

EU issues set to return to centre stage

Differences over the Constitution and the electoral timetable mean that Britain's political elite will no longer be able to ignore the question of British membership

Press reports of the EU summit in June indicated a greater degree of unanimity among ministers than may have been the case - especially in regard to the vexed issue of the Constitution. The reports suggested that EU leaders were in one mind in wanting to bring back some or all of the EU Constitution by 2008. It is certainly true that none of those present argued that the Constitution was fundamentally flawed, or that the document should simply be withdrawn. "Not a single head of state or government called into question the substance of the treaty", Austrian Chancellor Wolfgang Schussel said as the meeting closed.

Reform Process

There was also a measure of agreement on a strategy to deal with the on-going crisis brought about by the French and Dutch rejection of the Treaty, as is apparent from the official statement of Presidency Conclusions. This suggested a two-pronged approach:

"On the one hand best use should be made of the possibilities offered by the existing treaties in order to deliver the results that citizens expect. On the other hand, the Presidency will present a report to the European Council during the first semester of 2007, based on extensive consultations with Member States. This report should contain an assessment of the state of discussion with regard to the

Constitution and explore possible future developments. The outcome of this examination will serve as the basis for further decisions on how to continue the reform process, it being understood that the necessary steps to that effect will have to be taken during the second semester of 2008 at the latest. Each Presidency in office since the start of the reflection period has a particular responsibility to ensure the continuity of this process".

In other words the process of integration will continue come what may, but with the exception of the British (who gave the impression of being in a cold funk and of wishing that the issue would go away) it is evident that ministers are still desperate to revive the Constitution. This is because they know that to proceed with the grand project of creating a European state without even a semblance of democratic legitimacy entails high political risks in the longer term. There is, however, considerable disagreement about how this should be achieved; hence the vague words contained in the second part of the passage quoted above.

Cosmetic Change

The Austrian's would like a pan-European referendum with member states voting on the same day - but stand little or no chance of getting one. The Dutch Government, fearing an even bigger no vote than that delivered by the people of the Netherlands a year

ago, want at least some cosmetic changes. Luxembourg has declared that it is "unthinkable" that a different text to the one already ratified by 16 states should be put to a new vote. The Belgians have suggested changing the rules so the Constitution can be adopted by qualified majority voting and also suggested that those dragging their feet on the issue should be subjected to what amounts to systematic bullying. The Germans are adamant that the Constitution must be adopted as it stands and the public must be 'educated' to this unavoidable reality. The French political class evidently wants the French public to re-sit the examination question it flunked last time around but Ségolène Royal the front runner in the presidential stakes wants the document revised in order to stress the EU's 'social character'.

Most Abject of All

Meanwhile, various pro-EU voices have warned that if significant changes are made to the text the complex trade-offs on which the document rests will be undone with the likelihood that the entire enterprise will unravel.

The British position would appear to be the most abject of all. Foreign Office spokesmen have suggested that if the treaty text were merely to be 'tweaked' there would be no need for a referendum. But this position is both extraordinary and unsustainable: if the

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: EU funds a bridge that leads nowhere p.2 - Winemakers will be paid for doing nothing p.3 - Brown 'renews budget battle' p.3 - Review of Corruption - The World's Big C: Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures p.5 - EU threatens the long European peace p.5

EU issues set to return to centre stage

document remains substantially the same (with maybe a new title that doesn't include the 'C' word and a couple of extra appendices thrown in) there could be no even half-credible reason for going back on the Prime Minister's unequivocal commitment to consult the electorate. If on the other hand, there are significant changes to the text (which seems less likely) the case for a referendum in all those countries which promised a plebiscite, including those which have already voted on the existing text, would be equally strong.

Some EU ministers seem more aware of the implications of the British public's hostility to the European constitution and all that it stands for than the British themselves. "It is absolutely possible that the EU will move forward without the British if they reject the Constitution", said the Luxembourg Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker following the summit.

However, Europe Minister and former MEP Geoffrey Hoon, that fearless leader of opinion, has suggested that before a decision about a referendum can be taken there should be a debate on 'Europe' - this one with the aim of encouraging people to 'think Europe'. We are not entirely sure what he means by this but we have lost

count of the number of times British governments have called for a debate 'on Europe. It is an invariable sign that the government wants to stifle discussion on the subject at all cost. But this time domestic political and other factors mean that there will no avoiding one.

While pro-EU elites have so far been able to keep Europe off the agenda, Brown's leadership bid and the electoral timetable make this a near impossibility in the future.

Brown's friends have recently gone to some lengths to convince eurosceptics in and outside the Labour Party of the Chancellor's own increasing euroscepticism (although Open Europe recently reported that he had assured journalists on the *FT* of his growing *enthusiasm* for the EU). His decision to reopen the issue of Britain's budget contribution to the EU (see P.3) suggests that he will continue to talk tough on EU issues. Once he is in possession of the political prize he has sought for so long it is unlikely that he will drop his EU-critical line. Much more importantly, it also seems unlikely that he will wish to seek to deny the British public the opportunity for a vote on a warmed-up constitution with a general election around the corner and the 2009 European

elections in the offing, especially if, as seems likely, both of the other major parties commit to a referendum.

Meanwhile, the result of the by-election at Bromley and Chislehurst has sent an important message to David Cameron about the significance of the anti-EU vote. On issues relating to British nationhood and the threats thereto, Brown and Cameron are now engaged in a kind of shadow-boxing - witness the latter's call for a British Bill of Rights. The conflict is likely to become more real and far-reaching with the passing months.

British euroscepticism has done well at those moments when against the wishes of the pro-EU elites including, of course, the BBC, the issues relating to British membership of the European Union have been forced to the fore - for example during the debate over the euro or during elections to the European Parliament. Circumstances for taking the campaign for British withdrawal from the EU to a new and decisive stage are now more propitious than for many years. Matters are now coming to a head. The long awaited much heralded debate on 'Europe' finally looks like happening. Let the battle commence!

EU funds a bridge that leads nowhere

More than half the funds being handed to Bulgaria and Romania to prepare them from EU entry next year are not being fully used for the intended purpose, according to a damning report from the European Court of Auditors.

The report, presented by Marten Engwirda, a member of the Court, on the 20th June deals with funds paid to the two candidate states under the so-called Phare programme which is supposed to improved administrative efficiency and boost economic competitiveness. The audit covered projects initiated during the period 2000-2004 involving 511 million for Bulgaria and 1.4 billion for Romania.

The report states: "For over half of the investment projects audited, assets

were not, or only partially being used for the intended purpose. Output and results lagged considerably behind schedule, sometimes by up to two years. These were due to the continuing lack of both administrative capacity and national resources".

Among half finished non-functioning or apparently pointless projects highlighted by the report were:

- A 3.1 million bridge linking Romania and Moldova with no access road on the Moldovan side.
- A 1.8 million computer system for the Bulgarian prosecutor's office that included 37 work stations which were kept in store cupboards and never used.
- A newly completed asylum centre with an occupancy rate of 7.6 per

cent.

- The purchase of a fleet of four-wheel Jeeps which the Bulgarian police did not make use of because they preferred the usual fleet of Russian-built vehicles with their less expensive spare parts.
- A Romanian tourism development that contained an empty, degraded Olympic-size swimming pool.

Commission spokesmen were keen to point out that the report did not reveal any cases of fraud. But that should provide little consolation to the taxpayers: once Romania and Bulgaria are admitted - which is expected to happen on the 1st January - they will be eligible for structural funds without any outside supervision.

Winemakers will be paid for doing nothing

Huge sums are to be spent rewarding the producers of mediocre wines

When you sip the frascati you brought back from your summer holiday in Rimini are you instantly reminded of the advantages of shopping for wine at Tesco? If so it may be some consolation to learn that many millions of bottles similar in quality to your ill-judged purchase, along with an even larger quantity of low-quality wine from France, are currently being turned into disinfectant or fuel as part of a "crisis distillation" funded by the EU. Connoisseurs would say there's probably no need; that's precisely what they taste like already.

The scheme will cost 100 million and, in all, 430 million bottles of French wine and 371 million bottles of Italian wine will be distilled.

"Crisis distillations" have become an increasingly common occurrence, with the Commission spending 500 million last year in turning wine into spirit. For years many wine producers have known that their produce will never be drunk; nearly a quarter of Spanish wines end up being used for industrial purposes.

The EU Commission now recognises that this does not make economic sense. If you want to make disinfectant it is not logical to begin the process on the left bank of the Garonne. If you need industrial fuel it's cheaper to buy it from the greediest sheikdom than to distil sub-standard Beaujolais.

The EU Commission has therefore come up with another plan to deal with over-production; it will pay producers to dig up vineyards in order to curb the excess supply that its previous policies

have produced. In other words, instead of being paid to produce wines that no one wants to buy at the market price winemakers will be paid to do nothing at all, except, that is, to ensure that their land meets modest environmental standards.

Central to the proposed reform are plans to cut down some 400,000 hectares out of a total of 3.4 million hectares of vines over the next five years with 2.4 billion euros in aid to soften the blow.

Its 16-page plan for the European wine industry the EU also has lots of advice about how wine producers can compete more effectively with those from the New World, including a recommendation for better labelling (*something similar is being recommended in relation to the Constitution, but that won't work either* - Ed).

Spokesmen for the French wine industry have reacted by complaining that the root of problem lies with New World wines - especially those from Chile, Australia, Argentina and New Zealand - whose popularity, they imply, is not really justified, and against which European producers ought to be protected.

Last year claret sales in Britain (one of the few countries in Europe where wine consumption is on the increase) fell by 25 per cent. The world's most rapidly expanding market for wine is China. France holds 32 per cent of the Chinese market today - just over half its market share 20 years ago.

France still produces wines of

unsurpassed complexity and quality, along with huge amounts of mediocre wines that no British supermarket would even think of stocking. Of course, the best French wines are hugely expensive - with the consequence that many of the best clarets and burgundies are purchased by investors rather than by wine-lovers, or simply remain unsold.

Meanwhile, the forces of globalisation, so much disliked by the French, put before the consumer a range of wines of steadily improving quality produced by modern methods at reasonable prices. Instead of competing aggressively with the New World producers France has reacted by keeping foreign wine off its own shelves through non-tariff barriers such as its ban on alcohol advertising while protecting and rewarding incompetent producers by means of EU subsidies. It has been a magnificent performance in its way but this *folie de grandeur* cannot last.

Spokesmen for the French wine industry complain that if permitted unfettered market forces would not only put French wine-makers out of business but also destroy an age-old culture, all of which may contain an element of truth. But by trying to shut out international pressures instead of adjusting to them, France has merely ensured that when it finally comes change will hurt much more than is actually necessary. Much the same might be said in relation to the French conception of its role in the world.

Brown 'renews budget battle'

According to the *Financial Times* (26th June) Gordon Brown, UK Chancellor of the Exchequer, is fighting with Britain's 24 European partners over the implementation of a deal on the EU's 862bn seven-year budget brokered by Tony Blair in December.

Although Mr Brown was consulted throughout the negotiations in Brussels at the end of the British EU presidency, his officials claimed he was dismayed

by the outcome. Now they say he is fighting a rearguard action to save money.

With member states finalising the details of how the budget is financed, Mr Brown says he wants to minimise UK contributions. At the centre of the debate is Britain's budget rebate which Mr Blair agreed to cut by a maximum 10.5bn over the 2007-13 budget period, in spite of Mr Brown's reported opposition.

Under the deal four other big net contributors to the budget - Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden - were offered special reductions in their payments into European coffers.

Mr Brown is arguing that the December deal allowed Britain to receive its rebate on the extra contributions it has to make to compensate those four countries, a move that has infuriated other European capitals.

The internal contradictions of regional development aid

Like regional government the RDAs are turning out to be a spectacular failure

By Dan Lewis

Regional assemblies and regional development agencies - a whole new tier of government - are the most indefensible creation of the Blairite era.

As in the Keanu Reeves film *The Matrix*, these are artificial constructs; promising a great deal, while in reality crushing local democracy and dissent.

In 2002, the Government's White Paper "Your Region, Your Choice" advocated an expansion of regional government. By rights, the massive 78 per cent No vote to the North-East Assembly in 2004 ought to have stopped the programme in its tracks. Instead it was swiftly accelerated, in the form of the beefing up of the nine unelected regional assemblies imposed across the country, including the North-East.

In two short years since the referendum, then, regional policy has morphed into "Your Region, No Choice". How did this scandal occur?

The nine regions of England have a curious fantasy history. Unlike Wales or Scotland, it's no accident that you've never met anyone who pledges allegiance to the region, or who supports a regional football club.

As the whistle-blowing report English Regional Governance, published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in 2004 made clear, focus groups revealed that people have virtually no regional identity strong enough to demand new government structures.

As they are now constituted, the English regions are very similar to the designated civil-defence regions drawn up in the 1980s to cope with a Soviet nuclear attack. Since then, they have been revived, at the behest of Brussels, following the signing of the loathsome Maastricht Treaty.

It's particularly instructive here that the concept of regions ultimately comes from Belgium. No other country in Europe is more devoid of national unity or so divided by language.

The Belgian regions - and their

respective eight regional parliaments - were deemed to be the only way to hold the country together. As far as the UK is concerned, some in the European Union would rather it worked the other way round; break down loyalty to the nation-state and replace it with regional and European ties. Perhaps only then might Britons learn to love the European project.

Hark back a few years prior to the supposed referendum defeat of regional government and another worthless set of institutions was set up - the regional development agencies.

These are supposedly answerable to the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry and their stated objectives include economic development and regeneration. But the only real impact they have made is a large dent to the taxpayer's wallet.

Vast Budgets

The RDAs have vast budgets; Yorkshire Forward has £330m to spend. Its equivalent in London (hardly a city short of growth), the London Development Agency, has more than £400m. And Invest Northern Ireland, an RDA to represent a population the size of Lancashire, has tax-funded foreign offices in San Jose, Atlanta, Washington, Boston, New York, Dublin, London, Brussels, Dusseldorf, Taipei, Seoul and Tokyo. Yet the last foreigner that most of us can remember investing in Northern Ireland was John DeLorean in 1978.

As the English Regional Governance report said, RDAs "appear to have made no discernible difference to long-run patterns of uneven regional development in England".

Among many other problems, RDAs face a huge internal contradiction. On the one hand, their role is to accelerate development in a certain region. On the other, their job is to equalise regional economic disparities with other regions.

Success, then, in one objective

undermines the other. What is so ludicrous, though, is that they believe that, through Soviet-style planning, they can equalise the distribution of growth.

It's fallacious to believe that the uneven nature of economic growth can be overturned by RDA planning and target-setting. Regional disparities will continue to grow. What really matters is that the whole country should progress. The other deep flaw is to overlook the fact that regions are not self-contained economic units. In the UK, there tend to be sub-regions of large or medium-size cities.

In other words, the South-East is not a region - it is London and the rest. Nor are regions self-serving labour markets. Indeed, a large chunk of the UK labour market has now, through the Government's mass immigration policy, become semi-internationalised.

That's why setting targets on saving jobs, as our RDAs do, misses the point. It will be the advent of new industries, not the propping up of old ones, that generates genuine renewal.

A new Government would make itself instantly popular by abolishing the regional assemblies as soon as it took office.

The Tories have long scented blood over the regional issue and, should they win the next election, will move quickly on it, heralding the launch of "new localism".

Devolving powers from Whitehall is best channelled through the existing institutions of local government: parish, metropolitan, district and county, which already have legitimacy in the eyes of the voter.

The nine RDAs, meanwhile, should be abolished and their combined budgets, worth several billion, returned to the taxpayer in the form of a tax cut.

This is based on an article first published by the Yorkshire Post. Dan Lewis is Research Director of the Economic Research Council
www.ercouncil.org

EU corruption may spread to UK

Corruption in the European Union is becoming worse as a result of expansion and will become a still more serious problem if Turkey and Romania are admitted. This is the conclusion of a penetrating and highly original study of the problem world-wide, *Corruption - The World's Big C: Cases, Consequences, Cures*.

Its author, Ian Senior, an economic consultant, concludes that corruption harms nations, institutions and society in much the same way as cancer harms the human body - hence the title of his study. But, as he points out, in one important respect the damage done by corruption is yet more profound: not being contagious or infectious, cancer remains within the body, whereas corruption is both contagious and infectious. Unchecked and unpunished it can and does spread to other countries and institutions. So keeping the right political company is crucial to one's economic and moral health. Yet as Senior states: "*It is clear that a yawning gulf exists between what is considered unacceptable in the EU and what is considered normal in the accession states*".

The author estimates that enlarging the EU from 15 to 25 has increased the level of corruption by nearly five per cent and that enlarging it further with four states that include Turkey and Romania will increase the overall level of corruption by 10 per cent.

However, as he points out existing EU members are far from being free of the contagion.

Of the five countries at the top of a Corruption 'medals table' for the period 1980-2005 which he has ingeniously constructed four - France,

Corruption - The World's Big C Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures

By Ian Senior

Institute of Economic Affairs 2006
Pbk 207 pp

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

ISBN 13 978 0 255 36571 0

Germany, Italy and Belgium - are EU founder members. Those with fewest 'medals' i.e. the least corrupt include Australia, Finland and Holland. Those countries which Senior believes to be endemically corrupt are excluded from the table which he accepts does not provide a perfect guide to a problem which is intrinsically difficult to measure but he claims for it the merit of being based on a robust definition that is independent of time, place and local custom.

As the author acknowledges, we do not know precisely what happens when a relatively corrupt nation or nations joins a less corrupt group. Does the corrupt group corrupt the formerly less corrupt group? Or does the latter cleanse the former? Or does corruption in the newly enlarged group converge at the average level of corruption weighted by population? Senior is not optimistic about the present process of EU enlargement, however. It is worth noting, he says, that the EU structures

of government allow corruption from once source to infect it easily. One reason for this is that there are commissioners from the more corrupt new members and, in the future, from candidate states, who have complete executive responsibility for whole areas of policy, only partially restrained by democratic accountability. It is also certain that if corruption continues to flourish in the EU Commission, the prospect of reducing corruption in member states has little chance of success. In particular, the growing corruption in Germany coupled with historically endemic corruption in France, Italy and Spain suggest that closer ties within the EU under a new constitution could increase corruption in the UK.

The author recommends ways of tackling corruption worldwide based on two key concepts: full transparency and zero tolerance. As readers will be aware the EU was designed to preclude the first of these. Lack of transparency hampers those who wish to expose fraud and other forms of corruption. And as we learned during Neil Kinnock's tenure as Commissioner about the only thing that the EU will *not* tolerate is a whistle-blower.

Senior concludes that Britain should not sign up to a European constitution until the entire European project has been cleansed. Since, on the basis of the evidence presented by the author alone, there is as much chance of this happening as there is of Bill Cash being appointed President of the European Commission, there is a more practical and bolder way of dealing with the problem which will not be lost upon readers of *eurofacts*.

EU threatens the long European peace

How astonishing to see Britain and America, at huge cost, striving to install democracy in Iraq, while the muscle men of Brussels, ignoring democracy, plough on with *The Plan* - a federal Europe bound together by a constitution. I think it is also ominous...

I recall the ugly temper of the Spanish

civil war, witnessed the strength of feeling in Bosnia and Kosovo. There are European nations which Brussels wishes to embrace that are not going readily to submit themselves to undue conformity and regulation. The strong-minded will confront the determined.

What then? There will eventually be rebellion. Nations take sides, so

perhaps rebellion will lead to conflict. A single shot in Sarajevo paved the way to the First World War. And then my complacent vision of a peaceful Europe for my grandchildren will fall into small pieces.

W.F. Deedes writing in the *Daily Telegraph*, 23rd June, 2006.

LETTERS

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

Scholefield's Error

Dear Sir,

Anthony Scholefield is quite right in his examination of the economic effects of net immigration to denounce the lump of labour fallacy and to point to the operation of the market in balancing supply and demand. It is unfortunate that he then proceeds to perpetuate the fallacy that there is a true market rate for labour which is somehow different from the rate that consumers are prepared to pay for the services of labour. In a free market this is, of course, the least they can get away with. He then manages to confound matters with a monetarist fallacy that there is a fixed amount of capital available when in fact money can always be created for investment in profitable projects. Obviously some capital investments may take an appreciable time to come on stream but, equally obviously, immigrants may offer marketable services without the support of substantial fixed capital. Generalisations about labour/capital ratios afford no guidance in forming policy. If immigrants drive down the standard of living for some they are at the same time driving down the cost of living for others.

There are solid reasons for any country to control immigration selectively in the national interest but he has not found them here.

LIONEL BELL
Surrey

A Task for *eurofacts*?

Dear Sir,

"French eurosceptics gird their loins" (*eurofacts* 26th May) offers an example that British eurosceptics could follow.

To quote from your article: "It is

vitaly important that we gradually build up a body of detailed policies for the recovery of France".

For 'France' substitute Britain.

In our country the three political parties represented in Parliament follow the same policies on the EU and other major questions.

Like our French colleagues we need to "build up a body of detailed policies" that serve as a basis for successful UK government.

At the beginning of its second decade, *eurofacts* could provide the forum for this prime task.

RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

The Case for UKIP

Dear Sir,

Dr. Cooper asks what has to be done to convince UKIP (letters 23rd June). Convince UKIP of what? UKIP members are already convinced of the need to leave the European Union; in political terms what else do they need to be convinced about? Even the most ardent supporters of UKIP, of which I am one, do not expect in their wildest dreams to form a government at the next election, but the return of one or two UKIP MPs would give the matter of EU membership a higher profile than it gets at the moment and an opportunity to properly inform the populace which can then decide who and what to vote for.

Gerard Batten is right to say that "Anyone voting UKIP knows what they will get". Equally anyone voting Tory knows what they will get: a member of a party committed to the European Union and its enlargement.

Dr. Cooper, the Better Off Out Campaign, Frederick Forsyth, the

Democracy Movement et al all do sterling work in exposing the awfulness of the European Union and the need to leave it, but then negate all that work by telling people how awful it is to vote for the only political party committed to leaving. The logical extension of this is to advise the people who believe in capitalism to vote for a socialist party in the hope that one or two might see the light. I think that Mark Wallace exposes the weakness in his criticism of UKIP when he says that nine Tory MPs have put their careers in danger by supporting the Better Off Out Campaign: precisely nine MPs can forfeit their prospects but cannot change the policy of the party and so we are left with the status quo of the three major parties committed to membership of the EU.

ROGER WILSON
Hampshire

Cameron Must Quit EPP

Dear Sir,

David Cameron's integrity and pragmatism are at risk. He must honour his undertaking to quit the EPP and probably enhance his prospects of returning to government.

If and when the Conservatives are re-elected, he might usefully reconsider the advantages of leaving the European Union and redirecting the enormous wasted billions of taxpayers' money from Brussels to enable the hoped-for promises of tax cuts as well as a fundamental overhaul of the abysmal and farcical behaviour of many government departments.

R.S.GALLIANO
Buckinghamshire

Summer publishing plans

The summer double issue of eurofacts (Vol 11 No 20/21) will appear on the 28th July 2006.

MEETINGS

**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)

The Anti-Common Market League
01787 376374

Friday **21st July 2006**, 7.00 pm

“Exposed - The Secret Self-Perpetuating
Rulers of the EU”

Ashley Mote MEP, *South East*

PUBLIC MEETING
St John's Church, Waterloo Road,
London SE1 8TY (near IMAX cinema)
Admission Free

**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 **11th July 2006**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The
Management and Audit of EC Expenditure
and Accounts* from;
a) Mr Brian Gray, Accounting Officer,
European Commission; and
b) Ms Marta Andreasen.

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.

Wednesday **13th July 2006**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Science
Teaching in Schools* from witnesses to be
confirmed.

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.

Tuesday **25th July 2006**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The
Management and Audit of EC Expenditure
and Accounts* from Lord Kinnock.

*Note:
Committee Meetings can
change from Public to Private*

DIARY OF EVENTS

2006

UK Parliamentary **25th July**
Recess Begins

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 **1st January**
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.

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 useful 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.

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.

Corruption - The World's Big C

Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures

by *Ian Senior*. **£12.50**

Senior, shows how corruption in the EU is becoming worse and why therefore, the UK should not sign up to the proposed European Constitution.

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



9 771 361 413006