

## British universities forced into educational 'euro-zone'

*The creation of a European Higher Educational Area will lock British universities into a process that promises conformity and lower standards*

A top-down system which lowers standards, imposes conformity and reduces Britain's reputation in the world that has been designed to solve a problem that doesn't exist. This is a description which could apply to almost every institution of the European Union, and indeed to the European project as a whole.

It is in fact the picture that emerges very clearly from a report by MPs on the higher education "euro-zone" which has recently been created and which the EU is now seeking to control by means of a power-grab.

### Fundamental Principles

The Bologna Process is intended to develop a European Higher Educational Area (EHEA) with the aim of "increasing greater mobility of high level skills in an increasingly international higher education system". It is so called because Bologna University happens to be the place where on the occasion of the university's 900th anniversary in 1988 university heads from 45 countries got together to sign a statement on the fundamental principles on which university education should be based.

Why should Britain have signed up to such a thing? In important respects the principles on which British universities are organised differ from those which apply in continental Europe. Moreover, in the main, Britain's universities are considerably better.

The 2006 *Times Higher Educational Supplement* list of the top 20 universities contains only one university - the Ecole Normale Supérieure - which is located in an EU country other than Britain and this only squeezes in at 17th place. Britain has four - Oxford, Cambridge, Imperial College, London and LSE - in the top 20, the US eleven. Other more broadly based systems of university ranking include no European universities other than British ones in the top 25. Bologna is so far down everyone's list that it is difficult to locate. Britain apart there are remarkably few European universities in the world's top 50 given the continent's rich cultural history.

### Language Skills

Where is the evidence of a lack of 'mobility' that the EHEA is supposed to address? Britain is the second most popular destination for overseas students (after the US) and its universities consequently bring in substantial foreign earnings. For decades British students have experienced few difficulties in completing part of their studies in foreign universities, including European ones (where they have mainly gone to improve language skills) though many have opted to do so in the US, Australia, or Canada. Why then should Britain seek compatibility with universities with

lower standards and different principles?

The report of the House Commons Education and Skills Committee on the Bologna Process (HC 205) does not provide convincing answers to these questions and it even praises the aspirations of the EHEA. But it does not hide its concerns: "...anxieties still exist, despite the formal intentions, that working to achieve compatibility might in practice lead in the direction of standardisation or uniformity - and therefore undermine the autonomy and flexibility of the UK system. As a result, we have recommended that the Government be increasingly vigilant in guarding against a move towards bureaucratic, top down, detailed agreements".

### Not Fit for Purpose

These anxieties are not merely academic - no pun intended. The Committee expresses deep concern that the European Credit Transfer system (ECTS) - based solely on hours studied - is 'not fit for purpose'. In theory the European Commission's User Guide on ECTS is non-compulsory but it is increasingly used and accepted across the EHEA. As a consequence, the committee also reports concerns about the future of the one year Master's degree and four year integrated Master's Degrees taught in Britain neither of which corresponds to

**Continued on p.2**

**INSIDE: Why UK parties lined up for Sarkozy p.2** - New Tory selection process will protect incumbent MEPs p.3 - Communists still in charge in Marseilles p.3 - How an entire generation lost its voice p.4 - **Most people want new relationship with EU p.4** - Legislate now, find the treaty basis later p.5 - **The cost of the EU's travelling circus p.5** - EU 'worse than its worst components p.5 - **You certainly couldn't make this up p.5** - How long before public patience with the EU snaps?

# Why UK parties lined up for Sarkozy

As we go to press the outcome of the French presidential election is unclear and, although Nicolas Sarkozy would appear to be the favourite by a slight margin we would not place bets on the outcome. Neither candidate is exactly a British eurosceptic's cup of tea and some effort is required to establish which of the candidates would be the least awful from a British viewpoint. The choice - which will have been made by the time you read this article - would seem to be between a chic French socialist whose pronouncements are so vague as to make those of David Cameron appear to be a model of precision and clarity and an arrogant and abrasive Gaullist without de Gaulle's vision, grandeur or stature.

On the FT's Brussels blog George Parker predicted on 25th April, "If you think Chirac tried to dominate European summits, wait until you see this little cowboy in action". He reported that at meetings of finance

ministers Sarkozy was known to brief the press before the official press conferences - "a brazen breach of protocol". He quotes an experienced EU observer as saying, "Europe is the antithesis of his approach. He always wants to be acting constantly, getting into details, while Europe lays down rules to constrain the action of national politicians".

eurofacts has no quarrel with politicians who pursue national interest, but there is ample reason to think that British interests seldom coincide with those of France.

However, there is no doubting where the sympathies of Britain's main parties lay; they were all for Sarkozy. According to widespread reports Gordon Brown, the Prime Minister in waiting was keen to establish 'a strategic partnership' which would include Merkel, Barroso, and Sarkozy

Why should this be? Britain is said to care strongly about Turkish accession. Sarkozy is against, unlike his rival who

is for. Almost all British politicians are in favour of dismantling the CAP and Brown has condemned both its wastefulness and its impact on the Third World. Sarkozy has given firm pledges to preserve it.

Brown has condemned economic protection. As Finance Minister Sarkozy, a vocal champion of national champions, bailed out French companies - most famously in the case of Alstom, while keeping German engineering companies out of France.

The explanation why most British politicians back Sarkozy is, of course, that he is in favour of a slimmed down constitution which, he said, would not require a referendum. Royal said she wanted the constitution to be 'more social' but promised a referendum.

By the time you read this the outcome will be clear; if Sarkozy triumphs we may have cause to regret that the victor was not a glamorous French socialist with a vacuous line in rhetoric and a beautiful smile.

Continued from p.1

## Britain locked into educational 'euro-zone'

the requirements of the ECTS system.

The Committee's greatest overall anxiety has to do with the increasing impact of the EU Commission on a process which is already inclined to centralisation and the imposition of conformity: "The expanding role of the European Community in the field of education, however, and the belief that it is seeking to expand its role through the mechanism of the Bologna process, is a major source of concern to UK organisations and institutions. It is our greatest concern regarding the future of the Bologna Process".

The report states: "We recommend that the Government seeks clarification of the exact role of the Commission in the Bologna Process. A way must be found to ensure its involvement does not undermine the essentially voluntary and bottom-up approach and that the process remains outside the framework of the EC. The European Commission must be

appropriately circumscribed".

The Committee urges the Government to raise these concerns and to protect the future of the British degree structure at the ministerial summit scheduled for later this month.

Will it do so? There doesn't seem to be the faintest possibility that this will happen. Bill Rammell is not exactly a name that is synonymous with the pursuit of academic or intellectual excellence, but he happens to be Minister for Higher Education. He told the Daily Telegraph on 30th April: "It is important that the [Bologna] process complements the Commission's strategy for higher education reform which is all about making higher education systems more flexible, more coherent and more responsive to the needs of society. We want to influence the changes, not stand by and watch".

People who utter meaningless clichés of this kind should not be ministers, least of all ministers for education.

And, of course, Mr Rammell is disastrously mistaken. The Commission has no business imposing a 'strategy' for education on Britain; there is no treaty basis for action of this kind. And when observing others making mistakes by creating centralised systems of decision-making it is infinitely better to stand idly by than to meekly follow on behind. One is tempted to yell in Mr Rammell's ear: "Don't just do something. Stand there!"

What is presently happening is that the Commission is muscling in on a process that already threatens the autonomy and standards of British universities but which is consequently becoming far more damaging to our interests - while British ministers applaud. Unless checked the EU's takeover of British higher education will lock British universities into a process of inferiority and decline. It's part of a familiar pattern.

# New Tory selection process will protect incumbent MEPs

The Conservative Party has come up with a new system for selecting its candidates for the European Parliamentary elections. The old system was widely criticised for being undemocratic and for producing a European Parliamentary party which was significantly more pro-EU than either the grass roots membership or the voters. Of the 27 Conservative members currently sitting in Brussels only seven could be regarded as robustly eurosceptic and of these only two - Daniel Hannan and Roger Helmer have publicly committed themselves to backing withdrawal.

Despite its defects - or perhaps because of them - the Tory parliamentary party in Brussels has not been an effective political force. Hostilities have recently abated somewhat but for much of period since 2004 it has been embroiled in civil war.

What was needed if the wounds were to be healed were changes in the method of selection which would alter the balance of opinion within the party and leave it less vulnerable to accusation that it violated the principles of 'localism', accountability and openness that David Cameron preaches but doesn't invariably follow.

Will the new system achieve this?

While it is superficially more democratic in that all party members will be able to vote - last time around voting was confined to those members who had attended the hustings - the new system seems to be designed to preserve a parliamentary party which is rent by fundamental differences and sometimes gives the impression that it does not know what is going on around it. Most important of all it will be almost impossible to replace out-of-touch europhile incumbents with eurosceptics.

The finer details of the scheme are still to be announced but the outlines of the changes are clear from the following statement issued by the Tory Party Board following its meeting on 23rd April:-

*"Sitting MEPs who have been re-selected following a procedure similar to that laid down in the Party's constitution for Westminster MPs will be placed in ranking order by party members in a postal ballot. Members will also be asked to place additional candidates in ranking order."*

*"In the wholly exceptional circumstances that there will be no sitting MEPs who are women seeking re-election, and for this selection process only, the top position in each*

*region below any reselected sitting MEPs will be occupied by the woman candidate who gets the most votes in the postal ballot."*

What this will mean in practice is a high degree of protection for incumbent members since those voting will not be able to place a newcomer above a sitting member. It will consequently be extremely difficult for newcomers to get a look in.

Since the party's only female MEP - Caroline Jackson - is standing down in 2009 the top places below the list of incumbents will effectively be a women's only shortlist.

If the Conservatives had been serious about localism, openness, decentralised initiative and the like they could have gone for a system of primaries. Instead they have gone for a system which combines a form of political protectionism with an element of sexual discrimination.

The great virtue of democracy is that you occasionally have the opportunity to get rid of the rascals who govern. The combination of proportional representation, party lists, and managerial wheezes designed to protect sitting MEPs all but destroys this possibility.

## Communists still in charge in Marseilles

Readers may remember an article which appeared over a year ago (*eurofacts*, 16th December 2005, page 7, Trouble in France's Deep South) describing the grip which the French Communist trade union, the CGT, had on Marseilles. On 2nd April 2007, at the end of an 18-day strike which paralysed the port of Marseilles, the CGT once again came out the victor.

Ostensibly, the strike was about who had the right to employ workers at a brand-new liquefied natural gas terminal that the nationalised French gas utility, GdF, is in the process of building. GdF argued that the highly-specialised task of connecting the high-pressure flexible hoses through which

the pressurised liquid is fed from the ship to the shore installation had to be done by its own trained employees. The CGT argued that its dockers, who work at the nationalised Port Autonome de Marseille, should get the job. The strikers declined to unload 60 ships, including many oil tankers, which had to moor offshore until the strike ended, at huge cost.

In the end the French Government blinked first. With petrol and diesel shortages beginning to be felt inland, only three weeks before the first round of the presidential elections, a solution had to be found. So the government agreed that five of the jobs in question should be reserved for the CGT.

Private-sector employers in the Marseilles region were outraged, fearing that Marseilles' image will be degraded even further. Although Marseilles is still the biggest port in France (and indeed the Mediterranean), it is losing ground to North Sea rivals such as Le Havre and Antwerp, and to Mediterranean rivals such as Genoa and Barcelona. This demonstration of the CGT's continuing grip on Marseilles (and, more generally, on nationalised energy utilities like EdF and GdF), highlights the huge complexities of "reforming" the French labour market that will face the new President of France.

# How an entire generation lost its voice

*At least one leading member of the Establishment has owned up to his generation's failure to understand the folly of British EU membership*

In previous issues of *eurofacts* we have suggested that progress in the attempt to get Britain out of the EU has been fatally hampered by the unwillingness of the Great and the Good to admit the scope of their error in backing the European project even when the damage done by membership was becoming ever more obvious. But for their reluctance in this regard Britain might by now have broken free of the economic and political shackles of membership, or so we have argued.

We are grateful to a reader, Mr C Francis Warren, for pointing to a rare and honourable example of one establishment figure, the late Lord Annan, admitting just how disastrously wrong he and other prominent members of his generation had been. Although matters have got very much worse since these words were written more than a decade ago, they provide eloquent testimony to the folly of an entire generation:

*In their last years our generation looked at where they had left their country. The spectacle that greeted their eyes was odd...The British still continued to believe that the Community was only a large free trade*

*area in which goods and services, capital and people could move without frontiers.*

*But the Continent regarded economic cooperation as a step towards political union. Few of us realised that three bodies that made the law in the Community - the council, commission and the parliament were going to rule the lives of their successors through their regulations, decisions and directives. The Community's political practice ran counter to British constitutional practice. The bureaucrats in the commission drafted laws without the supervision of ministers, whereas in Britain ministers had to justify the detailed provisions in legislation before lobbies and public opinion. Not only did ministers have no voice in the commission, they were not heard in the European Parliament.*

## Rubber Stamp

*This parliament gave its views on the commission's proposals, and it was only when the council of ministers met that ministers could intervene. As a result they found themselves forestalled - they had lost their voice and a rubber stamp had been put in their hand*

[This comment was made well before

huge swathes of decision making in the Council of Ministers were placed under Qualified Majority Voting- Ed.]

*Few of us grasped that the Westminster Parliament would become the equivalent of a state or provincial legislature in America or Canada. Britain's foreign policy would be decided in Brussels. Ministries such as defence, agriculture and industry would disappear; public health, immigration, environmental controls, pensions and industrial relations would be governed by the regulations and controls of the Community. We had not understood how the European Court of Justice would interpret the wording of the treaties. The Court operated on a legal system based on Roman Law in which judgements were made not on precedent but principle. As the ultimate object of such treaties was the integration of all states within the Community the European Court ruled that the exact wording of treaties was not paramount. The ruling principle in deciding cases was whether the action was likely to bring about the political union of member states. (Noel Annan, **Our Age: Portrait of a Generation**, Ch. 27).*

## Most people want new relationship with European Union

Sixty nine per cent of Britons would either like to leave the EU or would like a looser relationship with it, according to an opinion poll commissioned by the newly-formed campaign group Global Vision. Only 27 per cent said that they wanted to remain in it.

Of those who wanted a fundamental change 29 per cent said that they wanted to leave while 36 per cent said they wanted a new looser relationship with Europe, maintaining free trade

and co-operating on common policies, but opting out of political integration.

Asked whether there should be a referendum on loosening ties 69 per cent said yes and 22 per cent no. An overwhelming 75 per cent of those aged 18-24 said that there should be a referendum.

Commenting on the findings, Ruth Lea, the director of Global Vision said: *"It is clear from these results that the wish to fundamentally change Britain's relationship with the EU is the majority*

*view. It is not an 'extremist' view."*

*"Britain can have a wonderful future, but it must be freed from the EU's political and regulatory shackles. The British people, of course, already fully understand this."*

The nation-wide poll in which 1008 people took part was carried out by ICM with the results weighted by the profile of participants. Full details can be found on the Global Vision website ([www.global-vision.net](http://www.global-vision.net)).

# Legislate now, find the treaty basis later

Comprehensive legislation covering smoking in public places is to be introduced in England, Wales and Northern Ireland from this summer. This follows an EU Commission Green Paper (Towards a Europe free from tobacco smoke) which in turn led to a proposal for an EU-wide ban on smoking in public places from the EU Health Commissioner Markos Kypriano.

Earlier this year Graham Brady, the Conservative spokesman on Europe

asked the Government about the treaty-basis for Mr Kypriano's proposal.

In a written reply, Caroline Flint, the Minister of State for Public Health merely referred Mr Brady to the EU Green Paper which states:

*"The exact legal basis of the legislation could be determined once the exact nature and scope of the instrument will be defined and this choice will have to take into account the results of this public consultation."*

(House of Commons Hansard, 13 February 2007).

The Minister's reply suggests not only that the Government doesn't have the faintest idea about the legal basis of the proposal, but that the Commission has no idea, either. Its plan apparently was to formulate the proposal and to come up with the legal justification for it after the event. It would seem that when it comes to EU law-making literally anything goes.

## The cost of the EU's travelling circus

The environmental cost of moving the European Parliament from Brussels to Strasbourg every month amounts to at least 20,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions - the equivalent of 13,000 return flights from London to New York per year - according to a study commissioned by Green MEPs.

The climate change cost was calculated by adding the costs of maintaining the separate parliamentary seats to the costs and CO2 emissions

resulting from MEPs and staff travelling between them.

In all 1,220 officials and other servants of the parliament make the return journey from Brussels to Strasbourg while another 525 travel from Luxembourg. In addition fifteen lorries ferry cupboards and tin trunks full of documents travel from Brussels or Luxembourg and back again

The financial cost of this travelling circus amounts to 18 million a year

Scrapping the Strasbourg seat has recently been supported by an on-line petition signed by more than 1 million people. But Strasbourg's position as one of the official seats of the European Union has been enshrined in the EU treaty since 1992 - and only a unanimous decision could change this. No prizes are offered for naming the country which has consistently opposed its closure.

## EU 'worse than its worst components'

*"Pope Benedict was right to mark the 50th anniversary of 'Europe' by pointing out that this bureaucratic concept, with its repudiation of the Continent's Christian and cultural origins, is shallow and materialistic, doomed to oblivion, a point undermined by the terrifyingly low birth rates of its peoples. Had he been a less circumspect and charitable man, he might have added, as I now do, that*

*Brussels-Europe combines all the worst characteristics of its components: French arrogance, German tunnel-vision, Spanish bloody-mindedness, Dutch obstinacy, Belgian cowardice, Austrian anti-Semitism, Portuguese evasiveness and Danish cop-outing, not to speak of the new Slav contributions, Polish irrationalism, Czech confusion, Slovak evasion, all topped up by Hungarian*

*deviousness. 'Europe' is the worst thing to happen to Europe since the two world wars it started, and the dire consequences are only just beginning to manifest themselves. What will it be like by mid-century? Is this pathetic continent heading for a species of historical hell?"*

Paul Johnson, *The Spectator*, 14th April 2007.

## You certainly couldn't make this up

We didn't have time to check before going to press - but according to the *Sun* on April 30th MEPs have asked the Commission to find ways of stopping livestock from farting. Their call came after the UN said livestock emissions were a bigger threat to the planet than transport.

The MEPs have asked the European

Commission to "look again at the livestock question in direct connection with global warming".

The official EU declaration demands changes to animals' diets, to capture gas emissions and recycle manure. The MEPs warned: *"The livestock sector presents the greatest threat to the planet"*.

The UN says livestock farming generates 18 per cent of greenhouse gases while transport accounts for 14 per cent.

A contributor to the excellent *England Expects* blog has a far more imaginative solution than the MEPs. It is to buy up Portugal's surplus cork production.

# LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## Global Vision Campaign Objectives

Dear Sir,

I read Frederick Forsyth's letter in *eurofacts* (27th April 2007) with great interest. But may I clarify the objectives of our new campaign group Global Vision.

As we make very clear in all our literature, whilst we would vigorously support major reform of the EU, we do not expect it. Therefore, we are promoting a new looser relationship for the UK with the EU based on trade and mutually beneficial cooperative arrangements, whilst opting out of political and economic union. The closest "model" already existing is Switzerland. We believe that this looser relationship is right for the UK as membership of the EU's political and economic union is impeding, and will increasingly impede, our prosperity.

A looser relationship is popular. In our recent ICM poll, people were given a choice of three options. The first was to stay within the EU and participate in further integration (27 per cent). The second was to have a looser relationship with the EU based on trade and cooperation, whilst opting out of political and economic union (36 per cent). And the third was to withdraw from the EU altogether (29 per cent). 8 per cent didn't know. Overall, therefore, two thirds of all respondents

wanted radical change - with the "looser relationship" based on free trade the option of choice.

People were also asked if there should be a referendum on the looser relationship option. An overwhelming majority, 69 per cent, said yes - whilst 22 per cent said no and 9 per cent didn't know.

Moreover, our preferred option is politically feasible, especially if the Government has a decisive referendum resulting in an additional, specific mandate. Any British Government can negotiate the terms of this new, looser relationship at any time. Britain's negotiating position is strong. But Britain's bargaining power is especially strong when there are treaty changes as every member state has the power of veto. And there will be future treaty changes.

RUTH LEA

Director, Global Vision  
London

## Moment of Decision

Dear Sir,

The European Commission's consultation period regarding the possible continuation of the use of imperial units as supplementary indicators after 31st December 2009 has now closed. A decision by the Commission is expected within the next month and it is hoped that the hard work of British Weights and Measures Association Director, John Gardner,

will lead to a positive outcome. John contacted much of British industry stressing the need to respond to the Commission's questionnaire. Virtually every segment of industry and commerce wanted the use of British traditional units of measurements to continue from 1st January 2010. Let us hope that the hard work of the Director and Committee of BWMA has not been in vain.

Imperial measures such as miles, yards, feet, inches, pints, pounds and ounces are part of Britain's heritage and culture. The Treaty of Rome, and later Treaty amendments, suggest that it is essential to maintain and promote the individual traditions and cultures of Member States of the European Community. Now is the chance for us to see whether the European Union lives up to its Treaty obligations and allows the British people to continue to use their native imperial system of units, which independent polls suggest over eighty per-cent of Britons prefer.

The BWMA, whose website can be accessed on [www.bwmaOnline.com](http://www.bwmaOnline.com), is not anti-metric, but believes that members of the public, business and industry should be free to choose whichever system they prefer, or best suits their needs, and is opposed to the European Commission's attempt to impose total metrication on the British nation.

DEREK NORMAN  
Cambridgeshire

## How long before public patience with the EU snaps?

**C**an Britain do anything effective to change the nature of the EU? Experience strongly suggests not. As very heavy paymasters to the EU, it might be thought that we were in a strong position to influence what it does. The problem is that threatening to withdraw funding only becomes an effective weapon against the background of a serious threat to leave the organisation altogether. As long as

all the major parties remain committed to Britain staying in the EU whatever happens, we have no effective leverage. The determination of the Commission and the other EU institutions to increase their power and influence, plus the acquiescence or encouragement of most of the EU's political elite to this happening, makes radical changes impossible to achieve. Especially against a backdrop of rising

net contributions to the EU budget, floods of regulations generating more costs than benefits and the madness of both the Common Agricultural Policy and the Common Fisheries Policy, it remains to be seen how long the British electorate will be prepared to tolerate this situation.

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign  
Bulletin, March 2007.

# MEETINGS

**British Weights & Measures Association**  
020 8922 0089

Saturday **19th May**, 2.00 pm

**Speakers include;**

**Rodney Atkinson**, *Author and Businessman*

**Malcolm Ball**, *Acting-Chairman of the Association of Suppliers to the Clothing Industry*

**Nigel Sitwell**, *Director of Ocean Explorer Maps*

**PUBLIC MEETING**

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

**Admission £5**

(On the door)

**The First Goldsmith Lecture**  
020 7247 2524

Tuesday **22nd May**, 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 £4 by ticket only**

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

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Thursday **24th May**, 6.00 pm

“Sixty Years On Leadership and Change: Prime Ministers in the Post-War World - Alec Douglas-Home”

**D.R. Thorpe**

with a response by

**The Earl of Home CVO CBE**

**PUBLIC MEETING**

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London

**Admission Free**

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **29th May**, 6.00 pm

“Our new Constitution”

**Vernon Bogdanor, CBE FBA**,  
*Gresham Professor of Law*

**PUBLIC MEETING**

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

**Admission Free**

**Get Britain Out**

(formerly The Anti-Common Market League)  
01787 376374

Thursday **31st May**, 7.00 pm

“The ‘Big Brother’ Surveillance Society - the EU Connection”

**Guy Herbert**, *NO2ID campaign*

**PUBLIC MEETING**

The Counting House, pub (upstairs) 50 Cornhill, London EC3V 3PD

(close to Bank Underground Station)

**Admission Free**

## SELECT COMMITTEES

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Monday **14th May**, 4.00 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Human Rights in the UK* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **16th May**, 11.00 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The EU Wine Sector* from Mr Philip Gregan, Chief Executive, New Zealand Wine Growers.

Wednesday **16th May**, 2.00 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *The draft Climate Change Bill* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Monday **21st May**, 4.00 pm

Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (TV Without Frontiers)* from Mr Shaun Woodward MP, Minister for Creative Industries and Tourism.

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

## USEFUL WEB SITES

**Better off Out Campaign**

[www.betteroffout.co.uk](http://www.betteroffout.co.uk)

**British Declaration of Independence**

[www.bdication.org](http://www.bdication.org)

**British Weights & Measures Assoc.**

[www.bwmaOnline.com](http://www.bwmaOnline.com)

**Bruges Group**

[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

**Campaign Against Euro-Federalism**

[www.caef.org.uk](http://www.caef.org.uk)

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**

[www.cibhq.co.uk](http://www.cibhq.co.uk)

**Democracy Movement**

[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)

**EU Observer**

<http://euobserver.com>

**EU Truth**

[www.eutruth.org.uk](http://www.eutruth.org.uk)

**European Commission (London)**

[www.cec.org.uk](http://www.cec.org.uk)

**European Foundation**

[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)

**European No Campaign**

[www.europeannocampaign.com](http://www.europeannocampaign.com)

**Foreign Affairs**

[www.foreignaffairs.org](http://www.foreignaffairs.org)

**Freedom Association**

[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)

**Global Britain**

[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

**Global Vision**

[www.global-vision.net](http://www.global-vision.net)

**June Press (Publications)**

[www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)

**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**

[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)

**New Alliance**

[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)

**Open Europe**

[www.openeurope.org.uk](http://www.openeurope.org.uk)

**Regional Assemblies**

[www.regionalassemblies.co.uk](http://www.regionalassemblies.co.uk)

**Speak Out Campaign**

<http://speakout.co.uk>

**Sovereignty**

[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)

**Stewardship**

[www.stewardship.org](http://www.stewardship.org)

**The People's “No” Campaign**

[www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk](http://www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk)

**United Kingdom Independence Party**

[www.ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org)

## DIARY OF EVENTS

**2007**

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

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

**The European Question and the National Interest**

by *Jeremy Black*. **£16.99**

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

**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](mailto:info@junepress.com)

**WEB SALES [www.junepress.com](http://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"

|                            |                      |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>European Commission</b> | <b>020 7973 1992</b> |
| European Movement          | 020 7940 5252        |
| <b>Federal Trust</b>       | <b>020 7735 4000</b> |

AGAINST "EU"

|                                   |                      |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Britain Out</b>                | <b>01403 741736</b>  |
| British Weights & Measures Assoc. | 020 8922 0089        |
| <b>CIB</b>                        | <b>020 8340 0314</b> |
| Democracy Movement                | 020 8570 5681        |
| <b>Freedom Association</b>        | <b>0845 833 9626</b> |
| Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign   | 020 7691 3800        |
| <b>New Alliance</b>               | <b>020 7386 1837</b> |
| Save Britain's Fish               | 01224 313473         |

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

**Congress for Democracy 01372 453678**

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Bruges Group</b>   | <b>020 7287 4414</b>  |
| Global Britain  |   |
| Email: <a href="mailto:globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org">globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org</a> |   |
| <b>Global Vision</b>  | <b><a href="http://www.global-vision.net">www.global-vision.net</a></b> |
| Open Europe   | 0207 197 2333   |

## POLITICAL PARTIES

|                                |                      |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Conservative</b>            | <b>020 7222 9000</b> |
| Rt Hon David Cameron MP        |                      |
| <b>Green Party</b>             | <b>020 7272 4474</b> |
| Richard Mallender              |                      |
| <b>Labour</b>                  | <b>08705 900 200</b> |
| Rt Hon Tony Blair MP           |                      |
| <b>Liberal</b>                 | <b>01562 68361</b>   |
| Mr Michael Meadowcroft         |                      |
| <b>Liberal Democrats</b>       | <b>020 7222 7999</b> |
| Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell MP |                      |
| <b>New Britain Party</b>       | <b>020 7247 2524</b> |
| Mr Dennis Delderfield          |                      |
| <b>UK Independence Party</b>   | <b>01626 830630</b>  |
| Nigel Farage MEP               |                      |

ISSN 1361-4134

