaited state-of-the-art MR scanners, funded by the UK government and patient charities, including those at St Thomas's and Great Ormond Street Hospitals.

The reason for the directive would appear to be related to concerns about exposure to magnetic fields. According

to Sense about Science, peripheral nerve stimulation (PNS) is a well known but harmless biological effect due to such exposure. But the PAD occupational exposure limits are **100 times lower** than the threshold for PNS. There is consequently no substantial evidence for any adverse health effects below this threshold.

So are there any safety worries attached to MRI?

"None at all. The PAD is unnecessary for medical MR and will impede the future of MRI", says Sense about Science.

"Such are the harmful consequences that some hospitals might be tempted to ignore the Directive. But that is not a practical option - all hospitals have risk managers who would understandably fear the consequences in terms of insurance cover and litigation".

The British Heart Foundation and the Medical Research Council have raised similar concerns with the Government. Even the normally cautious Health and Safety Executive has concluded "the benefits [of the PAD] ...are very heavily outweighed by the costs".

A Commission spokesman has said that the reason why the Directive applied to MRI was because of concern about the cumulative impact of the scanners on the health of medical staff. But the legislation refers only to "known short-term effects on the central nervous system occurring instantaneously...".

All of which suggests that not only is the Commission adopting measures that will cost lives, including those of small children, but that it is more than a little confused about its reasons for doing so.

European issue is top Tory priority - Davis

"The future of our country as an independent nation state is at the top of the list of issues an incoming

Conservative government would have to tackle. What matters in opposition is not symbolic short-term gestures but

the laying of foundations for change." David Davies MP, letter to the *Daily Telegraph*, 10th November 2005.

Inching towards the inevitable

By Ian Milne

Business for Sterling, the battle won, metamorphosed into the *No* (against the Constitution) Campaign, and now into *Open Europe*, which its press release describes as “an independent think tank set up by some of the UK’s leading business people to contribute bold new thinking to the debate about the direction of the EU. While we are committed to European co-operation, *Open Europe* believes that the EU has reached a critical moment in its development...and must embrace radical reform”. Its chairman is Rodney Leach and its deputy chairman Derek Scott, formerly economics adviser to Mr Blair.

This report was published to mark *Open Europe*’s launch on 20th October last. It argues that the EU is failing and needs to implement sweeping economic reforms, one of which ought to be trade liberalisation, which the French - plus ça change and all that - are once again doing their utmost to stop.

The great benefit of this report is that (using research commissioned from Oxford Economic Forecasting and published as “Trade Liberalisation and CAP reform in the EU”) it examines in detail various trade liberalisation scenarios, including abolishing the CAP. It goes on to assess their impact not just on the UK but on the rest of the EU and on countries outside the EU; it turns out that other EU countries would

Open up: why the EU must reform to survive

Open Europe,
October 2005.

Available free from
Web site;
www.openeurope.org.uk

benefit even more than the UK were reforms to be carried out.

Chapter 3 looks at past failed “reforms” of the CAP and the consequences for developing countries. Chapter 4 asks: How should the EU free up its trade? It describes one successful example, in another English-speaking rugby-playing offshore island, New Zealand, where, as a result of agricultural subsidies having been more or less abolished in 1986, the number of jobs in farming has remained broadly stable (versus a 40 per cent drop in the EU) and output has increased by 150 per cent (versus 20 per cent in the EU).

Chapter 5 describes how EU trade policy is made. Even by the abysmal standards of the EU, trade policy is characterised by grotesque levels of secrecy, lack of democratic control and absence of accountability. Neither ministers from member states, nor

national parliaments (no surprise there), nor even the European Parliament, are involved: something called the “Article 133 Committee”, made up of civil servants from member states and effectively a creature of the Commission, is in charge. Our own DTI web-site makes no bones about it: “Community trade policy is decided in the Article 133 Committee”.

Chapter 6, implicitly recognising that there’s little prospect of EU reform happening, asks: Could the UK be better off running its own trade policy? Answer: Yes, provided, post-withdrawal, “regulatory divergence” with the remaining EU did not act as a trade barrier. Given Continental Europe’s massive and growing trade surplus with the UK, which they’d be desperate to lock-in, it wouldn’t.

This report is a highly-valuable addition to the growing corpus of EU-critical literature. (Much of it will be familiar to readers: key quotes, arguments, statistics, calculations and sources come from *eurofacts* itself, from *Global Britain* and from works by *eurofacts* contributors on behalf of think tanks such as *Futurus*, *Civitas* and the *Centre for Policy Studies*.) Further research is promised by *Open Europe*. Hopefully, it will go beyond trade liberalisation and encompass a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of the entire relationship between the UK and the EU.

The French equivalent to *eurofacts*

L*’Indépendance* is the nearest France has to *eurofacts*. Its straplines are : Le Journal du Non and La Lettre de la Souveraineté: ouverte aux souverainistes de tous horizons. Three years old, it is run out of the Paris offices of the European Parliament (at 288 boulevard Saint-Germain 75341 Paris 07) by the *Indépendance & Démocratie* Group of MEPs. Its Director and main feature writer is the French MEP Paul-Marie Coûteaux and its editor is Jean-Paul Bled. The web-site is

www.pmcouteaux.org

There are 10 issues a year and the annual subscription is 20 euros. Amongst its contributors are some of the most prestigious writers in France. The topics covered are roughly the same as in *eurofacts*, but naturally from a very French perspective - one of which is virulent anti-Americanism, which is absent from *eurofacts*. The latest issue (November 2005), a special edition on the theme of “Secularism, response to Islamism”, came out a few days before suburbs across France with

high proportions of immigrants erupted into violence.

L’Indépendance publishes lists of public meetings throughout France, which include a series of “Café Souverainistes” organised in city-centre cafés in Nice, Toulon, Paris and other large cities (inspired perhaps by the ground-breaking “Red Lion” talks organised in London a few years ago by Dr Helen Szamuely). All of which demonstrates that EU-scepticism is alive, well and growing across the Channel.

How well will Europe cope with the new face of warfare?

An assiduous researcher of unusual resourcefulness and determination, Richard North has the ability to turn up facts that startle and alarm. He is also acquiring a reputation for the ability to apply a critical mind to strategic and defence issues. This is an area in which those in this country with real knowledge would appear to have little to say which they wish to communicate to the political class or indeed to the general public. Mr North badly wants to communicate.

His thesis is that the attempt to integrate the United Kingdoms military forces with those of Europe will make it difficult for the UK to act independently and to cooperate militarily with the United States, its traditional ally and the one remaining superpower.

"...it [Britain] has always seen itself as the bridge between America and Europe, but that option is no longer available. It is now in the metaphorical position of standing at the centre of Tower Bridge, just as the bridge has been raised. Britain has quietly ambled over to the illusory safety of the European side. If it wishes to choose the other side, the gap is still narrow and decisions can still be reversed. The leap back to the US can still be made. Soon, however, the distance will be too great..."

North cites chapter and verse in showing how when it comes to supplying UK forces American firms are being disadvantaged in relation to European ones even in instances where the American company has British collaborators and where the European product was inferior. He puts the cost of EU-preference at £14 billion.

He argues that the repercussions of the European bias of UK procurement policy are made all the greater because the US and the EU are on the edge of a technical revolution in warfare centred on satellites, electronics, and a new generation of vehicles - all coordinated by means of computer and satellite

The Wrong Side of the Hill The Secret Realignment of the UK Defence Policy with the EU *By Richard North*

Centre for Policy Studies,
2005 Paperback 51 pp

Available from *The June Press*
Price £10.00 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 1-9053890-8-6

technologies (net-centric warfare). Such is the sophistication of these systems that it will be impossible for forces working under different systems to be on the same side. Thus, even if political factors are disregarded, it may soon be impossible for Britain and the US to fight on the same high-tech battlefield.

This technical revolution, he points out, is part of a wider revolution in the way in which military planners think about war, or what professional strategists refer to as a revolution in military affairs (RMA).

All of this is true, but it should be pointed out that that revolution has not quite worked out as envisaged.

Partly as a consequence of overwhelming technical superiority the US is militarily invincible, at least as far as conventional warfare is concerned. So invincible that America's enemies have sought to offset US military power by asymmetrical means. On 9/11 Al-Qaeda operatives armed only with box cutters outflanked American military might. The London bombers used only unsophisticated tools. 'Rogue states', including North Korea, Iraq or Iran have sought to outflank American conventional strength by the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction against which notions of nuclear deterrence are of doubtful

value. All three nations have links with trans-national terrorism which is seen as another way of opposing US interests and those of its allies, and there are links between the terrorists and international crime organisations.

Moreover, even if a conventional war does occur it may be that this aspect of the conflict may not be the decisive one, as indeed could prove to be the case in Iraq. The likelihood, however, is that future conflicts will be fought out in heavily populated urban environments in the proximity of global communications systems and large numbers of TV camera crews.

This does not mean that America can or should abandon its conventional superiority; apart from anything else it fears the rise of China. But in Washington - where public debate about security issues is vastly more sophisticated than in London - the debate these days is not so much about "net-centric" warfare but about "net-wars" and the requirements of new security environments in which mobility, flexibility, and adaptability are the key requirements. Based on their experience of low intensity conflict the British and Australian armies, along with the US Marines, have developed concepts in line with this approach involving small mobile mission teams. The US army has also begun to adapt to new realities. The French have lots of concepts, but these are vitiated as a result of visceral anti-Americanism

It is against this context that the progress towards the creation of an autonomous European defence capability must be judged. How well are Britain's interests served by the creation of such a force and how well it cope with the demands of asymmetrical warfare and the new "net-wars" that we can confidently look forward to in the coming decades? For as long as we remain part of it our future safety may depend on the answer but one fears for the worst.

LETTERS

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

The Davis Approach Could Make Withdrawal Inevitable

Dear Sir,

Your lead story in the issue of 4th November somewhat misses the point! It is true, indeed, that 'Tory activists are far more eurosceptic than Tory MPs'. But it fails to go on to mention that the voters are far less eurosceptic than either of them! It is important to convince the wider electorate above all.

I am myself hoping for a robust line on our relations with the EU and find David Davis's Double Referendum promise on repatriation of powers compelling. The defeatist argument that the others would veto any concessions completely fails to take into account the novel circumstances.

All such legalistic talk is rubbish. Of course that's what the lawyers say but the reality is that for the first time a major country's government backed by the expressed vote of its people would be making major demands. The others would be faced with a crisis of a great magnitude. It's power politics not a legal jamboree. My guess is that they would turn the "enhanced co-operation" clause on its head and have a "diminished cooperation" clause. The implicit threat of a total break - with catastrophic financial implications would act as a powerful incentive to sort out these troublesome Brits for good.

David Davis's double referendum strategy would work like this. **Referendum 1** says do you approve of what we want from the EU? Assuming that the answer is Yes and that the suicidal tendency doesn't sabotage it, then he would go to the EU and say that this is what the British people have said. On the assumption that they will only give a little away then Davis comes back and in **Referendum 2** will ask if people accept such concessions as adequate.

That is when the subtlety kicks in and is so novel. With every sinew we fight for a NO [unless it IS adequate!] and

then withdrawal would become inevitable. No British government could fly in the face of that. If he started off by threatening withdrawal his bluff would be called and the British people probably wouldn't back him.

What we would have to do first, is pressurise the government to make sure that the demands set out in **Referendum 1** were as tough as possible. We won't get all we want but we can get enough if WE work at it.

It's up to us then.

CHRISTINA SPEIGHT
London

Unfair to Blunkett

Dear Sir,

May I draw your attention to striking evidence that the Government has betrayed the principle of equal opportunity which it claims to be at the heart of its philosophy?

Peter Mandelson was forced to resign from the Labour government on two occasions because of irregularities in his personal affairs. He was then handed a senior portfolio in the European Commission.

However, it is widely reported that, following his second departure from office, the career of David Blunkett is irrevocably finished and that he will spend the remainder of his days languishing on the back benches. This is grotesquely unfair. What more could Mr Blunkett possibly have done in order to demonstrate his suitability for a top job in Brussels?

RICHARD GIBBS
Bedfordshire

Christmas is Coming

Dear Sir,

May I suggest that *eurofacts* readers select one of the June Press books (see rear cover) that examines our membership of the EU and send it as a Christmas gift to their MP? Add a little note asking why the MP supports membership and what benefits he or she feel we have enjoyed over the past 32 years. I met recently with my local

MP and asked these questions. She simply replied that she "was an optimist and felt that (under a Conservative Government) the EU could be changed for the better". I asked what specifically gave her cause for optimism as the commercial, financial, industrial and political (sovereignty) costs and consequences of our 32 years membership are there for all to see and that despite many attempts the UK has been unable to influence the direction of the EU. I added that as the EU expands and under QMV any supposed influence is even further diluted. She could not give an answer. Perhaps *eurofacts* could run a competition for the most interesting or enlightening response?

How many would respond I wonder?
PAUL RHODES
London

Winning Slogan

Dear Sir,

Regarding suggestions on future strategy (letters, 21st October) may I suggest a slogan: '**EU is not Europe**'.

The strategy would be to ensure everyone sees or hears the slogan.

ROLAND HITCHCOTT
Hampshire

Tariff Talks

Dear Sir

If the UK were to quit the European Union and thereby deny Brussels a significant portion of its revenue, perhaps Jacques Chirac would be encouraged to reconsider his intransigent attitude to meaningful reform of the CAP. France would have to provide a larger share of farming subsidies for its own farmers from its own revenues. It might also kick start efforts to open up the much-needed western world markets to Third World natural resources.

R.S.GALLIANO
Buckinghamshire

MEETINGS

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)

**The Campaign for United Kingdom
Conservatism**

One Day Conference

"Conservatism, Europe and the Future
of the Conservative Party"

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

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

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

PUBLIC MEETING
Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

The Anti-Common Market League
020 8675 4854

Friday **2nd December 2005**, 6.30 pm

Annual Party
Special Guest
Gerard Batten MEP, UKIP

ANNUAL PARTY
The Hoop and Toy Public House
(Upstairs), 34 Thurloe Place, London
SW7 (nearest tube - South Kensington)
Admission - Advance £6 (double £10)
On the Door - **£7 (£11)**
Tickets: Anti-Common Market League,
28 Highdown, Worcester Park, Surrey
KT4 7HZ

Public Meeting
01672 515 275

Sunday **4th December 2005**
10.30 am - 5.00 pm

Speakers include;
Nicholas Hagger, Author
Brian Gerrish

PUBLIC MEETING
Church Hall, Silverless Street,
Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **22nd November 2005**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Water
Management* from Mr Richard Wood,
Head of Supply and Regulation,
Department for the Environment, Food
and Rural Affairs (Defra); Mr Mike
Walker; Mr Andrew Wells, Director of
Communities Plan Directorate; Mr Lester
Hicks, Head of Minerals and Waste
Planning Division, Office of the Deputy
Prime Minister.

Tuesday **22nd November 2005**, 4.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Merits of
Statutory Instruments* from representatives
from the Department for Environment,
Food and Rural Affairs.

Thursday **24th November 2005**, 10.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *Proposals for a
Regulation on Medicinal Products for
Paediatric Use and for a Regulation to
establish a European Institute for Gender
Equality* from Ms Meg Munn MP,
Parliamentary-UnderSecretary of State,
Department of Trade and Industry.

Tuesday **29th November 2005**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *A European
Strategy for Jobs and Growth - The Lisbon
Agenda* from Mr Kevin Daly, Goldman
Sachs.

Tuesday **29th November 2005**, 2.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on *CFSP* from Rt
Hon Hilary Benn, Secretary of State,
International Development; Lord
Triesman, Parliamentary Under-Secretary
of State, Foreign and Commonwealth
Office.

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

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.

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.

The Wrong Side of the Hill

The Secret Realignment of UK Defence Policy with the EU

by Richard North. **£10.00**

The author argues that Britain has embarked on a course that will divide it from its traditional American ally.

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

