

Boredom is the europhiles' secret weapon

If it were true that Europe needed a new treaty to be more 'efficient' there would presumably be a backlog of legislation - but there isn't

There is no doubt that many people are bored by the EU. Newspaper editors, even eurosceptic ones, do not bother to report its affairs except in the most superficial way and even some doughty eurosceptic bloggers have recently switched their attention to other matters. Such cries of protest that arise as a result of further turns of the integrationist ratchet come either from a tiny proportion of the population who remain switched on to what is going on or from those who suddenly find that their economic interests are under direct attack as a consequence of new EU regulations or directives.

Critical Scrutiny

This state of ennui suits the europhiles very well: there is no need for Europhile think-tanks, books and pamphlets: there is always the possibility that these might provoke interest in the subject - which is very much against the europhile interest. From the europhile point of view it is far better - to use Willie Whitelaw's memorable phrase - to go round stirring up apathy. That way many aspects of our relationship with the EU are likely to remain unnoticed and the claims of ministers in relation to EU affairs to escape critical scrutiny as the process of integration goes its heedless way.

Here is just one example of an obviously ministerial statement that cannot be true, but which has gone

largely uncriticised: for more than a year UK ministers have argued that while they were of course opposed to an EU Constitution there was indeed a case for measures to make an enlarged community of 27 nations work more efficiently, especially since the newcomers were new to the ways of the EU and would take time to adjust. Once the basic premise behind this claim - that it is in Britain's interest for the EU to work more efficiently - is accepted the argument has a certain plausibility. After all an organisation originally devised for a club of five cannot automatically be assumed to work for 27 especially when many decisions require unanimity.

Institutional Paralysis

It is a claim which has been repeated by both Blair and Brown; indeed, on occasions they have gone as far as suggesting that without structural changes the EU would suffer from institutional paralysis. Cameron, displaying his customary vagueness, has gone almost as far in the same direction.

It wasn't until 12th April this year that *The Economist* pointed out that there is no foundation for this claim. If true there would be a backlog of legislative proposals concentrated in those areas that need unanimous agreement by members. It might also be the case that the new members would be behind a disproportionate

number of blocked proposals. But as *The Economist* pointed out there is no logjam. The fact is that decisions continue to be taken unanimously without too much difficulty - would that it were otherwise. Recent examples of agreements reached on controversial issues include the Open Skies aviation deal - despite British reservations - and Mrs Merkel's 'historic' climate change plan. Nor is there a long list of projects being blocked by the new members.

The Economist points to a study from Sciences Po in Paris which shows that overall, the EU has been adopting new rules and regulations 25 per cent *more quickly* since enlargement. Its authors are said to have tracked thousands of proposals, both large and small. They conclude: "Contrary to much received wisdom, the data gathered shows that enlargement has not...brought Europe's machinery to a halt". In their search for 'blockages' they apparently find that the old members have opposed proposals more frequently than the new ones.

Further Claim

The real reason for the desperation for the reintroduction of the Constitution (although this is likely to go by the name of Basic Treaty) is, of course, that it promotes the objective of 'more Europe'. But the fact remains that the only case presently advanced

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: Why politicians support the transfer of powers p.2 - Sense from a former French Foreign Minister p.2 - Is there really 'a Huguenot invasion?' Or is Ken simply bad at maths p.3 - Setting the record straight p.3 - What will the EU look like in 20 years' time? p.4 - Britain's legal power to opt-out of continued EU economic and political integration p.5 - EU policies damage environment p.5 - EU girls offer marriages for cash p.6

Why politicians support the transfer of powers

It is a truism that politicians are people who like - even crave - power. For this reason *eurofacts* has consequently been puzzled by the readiness of British ministers to back policies which drain power away from Westminster to Brussels.

The following explanation of this seemingly curious phenomenon - the most plausible that we have come across - is provided by Anthony Coughlan, the Secretary of the National Platform, the Irish eurosceptic think-tank in his latest Newsletter:

Government Ministers and aspiring

Ministers welcome the transfer of powers from the national level to the supranational because it means a big increase in their own personal power, at the cost of a diminution in power for their own Parliaments and fellow citizens. At national level if a Minister wants to get something done, he or she must have the support of that country's national Parliament. Remove that particular policy area to Brussels however, where laws are made primarily by the EU Council of Ministers, and the Minister in question, who is part of the executive arm of government at national level and responsible to an elected parliament,

becomes a powerful legislator at EU level - one of an oligarchy, a committee of lawmakers, making laws for 500 million people as a member of the exclusive club of the EU Council of Ministers, which is irremovable as a group. Simultaneously senior national civil servants, who prepare EU laws in interaction with the Commission bureaucracy, are freed from questioning by their fellow citizens. There is an intoxicating increase in personal power for the politicians and bureaucrats concerned, and a corresponding reduction in the power of their fellow citizens, national Parliaments and countries.

Sense from a former French Foreign Minister

Hubert Védrine was French foreign minister in the Jospin government, in charge of French diplomacy during the last part of the Balkan wars. He is one of few recent French foreign ministers to take a realistic view of the world around us. In the teeth of official French europhilia he has never held back his eurosceptic views. In an article in *Figaro Magazine* on 10th March, urging his compatriots to take on board the rejection of the Constitution and renew their faith in the French nation, he said this:-

At the opposite end of the spectrum

from American hubris, we have that other manifestation of western illusionism, the naivety of the Europeans. Persuaded that they inhabit a world that is post-tragic, post-historic, and (for the federalists among them) post-national, Europeans behave as if the entire planet consisted of boy scouts wanting nothing better than to cooperate for the well-being of humanity, notably through the chimera of the 'international community'.

The 'multipolar world' favoured by the Europeans is being built without them, not to say against them. The Chinese, the Russians, the Indians, the

Arabs, the Brazilians and others are ploughing their own furrows. All continue to create the history of the world, when we Europeans imagine that the march of events has stopped in a universe where from now on the only thing that will count is our proselytising for human rights, democracy and our own conception of the market economy. It is time we came down from our Mount Olympus and opened our eyes.

Hopefully someone in the FCO will bring Mr Védrine's article to the attention of the current British foreign secretary - but don't hold your breath.

Continued from p.1

Boredom is the europhiles' secret weapon

for a new constitutional treaty by British ministers is based on a fallacy.

Here is a further claim - which is made by some eurosceptics - which as a result of the present mood of ennui has not received critical examination. It usually goes like this: yes, Europe lacks democratic accountability but the best way to fill the 'democratic deficit' is for Britain to lead a campaign for greater democracy.

But as Frederick Forsyth points out in

a letter in the current issue of *eurofacts* (page 6), most members don't want the kind of Europe that Britain wants. So how democratic would it actually be for Britain to impose on its partners what is, after all, a minority view? What Britain needs is a not a substantially reformed EU - to suggest that this is even a serious possibility is to engage in wish-fulfilment - but a reformation of our relations with Europe. Unfortunately many

'reformers' either lack the intellectual clear-sightedness or the courage to recognise this, or have convinced themselves that they are playing a clever tactical game which will enable them to get much of what they want at some unspecified date in the future. In doing so they contribute to the present mood of cynicism and ennui. An honest debate would not be boring, but we are a long way from achieving even that.

Is there really ‘a Huguenot invasion?’ Or is Ken simply bad at maths?

When was the last time you encountered a Frenchman in the supermarket check-out or the pub? *euofacts*’ own rich anecdotal experience suggests that if you are a Londoner you are more likely to meet a Pole, a Russian or an Australian.

Why do we raise the question? Because for whatever reason a variety of prominent europhiles and publications have recently suggested that as a result of ‘a new Huguenot invasion’ there are now between 300,000 and 475,000 mostly young French men and women living in London. If there are that many why don’t we bump into them more often?

The figure of 300,000 has been quoted by Ken Livingstone as well as by the *Guardian*. Lord Wallace of Saltaire, the arch-europhile Lib-Dem peer, has suggested that there are 300,000 French “citizens and voters” in London - which when dependents are taken into account would mean a total figure of around 350,000. Mark Leonard of the Centre for European Reform has referred to 300,000 “French workers” - which would mean that there are 450,000 French men, women and children living in the capital. If true there are more French in London than there are in Lyon and London is now the third largest French city in the world (since London is sometimes said to be the third largest Polish city in the world one is bound to wonder whether London can still be the largest British city in the world).

Writing in the 4th April edition of the *New Statesman*, Agnes Poirier, a London-based French journalist and author, refers to la *génération Londres* and estimates that there are a total of 600,000 French citizens in the UK,

with London being the favourite destination for her fellow countrymen. London, she suggests is in fact the seventh biggest French city in the world - which still puts it ahead of Nantes, Bordeaux, Montpellier, and Rennes.

But are any of these figures remotely correct? Is the average Greater London Borough really home to around 10,000 Frenchmen?

An unpublished paper from the think-tank Futurus run by Anthony Scholefield suggests that the ‘New Hugenot invasion’ is simply a myth and the number of Frenchmen in London is a small fraction of those said to have settled there.

Foreign Nationals

As Scholefield points out, the Labour Force Survey of 2005 found that there were 1.5 million foreign nationals working in the UK, of whom 682,000 were in London. In the whole of the UK the total number of French and German workers is put at 108,000 of whom 70 per cent are thought to be French. Most of these are thought to be young, but if a further fifty per cent is added on to cover dependents this gives a figure of 112,500 for the UK. This would be compatible with a range of other data. Eurostat estimated that there were 59,000 French nationals living in the UK in 1990; allowing for an increase in net inflows along roughly similar lines to the increase of Britain immigration to France you arrive at a roughly similar figure. We also know that in January this year 109,000 French men and women were registered at the French embassy as UK residents and that 60,000 had

registered to vote.

Around 43 per cent of foreign nationals - let’s say 50 per cent in the case of the French - settle in London. That would suggest a total of 55,000 to 60,000 Frenchmen living in the UK capital.

The true figure, of course, could be slightly higher - or lower - but it is impossible to justify or even take seriously the figures quoted by the Mayor and Lord Wallace.

Why should europhiles be so keen either to exaggerate the number of French living in London, or simply to accept uncritically figures which look unrealistic as soon as you think about them?

Perhaps it is because they like to believe that London is the cultural cockpit of a multi-national European state in which young Brits and French combine to create a new European consciousness and thus become the first true European citizens. Or could it simply be that they are bad at maths?

Dubious figures about the inflow of French immigrants prompts one other reflection. After the stifling protection of the risk-averse French nanny-state it may well be that many young French men and women do find London-life exciting and challenging. But evidently not all. Every year the French consulate assists those who, in the words of an official, “cannot adjust to the harshness of the Anglo-Saxon lifestyle”. (i.e had run up debts and couldn’t afford the fare home). In 2004 the number was 300. But presumably the number assisted by *mère* and *père* after frantic telephone calls home is very much greater than this. *C’est la vie*.

Setting the record straight

In our front-page article “Cameron’s EU Speech adds to cloud of unreality” (23rd March) we stated that “a repatriation of powers from the EU can only take place as a result of renegotiation”. While the article in

question was intended to draw attention specifically to the deep impracticality of Conservative proposals to repatriate powers that depend on unanimous support from other EU members, taken by itself, this assertion is incorrect. Powers could, of

course, be repatriated by means of a decision by the British parliament to repeal the European Communities Act 1972. This is a very important matter, which is set out in detail on page 5 and if we have mislead readers about this we apologise profusely.

What will the European Union look like in 20 years' time?

A scenario from a Europhile think-tank paints an amazingly rosy picture - but only by excluding important aspects of reality

What will the European Union be like in 2027. Well, according to Charles Grant, the director of the Centre for European Reform in an essay to mark the 50th anniversary of the EU, it is going to be absolutely terrific.* Reader, you will not guess the half of it: there is going to be rising economic growth, falling unemployment and more efficient labour markets, more democracy, a bigger world role for EU foreign policy and the triumphant fulfilment of the Lisbon goals. By 2027 the CAP will have been dismantled with countries taking responsibility for their own agricultural policies, Commissioners will be directly elected, the English language will have been adopted as the sole working language of the Commission, and the French will have reconciled themselves to Turkish membership. Around the world EU troops as well as European aid workers, policemen and administrators will be busy ensuring that the international order is safe, socially-just and green. Still more extraordinarily, French politicians will have begun to act as reasonable human beings and under a Labour government David Milliband will be about to offer the British the wonderful opportunity of joining the euro in a referendum.

Remarkable Transformation

If you think that all of this is far-fetched in the extreme - confirmation that most British europhiles have but a tenuous grasp of reality - then you will find the description of the events which lead to this remarkable transformation of Europe's economic and political prospects even more fanciful.

The tipping point was the Italian economic crisis of 2009 which brought about the collapse of the centre-left government. With foreign debt soaring

and Italy's exports priced out of international markets the political forces demanding the country's withdrawal from the euro and the repudiation of debt looked unstoppable. Would other countries follow Italy's example? The financial markets looked to Greece, Spain and Portugal as other countries that might follow Italy's example by quitting the euro. It was clear to many that the entire European project was about to implode. This was Europe's darkest hour.

Mass Demonstrations

But then the former EU Commissioner Mario Monti, not known hitherto as a miracle-worker, formed an Italian government of technocrats supported by moderates of left and right. This faced down mass demonstrations and civil unrest in order to introduce a reform package. Grant does not actually say what the package included but somehow business confidence, investment, and growth all picked up and Italy remained in the euro.

Nicholas Sarkozy who had begun his first term as French president very cautiously, is now inspired by Monti's example to liberalise the French labour markets, to reform French public services and to cut back the role of the state. There is a knock-on effect: EU economies now grow at more than three per cent.

But Monti is not the only miracle worker. Increasingly concerned by the belligerence and bullying of Vladimir Putin who has returned to office for a third and increasingly authoritarian term, EU countries display a rare, indeed unique coherence in foreign policy terms. When Putin threatens to invade Georgia the EU foreign minister Carl Bildt (does Grant give him the job because he is a member of

the advisory council of Grant's think-tank?) orchestrates an exercise in soft-power more effective than any since Moses parted the Red Sea. Terrified of facing sanctions and the appalling prospect of losing a seat at European tables, Putin lamely backs down and the Russian troops pull back.

It is easy to make fun of Grant's scenario because of its inherent implausibility, but it is still instructive in its way. There is no mention at all of the United States (was it in an isolationist sulk when Russia was threatening Georgia with military intervention or has it simply disappeared under the sea as a result of Global Warming?). There is no mention of NATO. There is no reference to the rising economic and political influence of China and India. There is no reference to terrorist activities (although we are told that the EU has developed an 'effective counter-terrorist agency'), rogue states, or weapons of mass destruction. There is no mention of Iran's nuclear weapons programme.

Demographic Problems

There is no mention of Europe's chronic demographic problems or the problems arising from Europe's unfunded pensions. Indeed there is scarcely a reference to any subject or topic which poses a problem for the EU or with which it is currently finding it difficult to live.

Grant is only able to weave his fairy story by excluding important aspects of economic and political reality. Indeed, his omissions tells us quite as much about the shortcomings of the European project as any eurosceptic polemic.

* "The EU in 2027", *Prospect Magazine*, Issue 133, April 2007 (www.prospect-magazine.co.uk).

Britain's legal power to opt-out of continued EU economic and political integration

There is no legal impediment to British withdrawal from the EU or to seeking to achieve a looser relationship with Brussels

Renegotiating EU Membership

The draft EU Constitution, signed by the Heads of Government of all twenty-seven of the current EU member-states on 29th October 2004, is only the latest in a twenty-year series of major renegotiations of the EU treaties: those resulting in the Treaty of Nice (2001); the Treaty of Amsterdam; (1997); the Treaty of Maastricht (1992) and the Single European Act (1986). Each renegotiation has radically altered the nature of the EU. There is no legal reason why future EU renegotiations should not provide some or all member-states with a looser relationship with "Brussels" and with each other than hitherto. Such difficulties that might be encountered are entirely of a political kind.

Flexibility is already built in to the existing EU treaties. Fewer than half (thirteen out of twenty-seven) of the current member-states have adopted its principal economic and political project, the "single" currency. The EU has long-standing free trade arrangements with its near-neighbours in Europe: for example, Turkey (a member of the EU customs union), Switzerland, Iceland and Norway (not members of the EU customs union). Outside Europe, the EU has a free trade agreement with a NAFTA-member, Mexico, and, once current negotiations are completed, will have free trade agreements with approximately 90 other countries - around half of all the

countries in the world.

Thus, neither on the grounds of precedent, nor of EU or international law, is there any impediment to a country like the United Kingdom negotiating with the EU an arrangement which suits it best.

Leaving the EU altogether

Neither would there be any legal impediment to the UK leaving the EU altogether. So confirmed the British Government, in the House of Lords, on 8th February 2007, in the following written answer to a written question:

Question: *Whether, under international treaties presently in force, the United Kingdom would have the legal power to withdraw from the European Union if Her Majesty's Government or Parliament so resolved. (HL 1863)*

Answer: *Parliament may amend or repeal any existing Act of Parliament, including the European Communities Act 1972. There is no formal procedure for withdrawal in the EU treaties, nor are there any provisions in the treaties or any other international treaties which affect the ultimate ability of the UK to withdraw from the EU.*

This formal statement of the position is consistent with the understanding of the government of the day in 1975, when, in its referendum on continuing UK membership of the EU, withdrawal would have ensued had the result gone the other way.

Greenland, then a province of Denmark, withdrew from the EU in

1985. The Swiss Federal Government, in its Europe 2006 Report on relations between Switzerland and the EU, concluded that EU members had, and will continue to have, an unequivocal right to withdraw.

Finally, the draft EU Constitution, signed by the heads of government of all 27 current member-states of the EU on 29th October 2004, but not in force, provides that any member-state may withdraw:-

Article I-60: Voluntary withdrawal from the Union:

Any Member State may decide to withdraw from the Union in accordance with its own constitutional requirements.....

The EU and its neighbours

The current EU treaties (at Article 300 TEC) and the draft Constitution (at Article I-57) require the EU to "develop a special relationship with neighbouring countries, aiming to establish an area of prosperity and good neighbourliness, founded on the values of the Union and characterised by close and peaceful relations based on co-operation.....the Union may conclude specific agreements with the countries concerned..."

These provisions would apply to the EU's relations with the UK in the event that the latter withdrew from the EU altogether, placing the UK on a legal footing vis-à-vis the EU no-less-favourable than that of Switzerland or Norway.

EU policies damage environment

Despite its environmentalist aspirations the EU currently imposes a 66.1 per cent tariff on low-energy light bulbs from China, Vietnam, Pakistan and the Philippines, according to a survey carried out by *Open Europe*. This has substantially driven up prices. Today, a single

energy efficient light bulb equivalent to 60 watts can cost as much as £4. Without the antidumping duty and the VAT, the price would be 66p - a price cut of more than 80 per cent.

While the Government is trying to encourage people to cycle to work, bicycles are presently subject to steep

tariffs - sometimes as high as 48.5 per cent. *Open Europe's* estimate that a standard high quality bicycle for commuters could go from costing £250 today to less than £80 without the anti-dumping tariffs and the VAT. This could encourage far more people to try cycling to work.

LETTERS

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

How to Repatriate Powers

Dear Sir,

It has been a week or two since you were kind enough to give the light of day to my piece on the nostrum of a referendum to seek the British electorate's view on the repatriation of sovereign powers. Let me call it RSP. Since then two things have happened, both bruited in your issue of 23rd March. One was David Cameron's Brussels speech in which, like so many predecessors he hoped he might 'negotiate' (oh yeah!!!) a root and branch reform of the EU. And Global Vision was launched with, so far as I could see, the same highly optimistic ambition.

Neither give the slightest indication of what they would do if rebuffed or what mandate they would have to brandish. What neither DC nor GV mention is that their ambition simply cannot avoid RSP. It would be like trying to go from West to East Berlin twenty years ago and not bump into the Wall.

Only a popular mandate in the form of a jaw-dropping 'Yes' vote in a referendum (very achievable), a list of national competences to be repatriated and the strongest possible hint of UK non-cooperation in financing the EU will be taken seriously.

That apart, we have no right to require the total reform of the EU against the majority's wishes (and the majority will be against us.) What both DC and GV really seek is not a reform of the EU but the reformation of our relationship with the EU. The latter, not the former, is absolutely our right

and competence.
FREDERICK FORSYTH
Hertfordshire

Time to target Lib-Dems

Dear Sir,

A number of your correspondents have exercised their minds over whether a strong UKIP performance would extend the life of a corrupt and damaged Labour government by taking votes from the Conservatives. I am not convinced that this is a valid argument. Is there any point in jumping onto an escalator going the wrong way? The only difference now between the big two is that the Labour escalator is moving into the EU faster and with less noise than the Tory one! Every Tory administration since 1970 has left us further integrated into the EU than it found us.

However, surely the answer is for UKIP to target the Lib-Dems with a clear focus on becoming the third largest party and perhaps the arbiter between the two in a hung Parliament. This targeting would have many advantages, not least because the Lib-Dems are the most pro-EU party despite tending to be most strongly represented in the Celtic fringes - areas which are most strongly anti-EU and where the Cons/Lab vote is often negligible. Elsewhere the Lib-Dems are seen as a convenient receptacle for protest votes; in this area careful scrutiny on policies such as those on drugs and the monarchy could yield significant advances. The UKIP bandwagon would consequently roll faster - as it did during the last European Elections when UKIP

pushed the Lib-Dems into fourth place.
G.F. MAIN
Sussex

Population Problems

Dear Sir,

The United Nations Population Division forecasts that the EU will lose 64 million people of working age by 2050 and that the UK will have gained 1.12 million in the same time frame (*eurofacts* 6th April). Does anyone at all give any credence to such reports?

The world's population has grown from 1.6 billion to 6.3 billion in the last 100 years. The UK's has grown from 37 million to over 64 million in the same time frame. The world's population will exceed 9.5 billion by 2050 and in many of the countries that I have worked in populations will double in the next 25 years. The UK will have around 600,000 immigrants this year and the last time I looked at the figure UK births exceeded deaths by over 250,000. There will be massive movements of people in the years ahead and the UK will remain a prime destination. As members of the EU and signatories of the 1951 UN Charter for Refugees we have - in theory, at least - no control over our level of population.

These kinds of reports are used to justify mass immigration. However what is or is not an optimum population is a complex subject and not covered at all in this report. To have any control over our level of population and to decide for ourselves what is or is not an appropriate policy for the UK we must first leave the EU
PAUL RHODES
London

EU girls offer marriages for cash

According to the *People* newspaper on 14th April immigrants from EU countries are offering to marry illegal immigrants in return for large sums of money. The newspaper reported that last year more than 500 Albanians applied for visas to stay after marrying EU nationals, and 41 were granted. It said that officials suspect that most of the marriages were bogus. A *People* investigator posing as an illegal immigrant reportedly found four Polish girls willing to marry him for sums of money ranging from £3,500 to £12,000.

MEETINGS

The Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Tuesday **1st May**, 7.00 pm

“Celebrating the Act of Union and the creation of a Great Nation”

Reception

7.00 - 7.30 pm Princess Alexander Hall

Supper - 7.45 pm Hall of India

Speeches - 9.15 pm

The Countess of Mar

Andrew Roberts, *broadcaster and historian*

Lord Tebbit, *former Chairman of the Conservative Party*

TERCENTENARY DINNER

Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St. James's Street, London SW1A

Admission £70 in advance

(tables of 10 are available - includes three course supper, wine and refreshments)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **2nd May**, 1.00 pm

“Our New Constitution”

Vernon Bogdanor, CBE. FBA,
Gresham Professor of Law

PUBLIC MEETING

Allen & Overy LLP, 40 Bank Street, Docklands, London

Admission £14

(Reservations Required)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **10th May**, 6.00 pm

“Sixty Years On Leadership and Change: Prime Ministers in the Post-War World - Anthony Eden”

Dr David Carlton

PUBLIC MEETING

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

British Weights & Measures Association

020 8922 0089

Saturday **19th May**, 1.30 pm

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

Victory Services Club, 63 Seymour Street, London W2 2HF

Admission

(details to be announced)

The First Goldsmith Lecture

020 7247 2524

Tuesday **22nd May 2007**, 7.00 pm

Prof Stephen Bush, *Manchester University*

The Rt Hon Lord Tebbit CH
Chairman, **Dennis Delderfield**

PUBLIC MEETING

Sir Ambrose Fleming Lecture Hall, Roberts Building, University College, London

Admission £3

(From New Britain, 10 College East, Gunthorpe Street, London E1 7RL)

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **1st May**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *European Union documents* from the Croation Ambassador, HE Mr Josip Paro.

Tuesday **1st May**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *UK Economic Regulators* from:
(a) a Rail Industry Panel;
(b) an Aviation Panel, witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **3rd May**, 10.00 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into Labour Law* from Mr Jim Fitzpatrick, Minister for Employment Relations, DTI.

Tuesday **8th May**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *European Union documents* from witnesses to be confirmed.

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

Better off Out Campaign

www.betteroffout.co.uk

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdication.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.cibhq.co.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

<http://euobserver.com>

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

<http://speakout.co.uk>

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Stewatch

www.stewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

French Parliamentary Election **10th and 17th June**

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

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*. **£10.99**

This book is the most comprehensive history of the EU.

Living in a Fascist Country

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£15.99**

The disappearing freedom and privacy.

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**

An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

Iran

The Clash of Ambitions

by *Houchang Nahavandi*. **£16.95**

A history of the people and influences that have formed the Iran of today. It has a history of integrating invaders.

Britain and the EU: Time to Move On

by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£3.95**

The European Union malaise and the future direction for a nation state.

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.

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.

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

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.

Better Off Out! Okay What Next?

by *Bruges Group* DVD

Per Session *Morning/Afternoon/Evening* **£10.00 each** Complete Set **£25.00**

The 2006 Conference, held in the Great Hall of King's College, London.

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 Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
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	
Global Vision	www.global-vision.net
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
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

