

Why raising the EU flag may backfire on Mr Prescott

Three developments symbolise the Government's total disregard for public opinion

Without doubt the most significant development to have occurred in the EU in 2005 was the French and Dutch rejection of the EU constitution against a background of a steadily rising tide of anti-EU sentiment throughout Europe. According to the latest EuBarometer, the EU Commission's own survey of opinion, only half of those polled now believe that their country has benefited from membership, an extraordinary result given the expectations that the EU once aroused in many parts of Europe. Nowhere is that tide stronger than in Britain but as the year came to an end three quite separate developments appeared to symbolise the Blair Government's indifference to it: the decision to surrender a fifth of the UK rebate, the launch of the Galileo spacecraft from the Baikonur cosmodrome in Kazakhstan, and an announcement that will effectively give the EU flag equal status to that of the Union Jack. Taken together they constitute the clearest possible evidence that with or without a constitution the Government is willing, even eager, to make further major concessions to the goal of European political integration.

The budget deal which means that Britain will pay to the EU 6 billion euros a year more than it gets out while receiving nothing in return (see P.3). ranks with major sell-outs of the past. Such is the totemic significance of Mrs Thatcher's rebate - it is, after all the result of a unique instance of a British Prime Minister battling

successfully for the British interest in Brussels - that just weeks ahead of the deal even members of Mr Blair's government referred to it as "sacrosanct".

Derisory

However, the rationale for the Blair deal is derisory. It will not help the poorer members of the EU in the way that Mr Blair suggests; absurdly Luxembourg, the richest country in the EU, will receive most EU spending in per capita terms; Belgium and Ireland will also do well. There is no reason to think that the deal will mean that the promised "review" in 2008 will result in a meaningful reform of the CAP; the reverse is more likely to be true. Once the CAP payments to the new members are phased in and the Central Europeans begin to get their hands on serious money they will be *less* likely to oppose the CAP. While instead of generating good will Britain's "flexibility" has merely demonstrated that the UK is a soft touch.

The Budget deal rightly received a critical press. No one, apart from the Booker-North team, seemed to grasp the huge military and strategic significance of the launch of the Galileo satellite as part of Europe's plan to produce a rival to the US Navistar global positioning system. By signing up to the programme - in which China has a one fifth share - the Blair government has indicated in the most unequivocal way that it believes that Britain's future security interests

will be better served through the integration of its armed forces and weapons systems with those of the EU than through cooperation with its traditional American ally. Indeed, with the development of the European Defence Agency, another necessary component of an autonomous defence capability, the development of the Galileo system would seem to signal the end of a relationship that has served British interests extremely well, especially at times when national survival has been at stake. It is also a relationship whose contribution to the defence of political liberty has been immense. But this fact is unlikely to bother those whose purpose is the creation of a post-democratic European order based on the illusion of soft-power.

By contrast John Prescott's decision to effectively give the European flag the same status as the Union Jack seem a merely symbolic matter, and so it is. But nations need symbols and cannot survive without them. Curiously, like so many of Mr Prescott's decisions, this one may have the opposite to the intended effect. Nothing is more likely to encourage the flying of the Union Jack and the flag of St George. In any case, why shouldn't the EU flag be flown? Half of our laws or more are made in Brussels. Won't the unfolding of the EU-emblem serve to draw attention to a transfer of powers whose extent is still not fully grasped? Thus far the success of the European project has depended on leaving the shell of

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: World investors vote of no confidence in the Eurozone p.2 - Russian bear turns into a tiger p.3 - UK budget deal p.3 - Finns go cold on the EU p.3 - Review of The Benefits of Tax Competition p.4 - Why the EU can't be fixed p.4 - Reform 'less likely than Scots World Cup Win' p.4 - Managing decline, by the Chancellor p.5 - Austrian Presidency p.5 - Chirac simply can't wait to build 'political Europe' p.5 - Will the Chancellor fight - or roll over p.6

World investors cast vote of no confidence in the Eurozone

Statistics from an impeccable source show investment into the eurozone is in free fall

The table below provides unassailable proof - if indeed further evidence were needed - that the political and economic project into which Britain continues to divert huge amounts of economic, political and moral capital belongs to a previous century. The figures, which measure investment flows into and out of the Eurozone, come from an impeccable source: the ECB *Monthly Bulletin*. The text which accompanies the figures may well underestimate the extent to which inward foreign investment into the Eurozone is in free fall. But the figures speak for themselves: they demonstrate quite clearly that the world has cast a verdict of no confidence in Europe's economic future.

The figures show that during the first eight months of 2005 inward investment into the Eurozone plunged to 26 billion compared to 181 billion during the full calendar year of 2002, and that during the two year period 2002-04 inward FDI fell by 57 per cent. In 2002 inward investment exceeded outward investment by one billion euros, but by 2004 outward investment exceeded inward investment by 78 billion and during the first eight months of last year this gap had grown to a massive 129 bn.

As we have pointed out in previous issues, Britain (along with Ireland) has been Europe's stellar performer in attracting foreign inward investment,

but it would be naïve to expect this situation to continue as the British economy becomes 'Europeanised'. Despite what Gordon Brown has to say on the matter the differences between the European and British social models are gradually disappearing. In the main, we are becoming more like them. A combination of increasing public expenditure as a proportion of GDP, higher taxes, the rising burden of regulation and the blunting of

remain alert to the big picture and to the opportunity as well as the direct costs of membership of the EU. The big picture was very well described by the journalist and broadcaster Andrew Neil when he delivered the 14th annual Hayek lecture in London on the 28th November 2005:

"It is now clear that in our lifetimes we will witness the eclipse of Europe. The 19th century was Europe's century of dominance, the 20th century was when Europe lost its dominance, forced to rely on America's help to save itself from itself. The 21st century will be the Asian-American century, with only the US rivaling China and India in economic, military, educational and cultural power."

It is one of the many ironies of the present situation that

a prime minister who embraced modernity with such enthusiasm at the start of his premiership should close it by seeking further ways of hitching Britain's future to conspicuously failing and outmoded economic structures, closing off more exciting possibilities which in other circumstances Britain would be well placed to take advantage of in the process. Britain can only regain its attractiveness to international investors by making a fundamental break with the past, of which there is presently no prospect.

Foreign Direct Investment: Eurozone: bn				
	2002	2003	2004	1st 8 months of 2005
Eurozone FDI outward	(180)	(136)	(155)	(155)
Inward FDI into Eurozone	181	141	77	26
Net Eurozone FDI	1	5	(78)	(129)

Source: ECB Monthly Bulletin, Table 7.1.4, Nov 2005

economic competition as a result of EU protectionism are gradually destroying the economic advantages which the UK once enjoyed (for an account of Britain's economic prospects see page 5). Indeed, given the nature of the economic cycle it is easy to imagine circumstances in which the economic indicators for some Eurozone members are likely to be more favourable than those for the UK - a situation which may be used by europhiles to reopen the question of British membership of the single currency.

In this situation it is important to

Continued from P.1

Fly the EU flag!

British institutions intact while destroying them from within. The public display of the EU-emblem is an *explicit* symbol not only of European

Union pretensions but also of what has happened to this country. It is tantamount to a boast. Who knows where Mr Prescott's initiative may

lead? On past evidence, certainly not the deputy Prime Minister.

Russian bear turns into a tiger

Russia, with a population of 140 million, six per cent of the world's proven oil reserves and twenty-seven per cent of the world's proven gas reserves, is booming. The robust health of its government finances is enough to make most EU finance ministers (including our own) choke with envy. Rising income from exports of oil (Russia is the second largest producer in the world) has helped to produce massive surpluses on trade and government finances - even after repaying all IMF debt and most of its pre-Soviet debt.

Russia is now the seventh largest

holder of foreign reserves worldwide and an international net creditor. Inflation is still high - 12 per cent in 2004 - but has decreased every year for the last seven years.

The Russian economy is heavily dependent on oil, gas and metals, which account for perhaps a quarter of its GDP. Oil and gas alone account for over half of its exports of goods and services (of which around half go to the EU) and generate up to 40 per cent of all federal revenues. With global demand for energy set to grow substantially in the years to come this over-dependency won't be causing

Russian policy-makers to lose sleep.

The reverse of the coin is that most of the EU, with the exception of France (three-quarters of whose electricity is nuclear-generated) is becoming more and more dependent on Russia for its energy supplies. The current insouciance of the British government about over-dependence on a small number of countries for its energy, and an equal insouciance about the consequences of the rapidly-deteriorating UK balance of payments, may yet turn out to be an example of almost-criminal negligence.

Russia: Basic Economic Data

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Real GDP: Annual % Growth	(5.3)	6.4	10.0	5.1	4.7	7.3	7.2
Current A/c Balance: % of GDP	0.1	12.6	18.0	11.1	8.4	8.2	10.3
Annual Govt. (debt)/surplus: % of GDP	(8.2)	(3.1)	3.1	2.7	0.6	0.9	4.5
Unemployment: % of workforce	11.9	12.9	10.5	9.0	8.1	8.6	8.2

Source: Bank of Russia, IMF, ECB

UK budget deal: failure disguised as triumph

In the early hours of Saturday 17th December 2005 the current British Prime Minister gave up the rebate secured by Mrs Thatcher two decades earlier. In return he got.....zilch.

Mr Blair nevertheless deserves our gratitude for demonstrating, with blinding clarity, the utter futility of UK membership of the EU. Blair, the most europhile PM since Heath, engineered for his country its worst diplomatic humiliation since Suez - and then sought to disguise manifest failure as

triumph. The measure of Blair's naivety, vanity and ineptitude on "Europe" is that it makes even John Major appear in comparison to be a veritable Talleyrand of European politics.

The British - and French - media were in no doubt. This, for the UK, was a monumental fiasco. Especially noteworthy were Allister Heath's leader in *The Business* and Simon Jenkin's coruscating op-ed piece in the *Sunday Times* on 18th December. Even

the BBC, in reporting the humiliating outcome, had the decency for once to sound embarrassed.

For the British taxpayer and the British economy alike there will be consequences. Countries round the world - including our "allies" in the EU - have noted that the UK is a diplomatic pushover, and will act accordingly. In future issues we will try to disentangle the Downing Street spin and evaluate the real cost of this exercise in futility.

Finns go cold on the EU

Most Finns are unhappy with their membership of the European Union and would reject their country becoming a member of the bloc if asked, a new poll conducted in

December 2005 indicates.

The survey conducted by Taloustutkimus - the second largest market research company in Finland - found that Forty Nine per cent of Finns

would vote 'No' to EU membership as opposed to Forty Four per cent who would say 'Yes'.

At war with economic reality

Tax competition is the process by which governments attempt to attract capital and labour to their country by offering low tax rates or other incentives. Britain, Ireland and the Baltic States are examples of countries which have recently competed in this area to the great advantage of their citizens - and to the considerable irritation of their EU partners. Britain however appears to have become complacent about the rewards of competition and shows signs of wanting to quit the race.

That so many politicians should so strongly dislike tax competition is not difficult to understand. As Richard Teather, the author of this Hobart Paper makes clear, tax competition acts as a brake on governments' ability to raise taxes. By ensuring that there are limits to what governments can raise and spend governments are given an incentive to spend wisely, although there is, of course, no guarantee that they will do so. However, it is striking that politicians who call for competition in many areas should seek to exclude tax from their own area of activity.

The author has little difficulty in showing that, by preventing taxes from

The Benefits of Tax Competition

By *Richard Teather*

IEA Hobart Paper 153
Pbk 166 pp

Available from *The June Press*
Price £12.50 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 0-2553656-9-1

rocketing, tax competition boosts economic welfare, productive investment and employment. Low-tax jurisdictions also make global capital markets more efficient.

Opposition to tax competition is misguided, the author argues, being based on a false understanding of tax havens or idealised views about the role of government. In the real world tax competition is beneficial.

The current attempts by European governments to restrict competition through the EU or OECD will consequently hurt the world economy

and damage the interests of their citizens. If there is any damage caused by competing tax regimes it is that caused by the EU governments in offering tax breaks rather than in providing a simple, stable and neutral tax system, he says.

In the view of the author, it is simply hypocritical for governments to defend their own harmful exemptions while attacking open low-tax jurisdictions. With its historic links to many low-tax countries the UK, he concludes, should continue the tax reforms of the 1980s while supporting the right of others to maintain low tax jurisdictions.

This book, written by a lecturer in tax law, will mainly be of interest to economists and lawyers. However, it will also be of considerable interest to all those who grapple to understand why the EU behaves as it does. Not the least pleasure to be obtained from a careful perusal of the text is the confirmation of one's prejudice that the designers of the European project are not simply ignorant about the way in which the world works but are actually at war with economic reality, and perhaps other aspects of reality, too.

Why the EU can't be fixed

Undoubtedly, the major reason why it is so difficult to deal with all this network of problems is that there is now such a large politicised class in the EU who benefit enormously from the present arrangements continuing. There are thousands of highly paid Commission officials, with tax breaks, free schooling and generous pension arrangements, which anyone would envy. There is an army of lobbyists whose prosperity depends on

incestuous relationships with the EU bureaucracy. There are organisations large and small all over the EU whose funding depends on EU grants. There are powerful agribusinesses which are intent on holding on to the subsidies which the EU provides to agriculture in the EU, however much damage may be done to Third World farmers as a result. Above all, there is a vast number of politicians in all member states whose future depends in one way or

another on the present system of governance in the EU remaining substantially as it is. The problem is that there is no way, as things stand at the moment, that any of this structure of mutually supporting self interest can be overturned. As a result, instead of being reformed, it is inclined to become yet more firmly entrenched.

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
Bulletin, November 2005.

Reform 'less likely than Scots World Cup Win'

"For over 30 years politicians as diverse as Ted Heath, Robin Cook, Douglas Hurd, Tony Blair and Michael Heseltine assured me we 'were winning the arguments' in Europe. There were times when I even believed them, just as a wee lad I believed Scotland could win the World Cup. Through bitter experience I now suspect that there is more chance of Scotland winning the World Cup than of Britain winning the arguments in Brussels."

Andrew Neil, delivering the 14th annual Hayek lecture in London on 28th November

Managing decline, by the Chancellor

Gordon Brown's pre-Budget report acknowledges that the rest of the EU continues to drag Britain down

Remember the phrase that defeatist UK mandarins used to use to describe their role in the bad old (pre-1979) days? "Managing Decline". It looks as if those days are back, judging by the forecasts set out in the 5th December 2005 *Pre-Budget Report**, which go up to 2008.

These show the UK trade deficit going up; UK unemployment going up; and - even before the humiliating surrender by the Prime Minister over the rebate on 17th December 2005 - the UK net contribution to Brussels going up. Meanwhile, the UK's share of world exports of goods and services is forecast to shrink, as is its share of world GDP. Here's what the relevant extracts say:

■ The UK deficit on trade in goods and services with the rest of the world is projected to increase steadily from £39 billion in 2004

to £49.5 billion in 2008 (Table A7, page 200).

■ Unemployment (claimant count): "rising slowly to 0.97 million in 2007-08, from recent levels of 0.87 million" (Box B1, page 214).

■ Net contribution to EU Budget (no account taken of giving up part of the UK rebate); rising from £3.9 billion in 2004-05 to £5.2 billion in 2007-08 (footnote 3 to Table B 17 on page 233).

■ UK share of world trade in goods and services is projected to shrink. World trade is forecast to grow at between 6.75 and 7.75 per cent per year (Table A1, page 175) while UK exports of goods and services are forecast to grow more slowly at between 4.75 and 5.75 per cent per year (Table A10 on page 205).

■ UK share of world GDP is forecast to shrink. World GDP is forecast to

grow at between 4 and 4.25 per cent per year (Table A1 on page 175); UK GDP is forecast to grow at between 1.75 and 3.25 per cent per year (Table A3 on page 191).

The *Pre-Budget Report* acknowledges that the rest of the EU continues to drag the UK down. "External demand for UK output from non-EU countries appears to have remained significantly stronger than from the EU. In the third quarter of 2005, the volume of goods exports to non-EU countries was up by around 13 per cent on a year earlier, compared with only around 4 per cent for goods exports to the EU..." (paragraph A 98 on page 201). The Chancellor doesn't say what he intends to do about that.

*Cm 6701, www.hm-treasury.gov.uk

Austrian Presidency: the way ahead

Neil O'Brien of Open Europe has produced the following briefing note on what can be expected during the Austrian Presidency which began on 1st January 2006.

The Services Directive. Austria has announced its intention to balance the Services Directive with harmonisation measures, intended to limit the competitive impact of the Directive. The Austrian Government Presidency programme notes that "Austria will take particular care to ensure that the Directive does not lead to wage dumping and social dumping". A key danger during the Austrian Presidency is that during the ongoing negotiations the directive will become so loaded

with harmonisation provisions that it will lead to negligible economic gains at the expense of a major increase in the EU's powers over the economy and employment law.

The Working Time Directive. Austria has signaled that it will attempt to restrict the UK's opt-out from the 48 hour week.

Free movement of people from the new member states. By the 1st May the member states which have so far retained limits on workers from the new eastern member states will have to declare whether they will extend their decision to keep the barriers in place.

Welfare harmonisation. Under the banner of a "new EU Social Agenda"

Austria's presidency programme promises that "Austria will prepare the streamlining of coordination processes in the social area... The initial common objectives for social protection should be adopted at the March 2006 summit". It adds that "considerable attention will also be paid to coordinating social security systems". Social security ministers are scheduled to discuss these issues at an informal meeting at Villach in Austria.

Home affairs. Austria plans to press ahead with controversial plans in the justice and home affairs field, including the idea of a common EU asylum procedure.

Chirac simply can't wait to build 'political Europe'

"With all our partners we have reached a budget agreement, but Europe needs institutions that are more democratic, more stable, more effective. We cannot

wait. This is why I will quickly take up the initiative to start building a political Europe, a social Europe, a

Europe of projects."

President Chirac, televised speech to the French nation on the 31st December 2005.

LETTERS

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

How Thatcher won the Day

Dear Sir,

You are entirely correct in your contention that 'Renegotiation' is a slogan - and not a policy. But your point can be most effectively enforced by consulting the Conservative Manifesto in the most recent General Election.

For in it the party promised that, if elected, it would renegotiate the Common Agricultural and the Common Fisheries Policies. But this promise, although made by a party of which the then leader is a leading professional lawyer, was not accompanied by any threat to force the Masters of the EU to become the necessary second party to the negotiation.

It is time to remind everyone of how Prime Minister Thatcher won the rebate that the Masters of the EU are so eager to withdraw. This was by preparing Parliamentary legislation to effect withdrawal from the EU and telling the Masters of the EU that this legislation would be put into effect unless they were prepared to negotiate something less drastic.

PROFESSOR ANTHONY FLEW
Berkshire

Tory obligations

Dear Sir,

Stuart Sexton is correct in saying that most people are more interested in pensions, schools and the NHS than in

Europe. They need to be educated into appreciating that one of the reasons that these are a mess is that we are giving huge amounts of money to the EU. For example £1bn would pay for building five new hospitals.

I believe that it is the job of a Conservative leader clearly to spell out these facts. Once they are understood then our exit from the EU would be a foregone conclusion and the party that spelt them out would win the next election.

GERALD STANCEY
Leicestershire

A Strategy for Cameron

Dear Sir,

Much has been made of David Cameron's pledge to distance his MEPs from the EPP-ED group in the European Parliament which is dominated by the federalist European People's Party (EPP). However it is less well known that 'Conservative' representatives in the EU Committee of Regions (COR) are counted as "full-fledged members" of the EPP group (EPP-COR).

Both COR and the European Parliament could basically be described as talking shops - the former provides opinions while the latter has some law-shaping role. However, in 2003, COR claimed that under the 'Maastricht' commitment to political union, regional and local authorities were to become political players at EU level, and acknowledged the contribution of devolution to European

integration. To continue its role in weakening the nation-state, the European Court could well use 'subsidiarity' as a pretext to further the cause of regionalism.

The EPP-COR group's Political Priorities reflect the EPP Basic Programme - which is unashamedly federalist. Its committed 'democrats' and 'localists' are pushing for the rejected EU Constitution over the heads of Dutch and French voters; also a 'common European educational area'.

David Cameron's personal manifesto, Change to Win, said: "*We believe in national sovereignty...*" and offered '*bold and consistent leadership*'. If he is to be at all consistent, he will have to regularise the position of the Conservative members within COR.

There is a precedent for resolving both this issue and that of his MEPs. In the inter-governmental Council of Europe (*which is quite separate from the EU - Ed.*), Conservative delegates are part of a 'European Democratic Group' alliance. Their Statute rejects a United States of Europe and considers that Europe must be a continent of nation states. It recognises the primacy of the nation and its parliament as the source of legitimate government and pays tribute to free enterprise and minimal government.

Why settle for anything less?

BRIAN MOONEY
London

Will the Chancellor fight - or roll over?

On the 5th December 2005, in his Pre-Budget Report*, Gordon Brown stated (paragraph 5.124 on page 117):

"The Government is determined to continue to defend robustly the corporation tax system against legal challenges under EU law."

On the 13th December 2005 a rather

big "legal challenge" came along from the UK's Supreme Court, the European Court of Justice. This ruled that Marks & Spencer could set off losses in subsidiaries in Continental EU against profits earned in the UK, thus reducing its UK corporation tax bill. The Court said that UK tax law had to be brought into conformity with EU law - in plain

English, "harmonised" with the rest of the EU.

So now it's up to the Chancellor: "defend robustly", or roll over and "bring UK tax law into conformity with EU law". Which is it to be?

*Cm 6701, www.hm-treasury.gov.uk

MEETINGS

UK Independence Party

01962-711112

Monday **23rd January 2006**, 7.30 pm

“The EU Constitution by the back door
- Mr Brown and the Euro”

Nigel Farage MEP, UKIP
Godfrey Bloom MEP, UKIP

Questions & Answers session

PUBLIC MEETING

Guildhall, Winchester, Hampshire

Admission Free

(Turn up on the night or reserve seat by
telephone prior to meeting)

Gresham College

020 7831 0575

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

“The referendum: direct democracy and
the Constitution”

Professor Vernon Bogdanor CBE
FBA, Gresham Professor of Law

In 1975 we held our first and - so far -
only nationwide referendum. It was on
whether we should remain in the
European Community, as it then was.
Until then, the referendum was widely
regarded as unconstitutional. Yet a num-
ber of non-nation-wide referendums
have since been held - mainly on devo-
lution - and more are promised. What
are the advantages and disadvantages?
Does it have any role at all in a parlia-
mentary system of government? What are
likely to be the constitutional conse-
quences of the increasing resort to the
referendum device?

PUBLIC MEETING

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

FREE - Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting
and/or conference dealing with the sub-
ject of UK-EU relations we may be able
to advertise the event without charge.

Contact Details

euofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65

or Email: euofacts@junepress.com

Bonar Law Club

07984-610696

Tuesday **24th January 2006**, 7.00 pm

Michael Brown, Political journalist
and former MP

Questions & Answers session

PUBLIC MEETING

The Two Chairmen, 39 Dartmouth
Street, Westminster, London SW1

Admission £2

The Northern Ireland Springbok Club

Saturday **28th January 2006**, 11.30 am

“The EU Conspiracy, the Gunpowder
Plot, Napoleon and Hitler”

Pastor Nigel Owens B.Th.,B.A.
(Hons)

PUBLIC MEETING

Chairman's house in Finvoy,
Ballymoney

Admission £5 - Members Free

**(Tickets from N.I. Club, PO Box 35,
Ballymoney, County Antrim,
Northern Ireland BT53 7YE)**

Freedom Association

07979-695611

Tuesday **7th February 2006**, 12.30 pm

Philip Davies MP, Conservative
Member for Shipley

PUBLIC MEETING

The Function Suite of the The Counting
House Pub, 50 Cornhill, near Bank,
London EX3V 3PD

Admission Free

Bonar Law Club

07984-610696

Thursday **9th February 2006**, 7.00 pm

The Rt Hon. the Lord Tebbit of
Chingford

PUBLIC MEETING

The Two Chairmen, 39 Dartmouth
Street, Westminster, London SW1

Admission £2

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **17th January 2006**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *A European
Strategy for Jobs and Growth - The Lisbon
Agenda* from; (a) representatives from the
TUC; and (b) Professor Maria Rodrigues,
Professor of Economics at ISCTE and
Special Advisor to the European
Commission for the Lisbon Agenda.

Tuesday **17th January 2006**, 4.00 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Statutory
Instruments* from the Home Office (to be
confirmed).

Tuesday **17th January 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The European
Union UK Presidency* from Douglas
Alexander MP, Minister for Europe.

Wednesday **18th January 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *War Making
Powers* from; (a) General Sir Rupert
Smith, Admiral Lord Boyce, Field
Marshal Lord Brammell, Field Marshall
Lord Vincent of Coleshill, Air Marshall
Lord Garden; and (b) Professor Sir
Lawrence Freedman.

Wednesday **18th January 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The European
Arrest Warrant* from Mr Andy Burnham
MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of
State, Home Office.

Thursday **19th January 2006**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *The progress
made on the EU Code of Conduct for
Defence Procurement and current devel-
opments in EU Defence Policy* from Lord
Drayson, Minister for Defence
Procurement, Minister of Defence.

Tuesday **24th January 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The Austrian
Presidency of the European Union* from
Dr Gabriele Matzner-Holzer, Austrian
Ambassador.

Thursday **26th January 2006**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *Current
Developments in EU Foreign Policy* from
Mr Douglas Alexander MP, Minister for
Europe, Foreign & 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.

**The Great Deception:
Can the European Union survive**

by Christopher Booker. **£9.99**

This is the latest version (November 2005) of this comprehensive history of the European Union.

The Syndicate

by Nicholas Hagger. **£11.99**

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

The Case for EFTA

by Daniel Hannan MEP. **£3.00**

Alternatives to the EU.

**Britain and the EU:
Time to Move On**

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

The EU malaise and the cure.

The Future is a Foreign Country

by Matthew Illsley. **£10.00**

Full of useful detail and quotes on how and why we got into the EU mess. It leads one to the conclusion that out of the EU is the only sane way.

Disappearing Britain

The EU and the death of Local Government

by Lindsay Jenkins. **£14.99**

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 2006 Essential Guide to the EU

by Ruth Lea. **£15.00**

A detailed yet accessible analysis of how the EU works now and in the future.

Who's Afraid of a

European Constitution?

by Neil MacCormick. **£8.95**

A member of the European Convention on the Future of Europe and former MEP describes its nature and purpose.

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.

The Benefits of Tax Competition

by Richard Teather **£12.50**

Teather argues that EU attempts to harmonise taxes will damage the world economy.

EU: Papacy Reincarnated?

by Mark Stout **£9.99**

This book explores the origins and functioning of both the EU and the Medieval Papacy from a legal/political/historical perspective and unearths a startling number of parallels.

Send Payment to

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

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@juneypress.com

WEB SALES www.juneypress.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
David Cameron MP	
Democratic Party	01684-891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Labour	020-7802 1000
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562-68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020-7222 7999
Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP	
New Britain Party	020-7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	0121 333 7737
Roger Knapman MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006