

Social Europe: How it fails the poorest

Even when judged by its own standards the European Social Model performs less well than its Anglo-Saxon counterpart

When the architects of the post-Second War German economic 'miracle' extolled the virtues of the "social market economy" they were not claiming to have invented a new economic system; they were merely pointing to the unsurpassed ability of the market to meet the diverse social needs of human beings. Similarly, when in 1985 in a pamphlet entitled "Why Britain needs a social market economy" the Centre for Policy Studies laid down the foundations of what came to be known as Thatcherism its authors were seeking to demonstrate the social character of capitalism, not to provide a blueprint for an economic third way.

Dismal Outcomes

The advocates of 'social Europe' are less modest. They claim to have devised a system which achieves far higher social standards than the allegedly heartless Anglo-Saxon economies. As a result of truly dismal economic outcomes within the core EU countries over more than two decades they have been forced to acknowledge that the European social model results in lower levels of economic growth, but this, they say, is worth paying to achieve high social standards.

In previous issues of *eurofacts* we have questioned whether this is so. Further evidence that 'social Europe' is

failing dramatically even when judged on its own terms is contained in a lucid chapter by Lorraine Mullally in a book from Open Europe*. This shows that the EU is failing the poorest and most vulnerable people in many respects. She draws attention to the following:

- The social model has led to dramatically slower growth in incomes for the poorest. Over the last decade 1995-2004 the incomes of the poorest 10 per cent of the population have grown eight times faster in Ireland than in Sweden (and six times faster in Britain). As a result, so-called Anglo-Saxon economies like Ireland and the UK now have a smaller proportion of their population below the poverty line than Sweden for the first time.

- Reducing the tax burden as a proportion of GDP boosts growth and so ultimately means *more* money is spent on public services in real terms.

Accelerated Growth

For example Ireland has cut public spending *as a proportion of GDP* from 55 per cent to 35 per cent since the start of the 1980s, while the tax burden across the rest of the EU has stayed roughly the same. This reform dramatically accelerated growth in Ireland (which had historically been poor). This meant that public services were taking a smaller slice of a much bigger pie – and so Ireland has seen real spending on public services increase

more than twice as fast as the rest of the EU (nearly two and a half times more).

- The European Social Model is failing to provide a future for Europe's poorest. Europe is falling behind in education and science – only 29 per cent of EU citizens have a university education, compared with 39 per cent in the US and 52 per cent in Japan. And Europe's leaders are doing little to prepare for a severe demographic transition which will put government budgets under extreme stress.

In addition, social Europe has contributed greatly to two more widely recognised ills; historically high levels of unemployment and a mounting pensions crisis. By itself the first of these is sufficient reason to reject the European social model because long term unemployment has so many undesirable knock-on effects.

In 2004 in the US only 13 per cent of unemployed workers could not find work within 12 months, compared with 21 per cent for the United Kingdom, 42 per cent in France, 52 per cent in Germany and 50 per cent in Italy. In the EU as a whole the percentage of unemployed people out of work for longer than a year was 44 per cent. As Mullally points out high and long term unemployment reduces freedom and quality of life even for those in work.

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: EU Directive threatens craft history p.2 - Referendums a plea for 'more Europe' p.2 - Sleepwalking into an EU legal system p.3 - Another Tory backs withdrawal p.3 - Strasbourg and Brussels p.4 - Have a pint - by permission of EU p.4 - EU gun police in UK?. p.4 - French don't care for Capitalism p.5 - The logic of EU integration p.5

EU Directive threatens five centuries of traditional craft history

It is more than a decade since Douglas Hurd the then Foreign Secretary warned that the European Union invited hostility as a result of interfering in the “nooks and crannies” of national life. Since then it has interfered far more extensively without losing its ability to offend national sensibilities in little ways as well as large.

The Royal Artillery recently announced that it had been testing the use of quieter cannon rounds for its 21 gun salute in case it breaches EU noise regulations.

Extraordinarily, two new EU directives now threaten five centuries of tradition without any prospect that they will achieve their declared aim.

EU Directive 2002 (Risk of Hazardous Substances) and EU

Directive 2002 96/ec (Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment) will make the manufacture of pipe organs illegal from July 1st this year.

The Directives have the aim of limiting the dumping of consumer items such as mobile phones and computer circuit boards into landfill. But an error in the drafting of the Directive will mean that the making of traditional pipe organs for cathedrals, concert halls and churches will also be covered by the legislation.

The problem arises because of the use of lead in organ pipes which is one of the banned substances included in the Directive.

Tin/lead alloy has been used for making organ pipes – an industry in which Britain has a leading role - for many centuries because of its unique proper-

ties in the voicing and sound of the instrument. This is despite the fact that organ pipes last almost indefinitely and have no adverse environmental effects - they are never disposed of into landfill because old metal is easily recycled into new pipes. Complaints from the Institute of British Organ Building to the Department of Trade and Industry and the European Commission so far have met with no success. But a spokesman for the Institute commented “It is surely inconceivable that a unique cultural art-form and five centuries of tradition should be destroyed at the stroke of a pen in Brussels.”

Those wishing to join the growing protest against the Directives are invited to sign a protest petition which may be found on the Institute’s website. (pipes4organs.org)

Referendums a plea for ‘more Europe’

“We need a European defence, a European army, not just on paper but a force genuinely capable of operating in the field, including beyond the European borders...The philosophy behind all these proposals - economic, political, military - is always the same.

I believe that the citizens’ doubts and uncertainty, as for example reflected in the two referendums, actually constitute a plea for more Europe, a strong Europe, and not for less Europe. And I am also quite clear that I am advocating a more powerful Europe, a more

also closely-integrated Europe... In short I am advocating a United States of Europe.”

Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt speaking at the London School of Economics on the 21st March 2006.

Continued from P,1

Social Europe: How it fails the poorest

Bleak Futures

One of the many ironies in the present situation is that the casualties of Europe’s social model include the rioters who have engaged in violent protests in the suburbs of Paris and other French cities. By seeking to prevent the introduction of the so-called “youth contract” they are endeavouring to preserve a system which has condemned them to unemployment and bleak economic futures.

Mullally’s conclusion is that the EU should cease justifying flawed social programmes and allow member states to regain responsibility in these areas.

There is, of course, not the slightest prospect that this will happen any more than the EU will respond to the demands that it abandons its protectionist ways. In present circumstances high levels of unemployment make labour market reform less likely rather than more while fears about Europe’s shrinking share of world trade increase the pressures for new protectionist measures, rather than reduce them. If present trends continue – and there is no reason to think they will not – the outlook is bound to be one of increasingly rapid economic decline and worsening social problems made still worse by unfavourable demographic

factors. At the political level, the dangers of mounting civil unrest and authoritarian politics loom frighteningly large.

In this situation by far the biggest favour Britain can do for its EU neighbours is not to hitch its future to a failing economic and social system in the vain hope that it may ameliorate its worst aspects, but to head for the EU door marked exit.

* **Beyond the European Social Model** by Lorraine Mullally, Barry Watts, Paul Stephenson and others, published by Open Europe, available online. (openeurope.org.uk)

Sleepwalking into an EU legal system

To retain its independent status, now is the time for the UK to opt out of the EU's legal and institutional integration

By Norman Blackwell

Three years ago the Prime Minister solemnly vowed he would use the veto to prevent the inclusion of the Charter of Fundamental Rights in the proposed EU Constitution. A year later, having accepted its inclusion as Part II of the Constitution, the Prime Minister then declared that this would, after all, have little impact. Now it is becoming clear that, despite the demise of the Constitution, the Charter - though still never made legally binding - is increasingly being absorbed as a core part of EU law.

This would not matter as much if the Prime Minister was right to imply that the Charter is as innocuous as it sounds. But if it is innocuous how to explain his initial hostility?

Certainly the Charter does indeed duplicate many of the ancient civil rights long-enjoyed by UK subjects under common law. However, it also contains a large number of political aspirations reflected in a wide range of social 'rights'. These social rights included trade union rights and more general rights to education, to health-care, to housing and to benefits. The UK Government has recognised that these rights could result in expensive judgements if they were ever interpreted by the courts in line with EU social market values.

The Charter also includes a plethora of superficially meaningless rights such as the right 'to marry and found a family' (Article II-9), the right for children 'to have such protection and

care as is necessary for their well-being' (Article II-24), or the requirement that 'A high level of environmental protection and the improvement in the quality of the environment must be integrated into the policies of the Union.' (Article II-37). There is very little (if any) area of human and social activity that is not caught under the legal embrace of this Charter.

This is perhaps not surprising. The initial authors made no secret of their intent that the Charter should be no less than a new constitutional framework of civil and social law that would unite the EU under a single jurisdiction.

Political Manifesto

The Charter is, in reality, a political manifesto which enshrines a wide range of social policies as part of the rights of EU citizens. And because it has been developed as part of the governance of the EU it comes under the jurisdiction of the EU institutions including the European Court of Justice whose judgements it is intended to inform. For its part, the European Commission has stated that all new EU legislation is required explicitly to conform to the Charter - claiming authority from an obscure clause in existing treaties.

Given the way that UK courts are in practice inclined to defer to EU court precedents, the Charter could well become part of the governing framework for UK civil law, despite never

having been approved by Parliament. If this happens, not only will the UK have lost its legal independence, but it will also be locked into a legal framework that permanently enshrines the EU social market doctrine into its economic, employment, welfare, education, health, environment and cultural policies.

The development of the European Union is at a crucial point, with strong momentum from the Commission and much of Europe's political leadership to continue the process of integration. To be acceptable to those and other core Eurozone countries, the terms on which such integration will take place are likely to place even more emphasis on reinforcing the EU's social market model.

The way in which the Charter of Fundamental Rights is contributing to that trend is yet another reason for believing that this is the moment at which the UK, if it is to retain its status as an independent nation state, must take the initiative to negotiate a new relationship with other members of the European Union that allows it to opt out of the legal and institutional processes of political integration.

*This article is based on **Sleepwalking into an EU Legal System: How the Charter of Fundamental Rights is being incorporated into British law** by Lord Blackwell, published by the Centre for Policy Studies, available from the June Press price £5.00 plus Postage and Packing, see rear page.*

Another Tory backs withdrawal

As we observed in a previous article ("Time to emerge from the eurosceptic closet" 27th January) the political costs and risks of publicly advocating withdrawal from the EU appear to be diminishing - perhaps as a result of the French and Dutch objection to the Constitution. Until recently only one Conservative

MP, the plain-talking member for Shipley, Philip Davies, has publicly called for Britain to pull out. Now a second Tory MP, Douglas Carswell, the Member for Harwich has backed withdrawal. Although he does not actually use the 'W' word he says in a letter to *The Spectator* (25th March 2006) "Leaving the EU would not just

make us freer; it would make us richer, too."

eurofacts regards Mr Carswell's words as tantamount to a demand for Britain to pull out of the European Union and looks forward to adding other parliamentary names to this all too brief list of those with the courage of their eurosceptic convictions.

Strasbourg and Brussels

(With apologies to Sweet Molly Malone)

By John Culverwell

In Brussels' fair city where the EU
sits so pretty,
I first set my eyes on a Eurocrat
clone,
And she wielded some powers that
used to be ours
Til we tossed them away with the
Treaty of Rome.
She is a great sponger and sure to no
wonder,
Her colleagues are all just the same.
They all wield those powers that used
to be ours
Before we got timid and tame.
It's hard to describe them without
being rude,
Red tape is the product they freely
extrude.
By the edicts they issue fair trade is
afflicted
And poor nations' prospects severely

restricted.
On the fat of the land lives the
Eurocrat Band
And the Gravy Train runs at full
steam.
Not for them the poor food of an
African's bread.
The Clones live on the honey and
cream.
They can only be sacked for blowing
the gaff
And telling the world the accounts are
all naff.
But they regulate this then subsidise
that
The handouts they hand out are
financed by VAT.
Where Hitler has failed, the Clones
have prevailed
With the help of our legislators.
By these deeds of disgrace our MPs

have lost face
And can only be thought of as
traitors.
They seek to enslave us (only UKIP
can save us)
It's all a set part of the Eurocrats'
aim.
They are parasites all and they've got
us in thrall
And they don't know the meaning of
shame.
The Clones, we abhor them, we didn't
vote for them
If they think they are wanted the
answer is NO!
But due to their muscles in
Strasbourg and Brussels
They thrive, they thrive-O.

Have a pint – by kind permission of the EU

Lord Pearson of Rannoch asked Her Majesty's Government: Whether pint and half-pint measures in United Kingdom licensed premises are to be compulsorily replaced by metric measures; if so, when; and under which European Union legal statute. [HL 3573]

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department of Trade and Industry (Lord Sainsbury of Turville): The Government have no such proposals. The use of pint mea-

sures in connection with the service of draught beer and cider, and of delivery of milk in returnable containers, continues to be **permitted** (our bolding) by EC legislation on units of measurement (Council Directive 80/181/EEC as amended by Directive 89/617/EEC)

Parliamentary Copyright, Hansard, 26th Jan 2006

Note the cunning government response, which implies that it's up to

the British government to "make proposals". The reality is that if Brussels wants to replace pints and half pints in the UK it has the power to do so: the British government has no say in the matter. In a further Written Answer [to HL 4169 on the 3rd March 2006], the government admitted that the Commission's proposals to ban the sale of pre-packaged milk in pints will be taken in the Council of Ministers by Qualified Majority Voting.

EU gun police to hunt suspects in UK?

Armed police from other EU countries would be able to chase criminals or terrorist suspects in Britain and detain them under plans being considered by the Government, according to a report in the *Daily Telegraph* on 27th March.

The Home Office is looking at the implications of adopting the hot pursuit provisions of the Schengen agreement which removed internal frontiers throughout much of mainland Europe. Britain considered adopting the hot pursuit provisions earlier, but aban-

doned the idea when Ireland refused to participate, thus rendering any deal pointless. In the past British police chiefs have made it clear that they did not want foreign police to carry firearms on British soil.

Easter publishing arrangements.

The next issue of *eurofacts* (Vol 11 No 14) will appear on the 28th April 2006.

French simply don't care for Capitalism

A fascinating survey casts interesting light on French efforts to block all serious attempts at EU economic reform

Last June, July and August an international polling organisation, GlobalScan, on behalf of the University of Maryland, carried out a twenty-country survey of attitudes to the free-market economy. Rich as well as poor countries were surveyed, the sample in each being one thousand.

The question asked was very straightforward: *Is the free-market economy the best system for the future?* The results are shown in the table.

These results highlight the reality (uncomfortable for those who believe the way to cure poverty is to throw money at it) that belief in the market economy is strongly-held even in poor countries in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

The polls also demonstrate that the French are more "communist" even than the Russians: fewer French people are for the proposition that the market-economy is the best way forward than Russians, and more French people are against than the Russians.

The results show the enormous - some would say insuperable - hurdle that those who claim the EU can be "reformed" have to overcome. The reality in France is that a majority of the population believes in socialism; and a proportion of that majority believes in communism, even if they wouldn't call it that ("anti-globalisation" is just one of the euphemisms they use). No matter who becomes the next President of France a year from now: Madame Ségolène

Royal, the current (Socialist) favourite, or Nicolas Sarkozy (the front-runner of what passes for the "right" in France), or even Jean-Marie Le Pen (not impossible), he or she will have to deal with an electorate that viscerally distrusts capitalism and - despite all the evidence to the contrary - relies on the State for its security and prosperity. This is no temporary phenomenon: it dates from the mists of French history, from the era of Colbert at least.

in the past, but French ideas will prevail. At the very least, France will continue to block all serious attempts at EU economic reform - witness its recent success in taking Blair to the cleaners over the future EU Budget, the evisceration of the Bolkestein Directive, its unilateral withdrawal (with its protectionism of French national champions) from one of the founding principles of the Treaty of Rome (that of freedom of movement of capital) its blocking of the Doha Round of world trade talks, and so on.

Let not our readers interpret this article as an attack on France. The point is not whether one agrees or disagrees with French policies or French world-views. The point is that those in Britain who profess that "British ideas are gaining ground in the EU" or that "the EU is reformable" are living in fantasy-land. The hard, unavoidable, stark truth is that British ideas and French ideas are far apart - as they have been, thankfully, for centuries. If Europe is to have a future, then independent sovereign nation-states are the best way to accommodate

the legitimate different perceptions of the world prevailing in different countries. The British world-view is no more valid than the French, or the Slovenian, or Maltese world-view; so let those countries (and others) pursue their destinies as independent sovereign nation-states.

Rank	Country	Agree	Disagree
1	China	74	20
2	Philippines	73	22
3	USA	71	24
4=	South Korea	70	19
4=	India	70	17
6	Indonesia	68	29
7	UK	67	27
8	Nigeria	66	29
9=	Canada	65	29
9=	Germany	65	32
11=	Spain	63	28
11=	Poland	63	19
13	Mexico	61	38
14=	Italy	59	31
14=	Kenya	59	25
16	Brazil	55	30
17	Turkey	47	36
18	Russia	43	34
19	Argentina	42	29
20	France	36	50

An EU without the UK is definitely thinkable (and, contrary to what British politicians would have us believe, many on the Continent are currently thinking just that). An EU without France is quite unthinkable. France will thus continue to shape the EU in its own image: less easily it is true than

The logic of EU integration

"The Monnet System is to create situations from which the only way out is to increase the amount of supranationali-

ty. Each new difficulty drags us into a machine which pushes us a bit further into a federal state and disenfranchises

national governments a bit further." Charles de Gaulle, quoted by Alain Peyrefitte in *C'était de Gaulle*.

LETTERS

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

ID Cards: the Hidden Dangers

Dear Sir,
Your article on ID cards (24th March) served as a good reminder as to why we can't trust governments in general and this one in particular.

However, whilst ID cards do have wide-ranging uses with spying on citizens as a key element, you didn't mention their real benefit to government (EU government, that is) in that it provides the means by which an EU-wide citizens' tax can be introduced.

As you correctly pointed out, the (EU) government will have the power to prevent the use of your bank account and credit cards and, by extension, the ability to stop you shopping for groceries. Most people might not care that governments and corporations might know what type of bread they eat or when and how much money they take from a bank account because they may have fallen for the old cliché 'If you haven't done anything wrong, you've got nothing to fear.'

What most people will not accept however is an EU citizens' tax which thanks to the Legislative and Regulatory Bill the EU will be able to slip in by the back door with absolutely no debate in parliament. Some will rush to point out that tax is excluded in this legislative nightmare but I would respectfully suggest that they should remember that we are dealing with the EU and such exclusions can only ever be temporary. And besides an EU wide citizen-tax would never be identified as such... it would be introduced under the auspices of a health and safety benefit i.e. an entitlement to EU-wide health treatment, or suchlike. An EU 'Extra benefits abroad' card sounds about right to pull the wool over peoples' eyes. And the extra benefits abroad card (EBA) at just £10 per year would be sold as the bargain of the decade, with any suggestion that this might increase to £1000 in due course being poo-pooed as paranoia.

Meanwhile, we Brits will blithely go on believing that our taxes will somehow remain immune from the meddling of Brussels. Silly us.
ROGER HAYES
Merseyside

China's hidden protectionist trade barrier

Dear Sir,
Your leading, article *eurofacts* 10th March 2006, in doubting China's dumping practice, misses the point! As the blessed St. Enoch taught us, an artificially low exchange rate is equivalent to a protectionist trade barrier or tariff.

Recall that after WWII, because of the detrimental Bretton Woods Agreement of fixed exchange rates opposed by the UK representative John Maynard Keynes, both Germany and Japan built up trade surpluses. Denominated in world currencies, this lowered their export prices and increased the apparent cost of imports denominated in their own currencies, compared with those occurring, had their own currencies been freely convertible (allowed to float). Britain suffered particularly badly from this arrangement to the extent that we had a saying about "winning the war but losing the peace".

Now, China is similarly being allowed, by the International Community, to hold its exchange rate artificially low. If the UK were free to do so (i.e. not in the Customs Union that is the EU) it could take the matter to the WTO in its own right. That body could then decide if China's trade policy was illiberal and if necessary remove her benefits of belonging to it.

Of course, the EU is itself free to do this but hasn't, preferring instead to level a dubious (as your article explains) charge of dumping against her. Obliging the yuan to float, the rest of the world would still benefit from lower prices of Chinese goods, though to a lesser degree, but without there being unfair competition with extant manufacturers. Such a solution accords

with Pareto's Principle where no-one loses from an alteration in the economic scene!

JOHN S CHURCHILL
Gloucestershire

A lot to answer for?

Dear Sir,
Richard Clements finishes his letter to *eurofacts* (24th March) with the words "UKIP and Veritas have a lot to answer for."

I can only conclude that he is a typical Conservative Party supporter who thinks all UKIP and Veritas supporters should have voted for so-called Eurosceptic Conservative Candidates in the last General Election.

For those of us that are genuine EU-phobes there is never going to be a time when we will vote Conservative unless there is a definitive policy statement by the party leader together with a detailed manifesto describing the intended method of disentangling the United Kingdom from the European Union. Even then many of us will not fully trust the Tories to fulfill their promises. That is the point. Nobody trusts the Tories anymore. And for just reason: the Treaty of Rome, the European Communities Act, the Single European Act, the Treaty on European Union (Maastricht) and John Major's sly imposition of EU Metrication Directives to name but a few 'nasties' the Tories have perpetrated on the British people. And even in the present day, no Tory Candidate would dare say on TV or radio that he would support a policy of a friendly British pull-out from the EU. So there you have it! EU-phobes had nothing to loose by voting for UKIP or Veritas, (now moribund), because when it comes to the crunch, Tories are no different from Labour or the Liberal Democrats and cannot be trusted with our country's future.

The Conservatives have a lot to answer for.

DEREK NORMAN
Norfolk

MEETINGS

Marlborough Group
01672 515 275

Sunday **9th April 2006**, 2.00 pm

Harry Beckhough

PUBLIC MEETING

The Bear, High Street, Marlborough,
Wiltshire

Admission Free

Freedom Association
07979 695611

Tuesday **11th April 2006**, 12.30 pm

Nigel Farage MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

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

Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(South Manchester Branch)
0161 485 3818

Tuesday **11th April**, 8.00 pm

“The Myth of Europe”

Lynn Riley

PUBLIC MEETING

The County Hotel, Dairyground Road,
Bramhall, Cheshire

Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Tuesday **25th April**, 7.00 pm

Christopher Booker, *Journalist and
author of numerous books, the latest one
is “The Great Deception”*

**The Rt Hon the Lord Tebbit of
Chingford**, *Former Chairman of
Conservative Party*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Oak Room, Kettners, 29 Romilly
Street, Soho, London W1D 5HP

Admission £10

Payable on the door or in advance
(Includes, wine, juice, water and nibbles)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **25th April 2006**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and change: Prime
Ministers in the post-war world -
Thatcher”

Professor Keith Middlemas

PUBLIC MEETING

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

Campaign for an Independent Britain
020 8340 0314

Saturday **29th April 2006**, 2.30 pm

“Better Off Out”

Roger Helmer MEP, *Conservative*
John Midgley, *Co-founder of the
Campaign Against Political Correctness*
Doug Nicholls, *Secretary of Trade
Unionists Against the European
Constitution and General Secretary of
Community and Youth Workers Union*
Chairman, **Lord Stoddart of Swindon**

PUBLIC MEETING

Upper Hall, The Emmanuel Centre, 9-
23 Marsham Street, London SW1

Admission Free

Tough Talking From The Right
0208 691 7495

Friday **5th May**, 7.00 pm

“Defending our liberties and freedoms”

Roger Helmer MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

Upstairs Function Room, The Clarence,
4 Dover Street, Mayfair, London

Admission £17.50 by ticket

(Includes glass of wine)

British Weights & Measures Ass.
020 8922 0089

Saturday **6th May**, 2.00 pm

Speakers to be announced

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Victory Services Club, Trafalgar Room,
63 Seymour Street, London W2

Admission £5.00

(Lunch facilities available at the club)

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020 7219 3000

Thursday **20th April 2006**, 4.00 pm
Evidence will be heard by The BBC
Charter Review Committee from the Rt
Hon Tessa Jowell MP, Secretary of State
for Culture, Media and Sport.

Tuesday **25th April 2006**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard by The Science
and Technology Committee from (a) Mr
Nick Poole, Director, Museum
Documentation Association; Mrs Helen
Shenton, Head of Collection Care, British
Library; Mrs Nancy Bell, Head of
Conservation Research, Dr David
Thomas, Director of Government and
Technology, The National Archives; and
the Natural History Museum and the
Science Museum.

Wednesday **3rd May 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The
Consequences of the European Court of
Justice’s judgement in Case C 176/03-*
from Mr Richard Plender QC.

Tuesday **9th May 2006**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard by The Science
and Technology Committee from Sir Neil
Cossons, Chairman, Mr John Fidler,
Conservation Director, English Heritage
and Mr Chris Batt, Chief Executive, the
Museums, Libraries and Archives
Council.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2006

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

UK Independence Party **7-8th October**
Annual Conference
Telford

2007

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

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

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

The European Question and the National Interest

by *Jeremy Black*. **£16.99**

A leading historian's interpretation of Britain's relations with EU/EC/EEC.

Sleepwalking into an EU Legal System: How the Charter of Fundamental Rights is being incorporated into British law

by *Lord Blackwell*. **£5.00**

The title explains the story.

The Great Deception:

Can the European Union survive

by *Christopher Booker*. **£9.99**

This is the latest version (Nov 2005) of this comprehensive history of 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 to the conclusion that withdrawal from the EU is the only way forward.

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.

Resolving the European Crisis

Perspectives on the future of the EU.

Edited by *Paul Jervis*. **£9.99**

Authors include; Daniel Hannan MEP, Ruth Lea, Lord Pearson, John Redwood MP and Gisela Stuart MP.

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 impact of divergent national cultures.

The 2006 Essential Guide to the European Union

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.

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.

The Benefits of Tax Competition

by *Richard Teather*. **£12.50**

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

Video

Britain On The Brink

by *Sanity*. *DVD or VHS Video* **£5.00**

Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

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**

euofacts

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 *euofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....
to *euofacts*: **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	08705 900 200
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	0121 333 7737
Roger Knapman MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

