

Hague speech on Europe fails to satisfy eurosceptics

The Tory foreign affairs spokesman offers a firm commitment on the EPP but fails to deal with concerns about the ongoing process of European political integration

What is to be made of William Hague's 7th June speech on Europe - the party's first major pronouncement on the subject since David Cameron became leader? The best thing that might be said about it is that it was not as bad as the *Daily Telegraph* said it would be.

Hague did not renege on the party's promise that Conservative MEPs would leave the European Peoples Party, as the *Telegraph* claimed he would. Indeed, in answer to a question he gave a specific assurance that it would soon be leaving the EPP. One may criticise the decision to make the party's departure from the grouping conditional on the creation of a new group, but his speech did not represent a weakening of existing policy, such as it is.

In large part, the speech consisted of an account of the present crisis faced by the EU following the French and Dutch rejections of the Constitution, an outline of the EU's current defects and a fervent avowal of

hope that EU would become freer, more flexible and accountable. Its tone was consistently eurosceptic but, as might have been predicted, the

criticism was combined with praise for the 'great achievement' of enlargement and the 'conspicuous success' of the Single Market as well a 'strong' commitment to keep Britain in the EU. Much of the speech could have been delivered by Gordon Brown, and

We will be leaving the EPP-ED. It is an unequivocal commitment by David Cameron and it will be implemented. We have added to that a further objective which is not only to leave but to form a new group in the EU parliament. That does of course complicate that goal because it requires the timing of these things to be agreed with a variety of other partners, who occasionally have their disagreements with each other as we have seen in recent days, on entirely unrelated matters. All I can say is that we will be leaving the EPP-ED and forming a new group. And I will be able to say by the end of July how we are going to do that and to announce all the details that you will need to hear about that.

William Hague, Speech to Open Europe, 7th June 2006.

probably has been.

Those who put the unity of the Conservative Party above all other matters might have been relieved by

what Mr Hague had to say. But it was a speech that fell woefully below the challenge of events. What eurosceptics worthy of the description are presently most concerned about is the onward process of political integration that is taking place without any kind of

constitutional or democratic sanction. It is this process which is further eroding sovereignty and which goes a substantial way in the direction of completing a unitary European state. This is a vastly more important matter, than whether Conservative MEPs should continue to sit with arch-federalists in the European Parliament and it is this matter which requires urgent remedies. But Mr Hague, who gave the impression of being unfazed by the onward march of events - or perhaps just unaware of them - did not offer any. He merely expressed the view that there was now a better chance of EU reform than before - a claim which has been

made repeatedly over the last two decades - but which has never been borne out by events.

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: MEP backs UK withdrawal from EU p.2 - Why immigration can lower living standards and hurt the lowest paid p.3 - What has happened to democracy p.4 - Pan-european vote 'best way to save Constitution' p.4 - Vote until you get it right - Giscard p.4 - Beckett blocks transparency initiative p.5 - Council elections boost UKIP confidence p.5

Hague fails to satisfy eurosceptics

Unless accompanied by a credible description of how this is to be accomplished the assurance that a Conservative government would work to bring about a more flexible and accountable EU that does less falls a long way short of what is required. There is both the need for a credible alternative vision to present arrangements and a strategy for achieving this. But when asked how the Conservatives would aim to get agreement on the repatriation of powers Mr Hague replied *"We are not going to advocate withdrawal from the EU. Three years before an election, four years probably before an election if we continue to do well up to 2010, you can't expect me to spell out a negotiating strategy for the next Conservative government"*.

Earlier Lord Blackwell, the chairman of the Centre for Policy Studies asked Mr Hague: *"You have made a strong argument for why Europe needs to reform, but you have also recognised that there are other visions for the future of Europe which will make it difficult to agree a common way forward. Does your concept of a 'flexible Europe' encompass the possibility that, in that situation, Britain may need to negotiate changes to the Treaties that allow it to opt out of the institutional and legal structures of European integration?"*

Mr Hague replied that the objective was to win the debate 'over the long term' but there was a fresh opportunity to change the treaties. *"I don't want them changed before people are ready for that direction,"* he added, which

seemed to summon up the unlikely vision of a Conservative government trying to stifle its own eurosceptic instincts until the people had caught up with it.

Mr Hague's words confirm that in seeking revisions to the existing treaties a Conservative government would rely only on persuasion.

Asked whether it wouldn't be a good idea to allow the British people the opportunity to say whether they wished to remain in the EU Mr Hague replied: *"It would be very strange if Britain was a passionate advocate of bringing new countries into the EU but of leaving itself. I cannot reconcile that in my mind"*. This reply seemed to suggest that despite all its many failings Britain should remain in the EU in order to express solidarity with Bulgaria.

The need to anchor the new applicants - especially Turkey - firmly to the West is obvious. What is not so obvious that this can only be done by encouraging them to join the EU - with or without Britain as a member. According to Mr Hague the cost of denying the present applicants membership would be greater corruption, populism, authoritarianism and criminality; the new members would also be denied important new economic opportunities. Can Mr Hague not have noticed that corruption and criminality are alive and well in the EU, and that while EU membership may well offer new members exciting new opportunities in these areas, legitimate economic opportunities are not obviously superior to those

outside? Moreover, while applicant states are expected to reach given levels of democratic accountability before they may join, no such standards are required of the EU itself.

Nor does Mr Hague appear to be on firm ground when he talks of the advantages which he believes derive from 'conspicuous success' of the Single Market. Its completion, an outcome for which Conservative politicians regularly pray, is as likely as the early dismantling of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). Its presumed benefits have never been examined, while businessmen complain that its not working on the ground. It is ruled by a complex and ever expanding harmonised economic regulations. If Britain suffers from low economic growth as the result of EU membership - as even the Chancellor now accepts - why should the first priority of a Tory government be the completion of a policy which can only limit Britain's growth potential?

Mr Hague showed no inclination to grapple with these questions or move beyond the familiar Tory rhetoric; for some time there has been a flaccid quality and a lack of intellectual rigour about Conservative thinking on policy, not least on Europe. Perhaps this is the consequence of abandoning principle and a distinctive Tory way of looking at the world; in any event, Mr Hague's speech gave little reason for thinking that a future Tory government would find the intellectual and moral resources to establish a new relationship with Europe that better reflects national interests.

MEP backs UK withdrawal from EU

"After nearly seven years in the European parliament, I have now reached the firm view that Britain would be better off out of the EU. There is simply no benefit of membership, at all, that could not be achieved through a normal treaty between independent nations, without having to out-source our governance

to Brussels. The EU damages our prosperity, undermines our democracy, and increasingly threatens our national security.

"I appreciate that this view goes somewhat beyond current Party policy, but it is a view shared by many East Midlands Conservatives. At a time when the Party is undertaking an

extensive policy review, it is important that the withdrawal option should be on the table. So far, all the talk of renegotiation and repatriation has got us nowhere."

Roger Helmer MEP announcing his support for the Better Off Out Campaign in London on the 29th April 2006.

Why immigration can lower living standards and hurt the lowest paid

Anthony Scholefield takes issue with current attitudes towards the economic impact of immigration

Eurofacts' leading article "Should Britain admit a new wave of EU immigrants?" (26th May) makes many relevant points, but it also repeats some of the more questionable claims advanced by Tony Blair on this subject.

If there is to be an informed debate on the issue the argument that the arrival of Eastern Europeans 'undeniably brings a number of economic benefits' needs to be exposed to critical scrutiny. In particular we need to examine very carefully the claim that the immigration relieves labour shortages and pressure on pay levels and thus contributes to economic growth while helping to ease inflation.

Reduced Productivity

Tony Blair stated in his CBI speech in April 2004 that '*according to the Treasury, our economic growth rate would be almost 0.5 per cent lower for the next two years if net migration ceased*'. So what? Immigration increases the size of the labour force and must, therefore, increase the size of national income. But what matters is income per head and most of the extra income generated by immigration by necessity accrues to immigrants.

Economic theory suggests that mass immigration of labour without capital equipment must reduce productivity and, therefore, income per head. It should be noted that Britain's growth in total GDP in 2005 was 1.75 per cent but the number of Eastern European immigrants alone was about 200,000; on top of this there were a further 100,000 working immigrants from elsewhere, so total immigration amounted to at least 1 per cent of the British workforce of 30 million. Thus, the real growth in the economy is only 0.75 per cent. It is time eurosceptics woke up to the fact that a good deal of recent British 'growth' is simply the

consequence of a larger workforce.

The argument, also made by Tony Blair in his CBI speech, that '*there are half a million vacancies in our job market and our strong and growing economy needs migration to fill these vacancies*' betrays ignorance about how labour markets work. Since he made that speech there have been well over half a million immigrants - but there are still half a million vacancies.

This is understandable since immigration creates as many new jobs as it fills. Immigrants are not only workers, but also consumers and so add to demand. The fallacy perpetrated by Mr Blair - and apparently accepted by *eurofacts* - rests on the 'lump of labour' fallacy; the idea that there's a fixed amount of work to be done.

How does a free labour market work? The supply and demand for labour tends towards balance through the mechanism of fluctuating wages. As Professor E.J. Mishan remarked '*this policy of importing labour in order to meet an emergent shortage in any occupation, however, overlooks the fact that in any properly functioning economy, continual changes in the pattern of demand and supply unavoidably create initial shortages in the supply of some goods and an excess supply of other goods - and, therefore, a shortage of labour in some occupations and an excess in others. Yet the market economy is able to cope. ... through adjustments to the prices of labour in the affected occupations*'.

Or, as Dr Michael Teitelbaum put it in evidence to the USA Congress, '[To attract] *native workers, the employer may have to increase his wage offer. ... so when you hear an employer saying he needs immigrants to fill a 'labour shortage', remember what you are hearing is a cry ... to allow the employer to avoid the normal functioning of the market*'.

Mr Blair takes it for granted that immigration is a good thing because

British workers are unwilling to do many of the jobs on offer *at the wages on offer*.

All these efforts to get workers at below their true market rate must involve either maintaining a permanent helot class of people paid below their market rate or involve further immigration to fill low paid jobs as the previous batch of immigrants try to move up the wage scale.

Cheap Labour

As Peter Lilley put in his CPS pamphlet, "Too much of a good thing": '*It is amazing that a Labour government should be prepared to use the reserve army of Third World labour to depress the living standards of the lowest paid British workers to provide cheap labour for the better off*'.

It is also amazing that the Church of England, the Conservative Party (which, in its 2005 Manifesto wittered on about how immigration results in 'economic vibrancy') and the Lib Dems should all applaud a state of affairs which damages the worst paid workers in Britain.

There is a further point in which is often overlooked. Immigrants to Britain come without capital equipment or capital backing. (This, of course, did not apply to European immigrants to the New World or, for that matter, Han-Chinese moving to Tibet.) This means that there are more workers for the same amount of capital in existence and, therefore, that output per head must be lower. Immigration reduces Britain's capital-labour ratio and, therefore, its per capita real income. No wonder we are falling behind the Germans. For a long time a portion of the country's savings must be absorbed in providing capital equipment for the newcomers. Furthermore, immigrants - and this especially applies to those from

Continued on P.4

Immigration can lower living standards

Eastern Europe - are here to send money back home. This means that they are depleting savings in Britain and they are providing little or no contribution to forming the capital equipment that is necessary to bring the capital-labour ratio up to the level prior to their arrival. Over a long period and this may include generations, the savings and capital formation in the UK among immigrants may approach the level of the British and then will grow in line with the British rate. But at any future date Britain's capital-labour ratio will certainly be smaller than it would be in the total absence of immigration. As one would expect, the Bank of England now confirms slowing productivity growth (*Quarterly Bulletin*, Spring 2004) which arises from this basic point.

The only situation in which these arguments would not apply would be

one in which machinery was standing idle for lack of workers. With its high hidden and actual unemployment, this is not Britain's position.

Finally, one should say a few words about the effect on the finite economic factor - land. This will rise in price as population increases. This affects house prices and goods' prices generally which entails a reduction in per capita income together with environmental degradation and pressure on water and amenities. This is already evident in South East England. It is worth being a land owner under Labour.

There are no good reasons for stating that, in a perfect market economy, the mass immigration of workers without capital increases average GDP per head but plenty for thinking that it reduces it while redistributing income away from labour to capital and land. Even Mark Kleinman, for the left-

leaning IPPR, has stated '*There is not a compelling long-term case for increased immigration in terms of economic benefits*'.

The 1985 Canadian Royal Commission summed it up '*The broad consensus ... is that high levels of immigration will increase aggregate variables such as labour force, investment and real gross income but cause ... real wages to decline*'. On the distribution of income, the Home Office report of 2001 "Migration: an economic and social analysis" put it: '*In general, immigration increases the supply of labour. This is likely, in theory, to reduce wages for workers competing with migrants, and increase the returns to capital and other factors complementary to migrant labour*'. Maybe the Home Office got it right for once.

What has happened to democracy?

It is indeed its fatal lack of democracy which is the EU's Achilles heel. We need to remember that the EU was never intended by its founders to be a democratic organisation. It was always intended to have civil servants rather than elected politicians holding the real power. That is why, now just as much as fifty years ago when the first institutions which have transformed themselves into the EU were established, it is only civil servants in the Commission, not elected politicians, who can propose

legislation. Unfortunately, the EU, like every other organisation, is not immune to the influence that power without accountability always has on inducing and encouraging policies among those in power which suit their immediate advancement. The result is that they lose touch with those they are supposed to be representing, while self-seeking behaviour at best and corruption and fraud at worst steadily become more endemic. The way that the Constitution is being implemented without democratic consent is all part

of this pattern, for the new policies that are being put in place hugely increase the power, influence and rewards of those who are in charge of EU policies. The reason that these policies are going ahead is not because they are what most people in the EU Member States want to see being done. It is because those who run the EU are in a position to pursue them, to their own advantage, irrespective of democratic opinion which they believe they can safely ignore. Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign Bulletin, May issue.

Pan-european vote 'best way to save Constitution'

The head of the outgoing Austrian EU presidency, Chancellor Wolfgang Schussel, has urged member states to back plans for a pan-European referendum as the best means to revive

the stranded EU constitution.

In an interview with Germany's *Bild am Sonntag*, Mr Schussel said "I can well imagine a referendum that takes place simultaneously in all EU states.

The constitution would be accepted if the majority of the European population and a majority of states approve it".

Vote until you get it right - Giscard

"Manipulators tell you: 'We cannot vote again'. What is this joke? We have to vote again until the French see what the stakes are", Giscard D'Estaing, Agence Presse, 12th June, 2006

Beckett blocks transparency initiative

In halting measures to throw open ministerial meetings Mrs Beckett is being perfectly rational - the EU could not long survive full transparency

In earlier issues we have suggested that in common with most other EU institutions the European Council could not survive the full glare of public scrutiny. If meetings were thrown open to the public it would not be possible for every Minister to march in turn to the rostrum in order to describe the deal just struck as a triumph for the folk back home and his or her own remarkable powers of negotiation. For that reason we doubted whether measures to introduce greater transparency to ministerial meetings would ever get off the ground.

Nevertheless, the former Foreign Secretary Jack Straw, the Chancellor Gordon Brown and the Prime Minister have all made speeches about the need for greater transparency (although doing nothing to bring this about during the recent British presidency). However, earlier this year all of the British parties represented in the European Parliament signed up to a demand for greater transparency - the first occasion which they had joined forces on an EU issue. However, it has been Austria, not Britain which pressed most strongly for openness and backed

up its demand with practical proposals. Which EU country, one pondered, would be the first to stand in its way. The wily French? The Belgians? The Greeks?

No, the answer is the UK. Earlier this month the British Foreign Secretary Margaret Beckett announced that she has had second thoughts about transparency.

"We are not entirely convinced that the proposal on the table [this would have thrown all ministerial meetings open to the press] will give us the balance between efficiency and the sort of openness we are looking for", a spokeswoman for Mrs Beckett announced.

Well, what sort of transparency does Mrs Beckett want? If the word means what the Oxford Dictionary says it means - 'open, candid, ingenuous' - there can be only one kind. Evidently Mrs Beckett is looking for something rather different, something altogether more opaque and disingenuous.

Our EU partners obviously found Mrs Beckett and her evident sense of embarrassment highly amusing.

"How can you not be in favour?" asked an incredulous French spokesman (*FT* 7th June), while one

senior EU ambassador declared himself to be "amazed".

No one should be surprised by the British decision to try to keep the public in the dark about the EU's decision-making processes. The UK government has more to lose than other governments if full transparency is achieved, for the simple reason that Britain gets a worse economic deal than most other EU countries and this has recently grown worse as a result of the partial surrender of the British rebate. Anything that educates opinion about the realities of British membership is likely to be bad news for europhiles. Second, Britain probably has more eurosceptics than any other country; nothing is more likely to stir them into action than television coverage of British ministers following the time-honoured practice of surrendering British interests in the higher cause of EU political integration. It is easy to deplore Mrs Beckett's remarks - indeed they *should* be deplored - but she is being far more rational than Mr Blair, Mr Straw, and Mr Brown. She may be in favour of deceiving the British public; Blair, Straw and Brown are also guilty of deceiving themselves.

Council elections boost UKIP confidence

It is easy to read too much into by-election results but recent progress of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) in local by-elections may suggest that David Cameron has over-estimated the value of the green vote - and has erred in dismissing UKIP supporters as loonies, eccentrics and racists.

For obvious reasons European issues do not normally have much salience at local government elections but at a by-election in Wellingborough, in Northampton on the 1st June Tony Ellwood, the UKIP candidate won 11.7 per cent of the vote - more than double

the votes received by the Green Party.

At a by-election in Suffolk on the 8th June Ian Smith, the UKIP candidate did even better, winning 14.9 per cent of the total vote and knocking Labour (11 per cent) and the Lib-Dems (5.9 per cent) into third and fourth places respectively despite the fact that UKIP came last when the seat was last contested in 2005.

The results will no doubt hearten Nigel Farage who has been adopted as the UKIP parliamentary candidate for the Bromley and Chislehurst by-election following the sad and premature death of Eric Forth, one of

eight Conservative MPs who recently announced their support for the Better Off Out (BOO) Campaign

The second piece of good news for Farage is the Bromley and Chislehurst have chosen as their candidate Bob Neil who is pro EU and an enthusiast for EU-style regional government. Neil is obviously the favourite but the intervention of Farage, a local man and a highly effective campaigner, means that the Tory candidate is very likely to receive a reduced share of the vote - hardly the result Tory strategists have been hoping for.

LETTERS

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

A Reply to Batten

Dear Sir,

Since the launch of the Better Off Out campaign (www.betteroffout.co.uk) in April, we have brought together thousands of anti-EU activists, members of the public and politicians in stating clearly that we believe that Britain would prosper better outside the European Union and should leave.

In doing so not only have we distributed a quarter of a million leaflets and appeared prominently in the media, we have also provided a non-partisan platform that is acceptable to Eurorealists from all quarters, including Ruth Lea, Tom Utley, Lord Weatherill, Nigel Farage MEP and nine Conservative MPs. Against clear warnings of the damage to their careers from David Cameron, these MPs have put their principles above their personal interest and have placed their views clearly on the record. The Better Off Out commitment is a clear and simple one of belief that we should leave the EU: perfect, one would hope, for identifying our allies.

Given the progress we have made, and the clarity of the commitment given by our supporters, Gerard Batten MEPs re letter in *eurofacts* (9th June) surprised me. The kamikaze strategy of opposing even the Better Off Out MPs can only harm the anti-EU cause. For example, Philip Davies MP, who has been instrumental in rallying support for us, has a majority of only 422, won his seat in 2005 when he was not opposed by UKIP. If he was to be opposed, it would probably cost him his seat and let in a pro-EU Labour MP. Does Mr Batten really think that this would provide the best service to the future of our country? Whilst I am not a member of any party, it is clear to me that UKIP has achieved an awful lot in recent years; surely the next step ought to be the ousting of europhiles, rather

than those on our own side?

MARK WALLACE

Campaign Manager,
Better Off Out

How Do You Convince UKIP?

Dear Sir,

Gerard Batten writes that "*Anyone voting UKIP will know exactly what they are getting*".

Yes, but sadly they will also know what they will not be getting, which is a UKIP candidate elected to the Westminster Parliament under first past the post.

Meanwhile, the EU project rolls on, any Parliamentary resistance can only come from the more patriotic MPs in the main parties, and the most useful contribution which UKIP can make is to create a strong Darwinian selection pressure in favour of such patriotism.

Apparently the Tory candidate in Bromley and Chislehurst is a fervent supporter of the EU. It would be a timely warning shot across the bows of the Tory leadership if he lost the seat through the intervention of UKIP, so good luck to Nigel Farage in that contest.

But suppose instead that the Tory candidate had subscribed to "Better Off Out". What else would he have to do to convince UKIP of his sincerity? Write out a pledge in his own blood, and hand over his children as hostages?

Dr D R COOPER
Berkshire

Eurorealism's Achievements

Dear Sir,

Tony Stone's sweeping dismissal of the 'dismal non-achievements' of eurorealism's various cross-party and pressure groups (letters, 9th June) cannot be borne out by the facts.

Tens of thousands of eurorealists choose such organisations as the primary means to spread our ideas and encourage public action towards achieving them. This is both because more people can work together under such banners to build the necessary pressure for change, and because their information is far more likely to be

trusted by the public than that from any political party or politician.

The last eight years of eurorealist campaigning have seen undoubted successes such as fighting off the threat to the pound, forcing the pledge of a referendum on the EU Constitution and building majority opposition to that plan. These achievements can in no way be attributed to political parties alone, particularly when pressure groups have been campaigning hard on the streets up and down the country and distributing literally millions of pieces of literature.

Obviously these recent achievements don't go nearly as far as many eurorealists would like. The EU Constitution has far from gone away and there is clearly much more yet to do. But they have been steps in the right direction.

What would be more helpful is greater realism about what we expect to see happen, and when. The EU is a massive political issue with, today, influence in almost every area of national life. Trying to engage a majority of the public on the whole of that issue at once is a near impossible task. Certainly those expecting a quick or 'big bang' solution are being completely unrealistic and doom themselves to eternal depression about eurorealism's progress.

STUART COSTER
Campaign Manager
Democracy Movement

SOS from Save Britain's Fish

Dear Sir,

Save Britain's Fish needs help. We have produced a booklet exposing the flaws in the Tory party's new policy on fishing. This will be circulated at the Conservative Party conference at Bournemouth. We desperately require helpers on Mon/Tue 2/3rd October.

If you could help during those two days please phone 01751 433039.

JOHN ASHWORTH
Save Britain's Fish

MEETINGS

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **28th June**, 7.00 pm

Frederick Forsyth, *Author and political commentator*

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)

**United Kingdom
Independence Party**
South Manchester Branch
0161 485 3818

Tuesday **11th July**, 8.00 pm

“Honesty in Politics”

Delroy Young, *National Executive Committee Member, UKIP*

PUBLIC MEETING

The County Hotel, Dairyground Road, Bramhall, Cheshire

Admission Free

The Freedom Association
07979 695611

Tuesday **18th July**, 12.30 pm

Douglas Carswell MP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Counting House pub, 50 Cornhill, London EC3V 3PD

Admission Free

Swinton Circle
0208 691 7495

Tuesday **18th July**, 7.00 pm

Meeting and Summer Buffet

Douglas Carswell MP, *Conservative*

PUBLIC MEETING & SUMMER BUFFET

Parliament Room, The Clarence, 53 Whitehall, London SW1

Admission by ticket £15
(includes buffet and wine)

Campaign for an Independent Britain

Dorset Branch
01300 341788

Friday **8th September**, 7.30 pm

“Does membership of the EU benefit the United Kingdom”

Roger Helmer MEP, *Conservative, East Midlands*

Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP,
Conservative, West Dorset

PUBLIC MEETING

Town Hall Corn Exchange, High East Street, Dorchester DT1 1HF

Admission Free

Conservative Party Fringe Meeting Bournemouth

Save Britain's Fish
01224 313473

Tuesday **3rd October**, 6.30 pm

“Why sink the fishing policy”

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

The Cliffside Hotel, East Overcliffe Drive, Bournemouth.

Admission Free

Australian Monarchist League
00 (02) 9327 4582

Friday/Sunday **27/29th October**

“The Queen, the Realms and Europe”

Speakers to be announced

The Rt Hon Lord Tebbit CH to address the Dinner on Friday 27th October

CONFERENCE

The Skempton Building, Imperial College, Kensington, London

Admission £100 (2 day conference)
(Opening Dinner plus £75)

For further details contact Australian Monarchist League, PO Box 1068, Double Bay, NSW 1360 or by Email: secretary@monarchist.org.au

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020 7219 3000

Tuesday **27th June 2006**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Management and Audit of EC Expenditure and Accounts* from Mr Terry Wynn MEP.

Tuesday **27th June 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Further Enlargement of the EU* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **11th July 2006**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Management and Audit of EC Expenditure and Accounts* from Mr Brian Gray, Accounting Officer, European Commission.

Thursday **13th July 2006**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *Current Developments in European Foreign Policy* from The Rt Hon Geoff Hoon MP, Minister for Europe, Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

Tuesday **18th July 2006**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Management and Audit of EC Expenditure and Accounts* from Mr Jules Muis.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2006

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

Liberal Democrats Party **16-21st Sept.**
Annual Conference
Brighton

Labour Party **24-28th September**
Annual Conference
Manchester

Conservative Party **1-4th October**
Annual Conference
Bournemouth

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

2007

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

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.

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.

The Truth They Won't Tell You (And Don't Want You To Know)

About the EU

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£9.99**

A further 269 usefull facts you need to know about the development 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.

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 Referendum Roundabout

by *Kieron O'Hara*. **£8.95**

A lively and sharp critique of the role of referendums in modern British politics, includes the 1975 vote on Europe, devolution, and a possible Constitution.

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

