

EU enlargement may bring new wave of immigrants

Britain has given up control of its borders as part of a project which leaves it less free, less democratic and less wealthy

On 1st January Britain - a country which has all but given up control of its borders - got what it said it wanted: a further stage of EU enlargement. Enlargement has been a consistent goal of Britain's major political parties, one which commands the support of a majority of MPs and of all of our newspapers. In the naïve and mistaken belief that 'widening' would prevent 'deepening' it is a goal which has been supported by a number of those who regard themselves as eurosceptics. Many appear to believe that there is some kind of moral imperative to admit new members irrespective of the consequences. The degree of unanimity on this issue is indeed remarkable given that the impact on British interests of admitting Romania and Bulgaria - the poorest and most corrupt countries in Europe - is likely to be almost wholly detrimental.

No Passport Needed

Following the influx of half a million Central Europeans following the last stage of enlargement in 2004, the Home Secretary has introduced a system of work permits for unskilled Romanians, Bulgarians and some other non-EU countries; in the immediate future these will be limited to 20,000. However, all citizens from the new member states will still be able to travel here and will not even require a passport to do so; all they will need is a valid national ID card. There will be

no work restrictions on those with skills and those who are considered to be 'self-employed'.

Despite the introduction of on-the-spot-fines for illegal workers no one seems to have confidence that Dr Reid's measures will work or to have a clear idea how many Romanians and Bulgarians will settle here. Even if Britain is not the number one destination - because of similarities of language and culture this is thought likely to be Italy or Spain - the huge disparities between incomes in Bulgaria and Romania on the one hand and Britain on the other means that this country is likely to attract significant numbers at a time when its labour market is still adjusting to the huge wave of immigration after 2004.

Moving Westwards

In 2005 per capita income in Romania and Bulgaria was less than one tenth of that in the UK.

There can be no doubt that very large numbers of Romanians and Bulgarians are preparing to move westwards. In 2001 only one million Romanians possessed a passport. In December that figure stood at 6.2 million, with 600,000 applications for new passports having been made since August alone. The Open Society Foundation predicts that as many as 2.5 million Romanians plan to leave their country for work abroad this year. Since according to the Foundation this includes some of the best educated this can hardly be an

unmixed blessing for Romania. Meanwhile, the economic situation in neighbouring Moldova is said to be worse. Significantly, it was recently revealed that some 300,000 Moldovans have been granted Romanian citizenship and thus a legal passport to the EU.

The demographics of Bulgaria and Romania are already dire. According to the United Nations Population Division, between 2005 and 2050, Bulgaria's total population will shrink by 34 per cent (from 7.7 million to 5.1 million), while Romania's will shrink by 23 per cent (from 21.7 million to 16.8 million). These projections imply huge contractions in the economically active population as well as a dramatic fall in overall numbers.

But it is with the practical consequences of further immigration into the UK that British policymakers should be most concerned.

Fraud and Deception

On 31st October the *Sun* leaked the details of a Cabinet memo which warned that crimes involving fraud and deception were likely to increase as the result of Romanian and Bulgarian accession; it pointed out that 80-85 per cent of cashpoint fraud had been attributed to organised Romanian crime rings. A few days later Westminster City Council, which is in the front-line in dealing with the thousands of Eastern Europeans

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: *How EU immigration policy hurts the weakest p.2 - French to take back lost sovereignty p.2 - Constitutional creep: more evidence that the EU is acting illegally p.3 - Naive to entrust security to 'flabby Europe' p.3 - Is Brussels up to its usual trick of adopting new powers for itself? p.4 - A most unhappy birthday for the euro p.6*

How EU immigration policy hurts the weakest

The EU stands for the free movement of capital, labour, goods and services but there are huge differences in the benefit to be secured by these differing objectives. In particular, it has never been clear that the free movement of labour, on the scale which was inevitable when the boundaries of the EU were extended eastwards, was going to be beneficial to either the new or the older Member States in the EU. The very steep economic gradient between the economic conditions in the relatively poor Accession Countries and the much richer EU founder Member States, was bound to produce pressures for mass migration. These were grossly underestimated by the UK government, which expected the net inflow of migrants to be about 13,000 a year while the actual figure turned out

Reacting to this miscalculation, it has recently been decided to restrict immigration temporarily from Romania and Bulgaria. Even so, the impact of the large scale migration which has already taken place - with more to come even with the new curbs in place - has had large scale negative effects, which are likely to become more acute as more migration takes place. Existing EU rules ensure that there is only a limited amount that the UK can do to contain the pressures which arise, and in a few years' time, all restrictive controls will be illegal. With most benefits from EU induced migration going to the well off, this is not going to be an easy battle to fight. It is not the rich and powerful who are stuck in housing waiting lists which are

not moving, who are having their wages eroded away or who are losing their jobs. It is the poor and vulnerable who are the ones who suffer most. Up to now, they have mostly accepted their lot with fortitude and tolerance. It is vitally important to us all, however, that the pressures to which they are subjected do not become unacceptably high. The bonds which hold society together are stronger in Britain than in many other places, but they need to be cherished more carefully than they are at the moment, not fractured by dogmatic adherence to policies on the free movement of labour which are becoming increasingly inappropriate.

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign Bulletin, November 2006.

French to take back lost sovereignty?

“We must clarify matters in exchange rate policy, which means taking back our sovereignty”, the French Prime

Minister Dominique de Villepin criticising the impact of the European Central Bank's monetary policy on

French economic performance (quoted in the *Daily Telegraph* on 27th December, 2006).

Continued from p.1

EU enlargement to bring new wave of immigrants

arriving in London by coach, published a report showing that A8 immigration (immigration from the eight central and eastern European countries admitted in 2004) was over-represented in arrests for shop-lifting, drunkenness, prostitution and burglary. Half of those sleeping rough in central London are Poles.

However, the most serious impact of another wave of immigrants is likely to be on the labour market. In December the Office of National Statistics said there were 702,000 jobless young people aged 16 to 24, 37,000 more than a year earlier. Its figures also showed unemployment rising more rapidly than in any other European country.

Research carried out by the National Institute for Economic and Social Research suggests that between 60,000 and 90,000 of the rise in unemployment in 2004 can be attributed to competition for jobs from

foreigners.

A further wave of immigrants from eastern Europe is bound to increase competition for jobs, especially among the young, and to depress wages, especially among the low paid, even if, as the result of Mr Reid's temporary restrictions, many Bulgarians and Romanians take jobs in the black economy rather than finding regular employment. The long-term social and political impact of all of this is difficult to measure. It is evident that many working class people in those areas such as East London where immigrant numbers are greatest feel alienated, bitter and ignored - as Labour deputy leader John Cruddas, the Labour MP for Dagenham has frankly acknowledged during his campaign for the deputy leadership of the Labour Party. Relations between ethnic groups are likely to suffer. Feelings of resentment may become explosive, as

in France. The character of many of our cities will change in a way that is unlikely to find favour with the majority and as a result of policies for which no democratic mandate can be said to exist.

The accession of Bulgaria and Romania is likely to make things worse, but great harm has already been done. The most depressing thing of all is that the problems which are now forcing themselves on the attention of the political class have been self-inflicted. An island nation is better placed than others to control its borders. In the decades to come historians may well be baffled about the reasons which led Britain to cede that control to others as part of the price of being part of a political project which has left it less wealthy, less free, less democratic and less at ease with itself than it would otherwise have been.

Constitutional creep: more evidence that the EU is acting illegally

The British Government is either unable or unwilling to prevent the Commission's use of Article 308 in order to achieve its aims

Clear evidence that Brussels continues to build its empire illegally is contained in confidential papers from the Commons European Scrutiny Committee which have been passed to *eurofacts*. These show that the Commission is using Article 308 to achieve its objectives - even though this allows it to act only "in furtherance of the operation of the common market" - and that the Government has allowed it to get away with this.

The papers not only demonstrate Government timidity in the face of strong opposition from other members, but also show that it does not understand the EU veto procedure.

Natural Disasters

This is clear from an account given in a briefing paper circulated to members of the European Scrutiny Committee which describes measures to establish a new EU civil protection system to be used in the wake of major natural disasters such as the recent forest fires in France and Portugal and the floods in the Danube basin. The proposed budget for 2007-13 is 173 million.

With classic understatement the author of the paper notes that it is difficult to see how such measures contribute to "the operation of the common market". It notes that the Government, too, had expressed similar reservations.

The briefing paper continues: "In July, the Minister told the committee that not a single Member State shared the UK's doubts. Nor did the Council's legal services and the Commission. So the Minister said that the Government would reluctantly accept the use of

Article 308 and ask for its doubts to be recorded in the minutes.

"When the UK is isolated it is not necessarily because it is wrong. So the Committee asked the Minister some further questions.

"On 5th October the Minister said that, as there was no prospect of getting the documents amended, the only alternative would be to veto the proposals. But the Government did not want to do that because there is such widespread support for them. He also asserted that because unanimity was required, the Government could not abstain.

"This was a misconception. Article 205 (3) of the EC Treaty provides that abstention does not prevent the adoption of acts which require unanimity. The Committee drew this to the Minister's attention and asked him to think again and then tell the Committee what the Government intends to do."

Obviously Improper

The reply from the Minister apologised for overlooking Article 205 but still asserted that Article 308 provided a legal base for the proposals. If an acceptable agreement could be reached on another matter the Government would back them.

Another example of the obviously improper use of Article 308 is contained in a paper from the Committee concerning the EU's programme to support "active European citizenship" which, as the author points out, appears to be a euphemism for "ever closer union".

The 2004-6 programme expired at the

end of December. So in April the Commission proposed a draft Decision to renew the programme. It would run from 2007 to 2013 with a budget of 235 million.

In July 2005 the Committee expressed concern that the draft decision was not accompanied by an evaluation of the previous programme despite a previous assurance that this would be forthcoming. It also expressed concern that Article 308 was being used as part of the legal base.

Partial Exception

After many weeks of delay the Minister said that the Government was content with the substance of the draft Decision "but did not explain how the Government could have reached this view without an evaluation of the 2004-2006 period". Nor did it answer the question about the use of Article 308.

The leaked papers from the Commons European Security Committee confirm the widely held suspicion that illegal means are being used to complete the European project and that with the partial exception of Britain, Member States appear content with this. It would seem that British Ministers would prefer that this was not the case but appear unwilling to do anything about it. Ministers also appear confused about the use of the veto. Sadly, the leaked papers reveal one other thing: that the European Scrutiny Committee has little if any ability to hold the government to account.

Naive to entrust security to 'flabby Europe'

"Only the naïve would consign the country's security to the flabbiness of European solidarity; witness the

lukewarm support from France and Germany for our soldiers in Afghanistan", Sir Christopher Meyer,

the former British Ambassador to the United States writing in *The Sunday Times* on 31st December 2006.

Is Brussels up to its usual trick of adopting new powers for itself?

Debate on the European Council: 14-15th December 2006

Lord Pearson of Rannoch: My Lords, I refer the Minister to a revealing confession in paragraph 3 of the Presidency Conclusions, which admits that the EU is,

“making best use of the possibilities offered by the existing treaties to deliver concrete results”

as it pursues the proposed constitution, after it was voted down by the French and Dutch people.

Can the noble Lord confirm or deny that this means that a number of new initiatives, all of them giving more power to Brussels at the expense of the Member States, are going ahead, mostly based on Article 308 of the treaty establishing the European Communities? Can the noble Lord let us know what those initiatives are? If he cannot do so now, will he be good enough to write to me, putting a copy in your Lordships' Library?

I further put it to the noble Lord that Brussels is clearly up to its usual trick of quietly adopting new powers for itself, even if there is no clear legal base. When we come to the next intergovernmental conference, those new powers will be taken as read and incorporated into the treaties because they are already there. If we do not like it, we should have said so at the time. That is why I am asking the questions now. I would be grateful if the noble Lord could assure me that I am wrong and that any new powers have a clear legal base. To confirm his point, if that is what he is going to say, I ask him again to write to me with the initiatives which are currently going through based on Article 308.

Lord Rooker: My Lords, the fact that we are in this reflective period about the Constitution does not mean that all the agreements and treaties reached in Europe in the past few decades have been nullified or are inoperable. The

noble Lord assumes that nobody should do anything, even though the existing treaty provisions allow for it. I am happy to give him the chapter and verse that he asked for, but the underlying assumption of his question cannot be valid. Many existing treaties are operating in the normal course of events. Nobody ever implied or inferred that would not be the case. I reject what the noble Lord is implying because it is simply not the case.

Lord Stoddart of Swindon: My Lords, I am afraid that I am going to break the consensus of the admission of Turkey. I believe that Turkey is not a European country. Indeed, by the time it is admitted its population will be 90 million, the largest population in the European Union and it will be dominant. I imagine that I am in a minority on that issue.

What is meant by “justice and home affairs”? Does it mean that the Government are about to give up the veto on all matters relating to justice and home affairs? What is the latest situation on that?

As regards asylum, there is a United Nations policy on that. How will any agreement by the European Union affect the United Nations policy? Perhaps the Minister could remind me whether the decisions are taken by QMV or unanimity.

Finally, I note this declaration at the end of paragraph 3:

“The European Council reaffirms the importance of commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Treaties of Rome in order to confirm the values of the European integration process”.

I had understood that Her Majesty's Government were in favour of the European Union being an organisation of nation states co-operating together, not a process of integration. That is bound to lead eventually to a European

superstate, or a country called Europe. I really would like to know the Government's policy on that, and the Opposition's for that matter.

Lord Rooker: My Lords, to be honest the Government's policy is set out in the Statement. My noble friend Lord Stoddart - for he is still my noble friend - raises scepticism about Turkey, and he is of course entitled to his views. However, as I have made clear, Turkey is of strategic importance. It is a large state but it will not join the European Union for some years, as negotiations will take a while.

As I indicated in answer to an earlier question, Turkey has made huge changes in recent years by abolishing the death penalty, by significantly reducing torture - it should not be doing that anyway, but it is significantly reducing - and by ensuring Constitutional rights for women and improved cultural rights for minority groups. The EU accession process has been a catalyst for that reform, which has to be good, while Turkey has been an incredibly loyal and active member of NATO. Therefore, it does not quite fit to separate Turkey out as though it is some wayward state that has nothing to do with Europe.

There is no proposal to give up the veto at the Justice and Home Affairs Council, and I have no real details so far as celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Treaties of Rome is concerned. I understand that 2007 will be a year for celebrating several treaties - whether separately or together, I do not know.

HANSARD

House of Lords 18th December 2006
Parliamentary Copyright 2006.

A most unhappy birthday for the euro

Whatever its economic consequences the single currency has failed totally to create a sense of European identity

A flurry of opinion polls marked the fifth anniversary of the euro. None of them was exactly cause for bringing out the champagne at the European Central Bank or the European Commission.

In France a survey of opinion carried out by TNS Sofres for the magazine *Le Pelerin* showed that for the first time a majority of the French (52 per cent) now regard the euro as a “bad thing”, blaming it for inflation and job losses. The finding is in marked contrast to the mood in France in New Year 2002 where E-day was celebrated as a triumph for French diplomacy - the French having won the support of Germany for monetary union in return for French backing for German unification.

Meanwhile, in Germany a poll conducted by Forsa and published by *Stern* magazine in December suggested that an even larger proportion of Germans (58 per cent) now favour the return of the mark.

Predictably the EU Commission’s own survey of opinion - the Eurobarometer (whose findings need to be scrutinised with a high degree of scepticism) - suggested a somewhat higher level of support for the single currency than polls commissioned by the media. But even this could not hide the gradual but inexorable slide in the public’s regard for the euro, a state of affairs which is bound to have far reaching political consequences (see table).

The commentary which accompanies the data states: “*Although the adoption of the euro is still generally perceived to be positive in 2006, we notice a decreasing trend in enthusiasm for it*

since 2002. In 2006, the percentage of citizens recognising the adoption of the euro as advantageous is the lowest since the first survey was conducted in 2002. In 2002, 59 per cent of the citizens reported that the introduction of the euro was overall advantageous. This percentage dropped to 53 per cent in 2004 and to 48 per cent in 2006.”

In analysing the various polls the media generally focused on the public’s growing antipathy for the single currency and the future impact on opinion of the ECB’s tight money

people are unable to fully adjust to the fact of a single European currency? Does this reflect an enduring reluctance to accept the loss of national sovereignty which monetary union entails, or do people somehow sense that monetary union is not as permanent a deal as they have been led to believe? (Such suspicions might be banished if eurozone states were prepared to close down their national banks, pool foreign currency reserves and national debts - but there is about as much chance of Germany accepting

responsibility for Italy’s debt as there is of Daniel Hannan succeeding Manuel Barroso as EU Commission President).

Even more interesting are the poll findings that demonstrate that the euro has demonstrably failed in its central aim. As *eurofacts* readers

will be aware this was not economic: the introduction of a single currency was intended to provide the single most important step in the creation of a European state and a sense of European consciousness. But five years on there is not the slightest evidence that the latter is occurring. According to the Eurobarometer 78 per cent of those in the eurozone do not consider that the introduction of the euro has made them feel even “a little more European”. Only 19 per cent say that it has made them “a little more European”, while two per cent say that it has actually made them feel “a little less European”. The figures are identical to those recorded in 2005 and 2004 - all of which suggests the attempt to manufacture a European identity is doomed to fail.

Why is it that five years on so many

Overall evaluation of the adoption of the euro				
Poll	Advantageous	Disadvantageous	No change	DK/NA
September 2002	59%	29%	8%	4%
November 2002	54%	32%	7%	7%
November 2003	52%	36%	5%	7%
November 2004	53%	36%	5%	6%
October 2005	51%	39%	6%	5%
September 2006	48%	38%	7%	7%

Source: Eurobarometer, December 2006

policy which is widely blamed for low economic growth, especially in France. But there were other aspects of the poll findings which are equally interesting.

The first is the quite extraordinary continuing attachment of many Europeans for their old national currencies. According to the Sofres poll a quarter of the French still think in francs the whole time when shopping. According to the Eurobarometer national currencies are used for calculations in relation to major purchases most often by the Belgians (65 per cent), by the Dutch (57 per cent) and the Austrians (55 per cent). In the case of small purchases around about half of shoppers in many eurozone countries would appear to still use their national currency as a mental benchmark.

LETTERS

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

Free Trade Not the Only Way

Dear Sir,

Mr Anthony Scholefield is surely right in thinking that while an EFTA between the UK and the EU will be less costly than EU membership, it would still be costly. But his conclusion that only universal free trade would mean an end to the leeching effects of the EU, doesn't follow.

In 1980 Douglas Jay wrote that it was a crucial British economic interest to have free trade in food and materials, and some curb on imports of manufactures (*Change and Fortune*, Hutchinson, 1980, p349). Mr Scholefield may disagree, but when we consider that employment in the UK rose by 30 per cent in the six years after it abandoned free trade in 1831, and that the US, Germany, Japan and India all industrialised successfully behind protective tariffs, it is by no means obvious that Douglas Jay was wrong.

Fortunately, there is no need to resolve the issue of what long-term trading regime should succeed our membership of the EU at this stage. A return to free trade is one option. But there are others which would also be better for us than either membership of the EU or an FTA with it, and do not require the agreement of the EU or anyone else. (For instance we could get rid of all restrictions on food imports, while applying the existing CET to all imports of manufactures, without discriminating in favour of - and hence against - any other country.)

Which is best can only be determined by experience after withdrawal. No decision would be irrevocable and there is no need for advocates of withdrawal to commit themselves to any particular trading regime.

JOHN KISSIN

London

Let's all back BOO

Dear Sir,

Frederick Forsyth is calling (Letters 15th December) for three million

pledges - possibly using Paul Sykes' Speak Out Campaign - to force forward EU withdrawal. I am surprised that he did not opt to use the Better Off Out (BOO) Campaign (of which he is the joint Patron) as the vehicle.

The BOO Campaign run by the well-respected non-party political Freedom Association already has amongst its many high level supporters six MPs i.e. the nucleus of a grouping actually inside Parliament. Furthermore it has been given greater credibility in the minds of MPs and voters by the policy of the Leader of UKIP and his NEC not to oppose at a General Election any sitting MP who has, before July 2007, signed up to BOO and who actively and publicly supports its call for withdrawal.

Why suggest for his initiative yet another organisation when a very good one, in my view the ideal one, is already up and running? Wordings may vary somewhat but their ultimate aim is the same.

Sir GEORGE EARLE

Devon

Freddy's Pledge

Dear Sir,

Is Freddy's Pledge the way to force Cameron's hand on the question of a new referendum on EU membership? In a word? NO.

Cameron was and is a PR/Marketing man. He knows full well the consequences of his current strategies. He and his have created a "brand" and a set of marketing policies to attract young voters, disenchanted Labour/Liberal voters and those from ethnic minorities. The price to pay is the loss of some, but not all, of the Party's eurosceptics.

There is no new "Goldsmith" to motivate and combine the various Eurosceptic groups. It requires someone with deep pockets, dynamism and charisma to make things happen. He/she must have the attention of the media, be able to persuade these various groups to combine resources and lead a prolonged campaign. There are many "talking heads" in the

movement but not one has been able to convert the rhetoric into action.

Since the demise of Margaret Thatcher many of the Party faithful have tried to influence strategy. Not only on the crucial question of continued EU membership but also on those other issues that have undermined this society, immigration, crime and punishment, education etc. A succession of leaders have failed to convince anyone that they have the will or ability to at least make a start on facing up to the consequences of years of mismanagement.

Freddy's plan will make no progress unless or until a new Goldsmith appears on the scene. If UKIP had such a leader and access to substantial funds they would win the day and we would have a referendum on withdrawal from the EU.

PAUL RHODES

London

No Basis for Trust

Dear Sir,

Frederick Forsyth's suggestion about a Conservative referendum on our continued membership of the EU has its attractions. However, could we trust Mr Cameron to honour such a commitment? For me the answer is no. When he assumed the leadership of the Conservative Party he promised that within six months, he would have withdrawn all Conservative MEPs from the EPP. He broke this pledge. He has form. I will never trust him again.

G P STANCEY

Leicestershire

Tories for UKIP?

Dear Sir,

Christina Speight's proposal that voters should coalesce behind a slogan such as "Tories for UKIP" (Letters, 1st December 2006) is significant in that it proposes a practical step that can be put into effect immediately.

There should be wide publicity for this proposal.

RALPH MADDERN

Warwickshire

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Monday **22nd January**, 6.00 pm

“Corporation Tax or Income Tax: Which is the greatest con?”

Michael Mainelli, *Mercers' School Memorial Professor of Commerce at Gresham College*

Tuesday **30th January**, 6.00 pm

“The government of London”

Vernon Bogdanor CBE. FBA,
Gresham Professor of Law

Tuesday **6th February**, 6.00 pm

“Caps of liberty: The oddity of democracy”

Richard Barker, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

Brighton Philharmonic Orchestra
01273 709709

Sunday **25th February 2007**, 14.45 pm

A British Symphony, conducted by Barry Wordsworth.

(Mr Rodney Atkinson, the well known political author commissioned Andrew Grant, the organist, Choirmaster and Composer at Her Majesty's Chapels Royal, to compose “A British Symphony” - The work is in the form of a unified symphony which links, inter-plays and unites the separate strands into a musical finale of one British identity - This work was commissioned to provide a counter-balance to those forces both within and without who wish to break-up the United Kingdom.)

CONCERT

Concert Hall, Brighton

Admission £6 to £23 by ticket

(Mon-Sat at the Brighton Dome Ticket Office - Tel: 01273 709709 - 29 New Road, Brighton. or online at www.brightondome.org)

UK Independence Party
07900 438489

Tuesday **6th March 2007**, 8.00 pm

“Christianity in Politics”

Geoff Locke

PUBLIC MEETING

Butcher's Arms, Audley, Staffordshire

Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01722 744814

Saturday **14th April 2007**, 11.00 am

Speakers to be announced

SPRING CONFERENCE

Exeter University, Great Hall, Exeter, Devon

Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

Countries that have Ratified the Treaty “Friends of the Constitution” Madrid **26th January**

ECOFIN **30th January**

ECOFIN **27th February**

Countries that have not Ratified the Treaty on the Constitution **27th February**

Finnish Parliamentary Elections **18th March**

Berlin Declaration on the Future of Europe **27th March**

French Presidential Election **22nd April**

French Parliamentary Election **June or July**

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

2008

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

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

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **16th January**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard on *Science and Technology* from Mr Gordon MacKerron, Chairman, Committee on Radioactive Waste Management Sir Anthony Cleaver, Chairman, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority.

Tuesday **16th January**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Employment and Training Opportunities for low-skilled young people* from Prof Stephen Nickell, Nuffield College Oxford; and Dr Anna Vignoles, University of London.

Wednesday **17th January**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *Environment and Agriculture* from the Environment Agency.

Wednesday **17th January**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Constitution* from the Rt Hon Charles Clarke MP.

Wednesday **17th January**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Law and Institutions* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **24th January**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *Environment and Agriculture* from the Rt Hon Ian Pearson MP, Minister of State, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

Wednesday **24th January**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Constitution* from the Rt Hon Lord Mackay of Clashfern; and the Rt Hon Lord Lloyd of Berwick.

Wednesday **24th January**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Law and Institutions* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **25th January**, 10.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *Social Policy and Consumer Affairs* from Rt Hon Rosie Winter MP.

Monday **29th January**, 2.00 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Science and Technology* from the Rt Hon Ian Pearson MP, Minister of State, DEFRA.

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

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.

A Democratic Europe: An Alternative to the EU

by *Richard Body*. **£10.00**

Sir Richard lays out the case for a truly democratic European Union as opposed to an undemocratic super power.

The Great Deception: Can the European Union survive

by *Christopher Booker & Richard North*. **£9.99**

This book is the most 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.

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**

An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

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.

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 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 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**

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£16
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

Please send me *eurofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....
to *eurofacts*: PO Box 119
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Name

Address

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

European Commission	020 7973 1992
European Movement	020 7940 5252
Federal Trust	020 7735 4000

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403 741736
British Housewives League	020 8445 4848
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071 663876
CIB	020 8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020 8570 5681
Freedom Association	01746 861267
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
New Alliance	020 7386 1837
Save Britain's Fish	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy 01372 453678

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org	
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
Democratic Party	01684 891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender	
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	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

