

EU Big Brother takes new surveillance powers

"Until August 1914", wrote A J P Taylor in his English History 1914-1945, "a sensible, law-abiding Englishman could pass through life and hardly notice the existence of the state beyond the post office and the policeman. He could live where he liked and as he liked. He had no official number or identity card. He could travel abroad or leave his country for ever without any sort of official permission...For that matter a foreigner could live his life in this country without a permit and without informing the police".

Taylor's words remind us of the extent to which the liberties which were considered to be an Englishman's birthright have been irrecoverably lost. Indeed, it is a chilling fact that British citizens, along with the citizens of the EU states, are as closely watched by state officials as those of any other continent; they are about to become still more closely monitored as a result of proposals to collect data on everyone flying in and out of the EU.

These were put forward by the EU Commission on 6th November. Under the proposals airlines will be asked to collect 19 pieces of personal data (PNR) including phone-number, e-mail address, payment details. The data is to be kept for five years and then for a further eight years in a "dormant" database.

The data is almost exactly the same as that being collected under the controversial EU-US PNR scheme.

Perhaps the most sinister aspect of the proposals is the intention to produce "profiles" (i.e. risk assessments) of all passengers and to update this as fresh information comes

in. The subjects of the profiles will not know to what use the data is being put and how it will be further processed. As the civil rights watchdog Statewatch has pointed out, this raises important questions about privacy, data protection and civil liberties.

Especially disturbing is the fact that the European Council - in its secret working parties - can modify the proposals at will, ignoring the opinion of the European Parliament on the matter if it so chooses. This has raised fears that the scheme will be extended to cover internal flights within the EU.

The measures come on top of the mandatory taking of finger prints for passports and ID cards and the mandatory storage of all telecommunications data.

No Explanation

No explanation has been given as to why the existing and more limited API (Advance Passenger Information) data scheme is deemed inadequate for the purposes of combating crime and fighting terrorism. Moreover the new scheme is to go ahead despite the fact that an EU working party on data protection believes that no case has been made for it:

"[we] have not seen any information presented by the Commission that would substantiate the pressing need to process PNR data for the purpose of preventing terrorism and related crimes or law enforcement".

The working party further concluded: *"...until the working party is provided with clarification on these fundamental points... [we] cannot conclude that the establishment of an EU PNR regime is*

necessary. Therefore, under these circumstances, the Working Party would be opposed to its development".

Tony Bunyan, editor of Statewatch commented: *"This is yet another measure that places everyone under surveillance and makes every one a suspect without any meaningful right to know how the data will be used, how it is to be further processed and by whom. Moreover, the 'profiling' of all airline passengers has no place in a democracy".*

"The underlying rationale for each of the measures is the same - all are needed to tackle terrorism. Yet there is little evidence that the gathering of mountain upon mountain of data on the activities of every person in the EU makes a significant contribution. On the other hand, the use of this data will make the EU the most surveilled place in the world."

Euro-sceptic critics of the EU have often pointed to its inherent Big Brother tendencies. But with the loss of national sovereignty and the diminution of national parliaments these are now more marked than formerly and the citizen has less in the way of protection and safeguards. In enlarging the scope of its surveillance of ordinary citizens the Commission no longer feels it even necessary to make a case for doing so other than to assert - without producing evidence of any kind - that these are necessary to fight terrorism. The fact that further measures to limit the liberty of citizens are likely to be shaped by anonymous members of secret and unaccountable working parties bodes ill for the future.

INSIDE: 'Reform' plans come and go but the CAP goes on forever p.2 - CAP takes 47 per cent of budget p.2 - Treaty 'will rekindle flame of a United Europe' p.2 - My four-point plan to win a referendum on the EU Constitution by Frederick Forsyth p.3 - Death knoll for inter-governmentalism p.4 - Immigration issue could shake EU project to its foundations p.5 - Irish undecided on Constitution p.5

'Reform' plans come and go but the CAP goes on forever

The UK's vision of a European agricultural sector which is not dependent on subsidy or protection is simply a matter of wish-fulfilment

On 22nd October 2007, the day the Prime Minister made his statement to the Commons on his sell-out in Lisbon on the re-jigged Constitution, the government marked the occasion with the publication of a lavishly-produced 28-page booklet, complete with preface by Gordon Brown and David Miliband, called "Global Europe". This is intended to set out its "approach" to the EU. As in the case of other government papers on EU matters it displays the most tenuous grasp on political reality.

Here is an extract:

"The CAP remains the most visible and expensive common policy of the EU, but it distorts the Single Market, hampers innovation, and is increasingly out of step with the need for Europe to respond to the challenges of globalisation. Internationally, it continues to attract criticism, creates tensions in the EU's relations with trading partners, and imposes significant costs on developing countries. Domestically, it imposes substantial costs on consumers and taxpayers and is inefficient in delivering support to farmers and promoting an attractive rural environment. Indeed much of the CAP still has a negative impact on the

*environment. The UK's vision for EU agriculture by 2015-2020 is for an industry that is genuinely sustainable. It should be an integral part of the European economy, and internationally competitive without reliance on subsidy or protection. This means phasing out market price support and all direct payments to EU farmers by 2020".**

Any sane government that really believed the CAP's as bad as this would leave it. After all, the UK's not in the Euro (another "visible and expensive" EU common policy), and, according to Mr Brown, the UK, protected by his famous red lines, isn't subject to the Charter of Fundamental Rights and a slew of other EU "common policies" like defence and foreign policy and justice and home affairs. So what's the problem in unilaterally dumping a grotesque ramp like the CAP?

When Mr Blair gave up part of the British rebate in December 2005 he claimed that he'd got from his partners a "commitment" to reform the CAP. But the then French agriculture minister promptly announced to the French nation that that just wasn't going to happen. A bit later, the then

President, Chirac, declared publicly that the current CAP was safe until well past 2020. The current President, Sarkozy, has declared that any CAP reform must involve more protection for French farmers and be based on the principle of enhanced "community preference". Even to British politicians, that doesn't exactly sound like the sort of "reform" they profess to have in mind.

The next French presidential and parliamentary elections are in 2012. Campaigns for those elections will start in 2011. No French politician will ever go into an election campaign on a platform of CAP reform of the kind the British say they want. The same goes for politicians in other countries with their noses in the trough: the Club Med members, Ireland, Germany, Poland to mention just the most obvious. So the prospects of genuine CAP reform are almost infinitesimally small. If Brown seriously wants CAP reform, the only way is to get out and run our own agriculture.

**Box 4.2, The EU's Common Agricultural Policy, page 23, "Global Europe" Oct 2007, Cabinet Office/Foreign & Commonwealth Office.*

CAP still takes up 47 per cent of budget

Despite all the criticism of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) it consumed a bigger proportion of the EU budget last year than in 2005. The CAP took 46.7 per cent of overall allocated EU expenditure in 2006, compared to 46.2 per cent the previous year, according to figures released by the European Commission.

The ten accession states received nine per cent of overall CAP funding including 27.4 per cent of the Rural Development Budget. France remains the individual member state with the largest share of spending but this was down from 20.7 per cent in 2005 and 21.6 per cent in 2004.

68.4 per cent of the money was spent

on direct aid while spending on export refunds and intervention dropped to just 5 per cent and 1.5 per cent of the CAP budget respectively.

Five member states (Austria, France, Ireland, Portugal and Spain) are net beneficiaries of the CAP budget, as are virtually all new member states.

Treaty 'will rekindle flame of a United Europe'

"When men and women with sweeping ambitions for Europe decide to make use of this treaty, they will be able to rekindle from the ashes of today the flame of a United Europe."

Giscard d'Estaing in an article from *Le Monde* republished in the *Independent* on 30th October.

My four-point plan to win a referendum on the EU Constitution

The key to winning an amendment vote in the Commons depends on a coordinated campaign to target MPs in marginal seats

By Frederick Forsyth

Despite some pretty feverish daydreaming from the *Telegraph* group it is quite clear that Gordon Brown, back from his Judas-trip to Lisbon, is absolutely adamant he intends to achieve ratification of the new EU Constitution, and refuse a referendum.

Like his predecessor, he will use every lie, trick and (on his own MPs) blackmail in the book to get his way. First will come formal signature just before Christmas, then the recess, then the passage of the ratification on the floor of the Commons. If he can get it.

Note this most carefully. The key vote will not be the one on ratification. Brown, with a three-line whip to prove yet again his total contempt for people and country, plus the Lib-Dems and a handful of Tories, will win that.

The key will be the addendum motion for a people's endorsement by referendum. If Brown is to be stopped or even impeded, this is the one that must be won, and only the MPs can do it. The rest of this piece refers to that vote and only that vote.

Might the MPs do it? Well, the chances are helped by the fact that a large handful of Labour and Lib-Dem MPs who favour the EU still regard as a conscience issue the right of the people to be heard and know there is only one way.

Apart from those who will vote with the Tories out of conscience, the anti-referendum group contains an Achilles heel: those who cling to a marginal seat and fear a people's uprising back home. So here is a four-point plan, but it must be accomplished before they vote if it is to be passed.

1. Contact every single MP. (It would need the resources of a major newspaper to do this.) Ask: will you definitely vote with Brown, definitely with Cameron, or are you still uncertain? This exercise will give you

three figures totalling 645. Hopefully the first figure will not be 51 per cent of the Commons. The two figures of interest are the first and the third.

2. Using computerised data, establish the 200 most marginal of the 645 seats and note the names of all who have declared they will betray 2005's manifesto pledge to please Gordon Brown and also hold a marginal seat.

3. Assuming that the Brownite forelock tuggers, EU-fanatics and 'uncertain' are in aggregate about 100, hold a quick poll in each constituency. It is not hard or particularly expensive; five volunteers with clipboards can easily ask 100 each inside one day a simple question. Five hundred per constituency is a far higher percentage than the usual polling samples. Who would do it? Well, we have half a score of EU-sceptic bodies with supporters all over the country. Usually they pass resolutions that no one takes a blind bit of notice of. This would be a genuinely valuable task. The question is easy: do you believe the British should have a referendum on the issues of the new EU constitution, do you believe the reverse, or do you not really give a damn?

4. Every MP listed as supporting Brown and every association committee member of such MPs, plus the 'thinking it overs', should receive a courteous letter pointing out that they will be voting against a clear majority (if that be the case, which looks very likely) of their constituents on the most important issue of their lifetimes. Moreover, their vote will be noted and extensively published in local and national media. More to the point, at the next election a funded and articulate independent candidate of the same (or similar) party name will stand against them and split their vote. This is not a threat; simply a solemn pledge

and one, this time, that WILL be kept.

The point is this. All MPs entertain four loyalties and pray they will never clash. These are loyalty to personal conscience, country, constituencies and party line. But forty four million of us (the electorate) have only two, the first two.

When our 645 MPs prepare to vote, they will actually fall into three categories. In the first will be those who genuinely believe in the coming of Jose Manuel Barroso's EU empire, welcome its advent and this country's subsumation into it. They will know they are voting against the wishes of country and constituency but are convinced the EU Utopian dream must have precedence over all else. It is these and Category Three who must be targeted.

Category Two will be those who genuinely believe that regardless of their views on the EU, the British people have a right to be consulted on an issue this massive, and no MP has the right to treat them with contempt, nor make his manifesto pledge to them. Both categories will come from all parties.

Category Three are those who know they vote against country and constituency, and possibly conscience as well, but (and they will not all be voting with Gordon Brown) fear him and his whips more than us, the majority of the people.

They will do so in the hope that by the next election it will have all blown over and the usual couch-potato apathy that distinguishes most of the people will have taken over again. But though MPs fear their own whips there is one thing that terrifies them much more. Being thrown out by their constituents. It is the greatest of all the fears. As Johnson might have said, it concentrates the mind wonderfully. And though the whips can terrify voting rebels when

Continued on p.4

Death knoll for inter-governmentalism

Lord Stoddart of Swindon: My Lords, Article 1 of the treaty says that the Union shall repeal and succeed the European Community. Therefore, inter-governmentalism is dead. Together with the article that gives the European Union a legal personality, does that not really alter the whole situation?

The Prime Minister said that he wanted the best and widest possible discussion in the House of Commons and in this House. However, discussion is different from being able to amend a Bill. Will amendments be allowed when the Bill is discussed in the House of Commons and in this House, and what status will they have in relation to the treaty? Will the discussions and decisions take place on the basis of free votes? If they do not and if the Government use their majority, they, not Parliament, will ratify the treaty. So will the Government allow a free vote?

Finally, are the Government able, and do they intend, to use the Parliament Act if this House makes amendments and perhaps agrees on a referendum? Are the Government able to use the Parliament Act, and will they do so, or will this House have a real role in deciding the outcome of the treaty?

Baroness Ashton of Upholland, Leader of the House of Lords: My Lords, I trust that your Lordships' House will have a role in determining the basis of the legislation and the treaty, but I believe that it will agree with the Government and ratify the treaty as well. I say that on the basis that I expect there to be a lengthy and full debate. As I understand it, the legislation will be short. However, I expect a large number of amendments to it. Therefore, our deliberations may be long. Noble Lords will have opportunities to discuss amendments

and to vote as usual, if I can describe it as such. That will also be the case in another place. It is the Government's policy. We have agreed with the ratification process and determined our red lines. We are comfortable with the position in the context of the UK interest. Therefore, the vote will be on the Government's proposition that we ratify the treaty.

Lord Pearson of Rannoch: My Lords, can I press the noble Baroness on an answer that she gave to the noble Lord, Lord Stoddart? It concerns the basic ground rule against which our debates and the debates in the other place will take place. She said that we will be able to look at this treaty in detail. The Statement welcomes the opportunity to examine the protocol and the Charter of Fundamental Rights. It welcomes further scrutiny by the House of the foreign and security policy and of the treaty as a whole. The noble Baroness, Lady Williams, implied that we would be able to change the detail of the treaty on those matters. Can the noble Baroness, Lady Ashton, confirm that we cannot change anything? We can debate it for as long as we like, and we can discuss it at all hours of the night, but, in the end, we will either have to accept the whole thing or send it back for renegotiation in Brussels.

Finally, I do not hold it against the noble Baroness, whom, as I think she knows, I hold in great affection, but this Statement is a masterpiece of slippery EU deception. Entirely missing from the Statement - I hope that she will agree - is the fact that from now on the Council must put the interests of the European Union first. That is a huge change, and it is new. It is not in the Statement. I want to ask her about the passerelle clause. From now on, the treaty can be changed by

unanimity in the Council, but no further changes need ever come back to national Parliaments, so what is the value of the embargo on future changes? I would be grateful for answers to those points, because that would set out where we are starting from.

Baroness Ashton of Upholland: First, it is very important to recognise that this legislation will be put forward by the Government to ratify the treaty. The legislation, as I understand it, will be quite short, but there will be the opportunity to table amendments, which will enable noble Lords to look at every aspect of the proposed treaty, and I know that noble Lords will do so. It is government legislation, and the Government are putting forward the legislation to ratify the treaty. If your Lordships' House and another place choose to amend the legislation, the noble Lord is correct in saying that it would then need to go back, because the ratification would be contained in agreeing the legislation before your Lordships' House. That is probably not that unusual, and that will be the system.

As for the passerelle clauses, passerelle is a construct by which you can move from unanimity to qualified majority voting. It is a technical change. You can move to it only if there is unanimous agreement on the Council that all 27 member states agree that a measure should now be taken forward by qualified majority voting. That is a technical ability for which safeguards are already built in. We will debate this at greater length, but that is what a passerelle is.

Source: House of Lords Hansard, 22nd October 2007. Parliamentary copyright 2007.

Continued from p.3

My plan for a referendum

they come in singles, a phalanx of fifty plus is untouchable.

So who will buttonhole the holders of our marginals and explain the facts of

life to them? Global Vision? Open Europe? I do not know, but passing resolutions and waving placards is not going to change the quisling from

Cowdenbeath. And time is short to prove that contempt for people and country is not going to be free of retribution any more.

Immigration issue could shake EU project to its foundations

On 31st October a High Court judge refused the Government leave to appeal over the expulsion of Learco Chindamo, the Italian killer of headmaster Philip Lawrence. In doing so the Judge confirmed that the principal reason why the Government could not expel Chindamo was not the Human Rights Act, but as we pointed out in an earlier issue (7th September), the EU 2004 Citizens Directive.

Ironically, the High Court decision coincided with a decision by the Italian government to give local prefects the power to expel EU citizens who pose a threat to public security as well as immigrants from outside the EU.

The measures taken by the Prodi government, whose poll ratings have recently plunged to new lows, follows the particularly brutal murder of a 47-year-old woman, the wife of an Italian naval captain, who was raped and savagely beaten before being thrown into a drainage ditch in a suburb of Rome. Her killer is alleged to be an unemployed 24-year-old Romanian.

The killing has produced a sense of intense outrage amongst an Italian public which increasingly blames Romanians for a wave of crime in the country's big cities since Romania joined the EU. According to police figures, Romanians have been responsible for 76 murders, more than 300 rapes and 2,000 robberies during the last eighteen months. Nearly 400 Romanians have been charged with kidnappings, mostly involving prostitution, and 6,000 with receiving stolen goods during that time.

The Italian newspaper *Corriere del Sera* recently commented that Romanians had "replaced Moroccans

and Albanians as Italians' *no 1 nightmare*", adding, "the difference is that Romanians are now Europeans like us".

There were fears that large numbers of Romanians would settle in Britain, but most have preferred Italy or Spain, probably for cultural and linguistic reasons. More than 550,000 Romanians have arrived in Italy since 2002.

The legislation enabling the Italian police to arrest immigrants considered "dangerous" which, according to an opinion poll is supported by 83 per cent of Italians, was rushed through the Italian cabinet and took immediate effect. Within hours the police began arresting unemployed Romanians and placing them in detention centres prior to their expulsion and a prominent Italian politician promised the rapid expulsion of 5,000 Romanians.

Franco Frattini, the Italian EU Commissioner for Justice, Freedom and Security gave his blessing to the measures when he declared: "What has to be done is simple. Go into a nomad camp in Rome for example and ask them: 'Can you tell me where you live?'"

Those unable to give a satisfactory explanation should be immediately expelled, he suggested.

No doubt Signor Frattini was anxious to help out his old EU boss Romano Prodi as the latter struggled to save his political skin, but it is unlikely that Signor Frattini's colleagues in Brussels share his views for the simple reason that the new measures quite obviously contradict the principle of the free movement of peoples on which the European project is based. EU

directive 2004/38/EC specifically prohibits expulsions on racial or ethnic grounds and makes it clear that the only individuals who can be expelled are those whose behaviour "represents a genuine, present and sufficiently serious threat affecting one of the fundamental interests of society". This plainly is not meant to include mere criminals, even those like Chindamo, who have been tried and found guilty of the most serious of crimes; it certainly was not meant to include those whose only offence is the inability to provide a bona fide address.

As the number of those arrested and held by the Italian police grows, a number of conclusions may be drawn.

First, Signor Frattini is likely to be pressed by his EU colleagues to withdraw or, at least qualify his words, for fear that the Italian measures will set a precedent that other states may follow.

Second, given the supremacy of EU law over national law, the Italian measures are likely to face a successful legal challenge.

Third, as an increasing number of Europeans wake up to the painful reality that as a result of EU membership they have lost control over almost all aspects of immigration policy, attitudes to the EU will undergo a change, even in states such as Italy which have been pro-EU. Some attempts may be made to amend EU Directive 204/38/EC, but there is remarkably little scope for manoeuvre. Immigration remains an explosive issue in all of the EU '15' and one which is capable of shaking the European political project to its foundations.

Irish undecided on Constitution

The vast majority of voters in Ireland - the only country which will definitely hold a referendum on the Constitution - do not know whether they will vote yes or no to the new EU treaty when it is put to a referendum in the country early next summer.

Some 62 per cent of Irish remain

undecided on the treaty, while 25 per cent are in favour and 13 per cent are against, according to a poll commissioned by *The Irish Times*.

The figures also represent a sharp drop in support when compared to a poll conducted by the Commission two years ago when 46 per cent said they

were in favour of the Constitution.

Ireland is now expected to become a battleground for pro- and anti- EU campaigners from other countries. The news that most of the Irish have not made up their minds about the matter is likely to further encourage outside involvement.

LETTERS

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

Lib-Dem Hypocrisy

Dear Sir,
Comparing the original EU Constitution and the 'Reform Treaty', the Lib-Dems MEPs' leader, Chris Davies states: "We should be honest in admitting that the difference between the two is minimal". Yet both Lib-Dem leadership candidates have recently flopped on their 2005 manifesto promise of a referendum. Chris Huhne earlier said: "Public approval for new arrangements by which the EU is run is vital on principle".

Nick Clegg had warned that "haughtily dismissing all calls for a referendum" would create suspicion that Europhiles had something to hide, and did not have the guts to carry the argument to the people. He claimed that behind the government's failure to hold a referendum was the fear that it would lose.

In his new 'My Vision for Britain', front-runner Clegg urges faith in communities not bureaucracies. Both candidates have the cheek to expect us to believe that they stand for 'giving power back to the people'!

The votes of Lib-Dem MPs might be crucial in determining whether the public is cheated out of a referendum next year. *eurofacts* readers might take some pleasure in drawing their MPs and media attention to the inconsistencies above.

BRIAN MOONEY
London

UK Independence Party Intervention

Dear Sir,
I stood for the Conservative Party in Stourbridge in the West Midlands at the 2005 General Election.

I had an extremely good rapport with local UKIP, as well as UKIP in the Berkshire area.

After meetings with them they, knowing my views on Europe, advised that they would not be fielding a candidate against me. The Labour

Majority was almost 3,900.

At the last moment and against the wishes of the local UKIP, the National Party fielded a paper candidate. He was a paper candidate in every sense of the word, he was never seen in Stourbridge, did not attend the public debates and hustings, was never met by the press and the local press only obtained a photograph of him at the last minute.

He took over 1,200 votes. I lost by 407 and the now Labour MPs husband came up to me at the count and said "if we win tonight we have UKIP to thank". Sadly they were right. Result, one rabidly pro-European Labour MP elected, one staunch Eurosceptic just losing.

When will UKIP wake up to the damage they are doing? Lib-Dems and Labour love it when a UKIP candidate is fielded in a key marginal seat.

DIANA COAD
Conservative Parliamentary Candidate for Slough

Harsh Attack

Dear Sir,
Dr D.R. Cooper has stretched extrapolation to the limit by turning a reference to the Lib-Dem Leadership contest into a harsh attack on UKIP (letters 2nd November).

As a former UKIP candidate he knows that the Party's policy has always been to enfranchise all those that want to leave the EU by standing in every constituency possible. He should also know that to deflect criticism of us by the likes of him for standing against "good eurosceptics", we now have a stated policy of not opposing any sitting MP who wholeheartedly signs up to the Freedom Association's Better Off Out Campaign. Sadly only 9 MPs have defied their Leaders to do this so far.

Dr Cooper, in my view, is the doyen of eurorealist letter writers with a steady stream of well informed letters in national and local papers. I hope his vitriol for UKIP is confined to this publication, the eurorealists' 'house magazine'. He knows perfectly well

that, whether in UKIP or not, we are all pursuing the same cause - withdrawal from the EU.

SIR GEORGE EARLE
Devon

Could it Happen Here?

Dear Sir,
The complacent British may assume that what has happened in Pakistan could not happen in this country.

State of emergency? Judges arrested, and removed from their courts by troops? Of course that could never happen here.

Well, suppose that Parliament carelessly passed a Bill acknowledging the intrinsic superiority of EU law, but afterwards - belatedly - it attempted to reassert its sovereignty by legislating contrary to some particularly obnoxious provision of EU law.

British judges, having been instructed by one Parliamentary Act to implement EU law, and to automatically follow all the decisions of the EU's European Court of Justice, would face an intolerable dilemma when a later Parliamentary Act instructed them to disregard some such decisions and implement the new law as laid down by the British Parliament.

So far, only one lower level judge, Judge Morgan, has openly declared EU law to be intrinsically superior to British law, in the Metric Martyrs case; and he was later corrected by Lord Justice Laws in the High Court.

But what would happen after Lord Justice Laws had retired, and an EU-oriented judge like Judge Morgan had taken his place?

Is it really too far-fetched to imagine that to assert its paramount authority Parliament would then have to pass a resolution ordering his removal, and - presuming their continuing loyalty to the British, rather than the EU, state - that could ultimately involve the police, and possibly even the army?

Dr D R COOPER
Berkshire

MEETINGS

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Saturday **17th November**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

Speakers to include

Gerard Batten MEP, UKIP

Christopher Booker, Journalist and author

Bernard Connolly, Financial Market Economist and Author

Roger Helmer MEP, Conservative

Martin Howe QC, Specialist in EU law and Author

Bill Jamieson, Executive Editor of The Scotsman and Author

Ruth Lea, Director of Global Vision, Economist

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, Kings College, The Strand, London

Admission £20 Payable in advance or on the door

(Includes; lunch, wine, tea, coffee and refreshments)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Monday **10th December**, 6.00 pm

“Do Governments and Societies need Enemies?”

The ways in which enemies are described and portrayed, and the extent to which this functions to sustain social cohesion and justify the powers of government.

Rodney Barker, Gresham Professor of Rhetoric

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

The Freedom Association
0845 833 9626

Tuesday **12th February**, 1.00 pm

“Freedom in the City”

Jeffrey Titford MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Function Suite, The Counting House, 50 Cornhill, London EC3V

Admission Free

USFUL WEB SITES

Better off Out Campaign

www.betteroffout.co.uk

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.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

www.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

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

SELECT COMMITTEE

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **20th November**, 10.40 am

Evidence will be heard on *Solvency II* from Peter Vipond, Association of British Insurers.

Tuesday **20th November**, 11.10 am

Evidence will be heard on *Waste Reduction* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **20th November**, 3.35 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the Economic Impact of Immigration* from a) the National Institute for Economic and Social Research; and from b) Professor David Coleman, Oxford University.

Tuesday **27th November**, 11.10 am

Evidence will be heard on *Waste Reduction* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Note:

Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning

FREE Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

Contact Details

euofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65

or Email: euofacts@junepress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

European Reform Treaty to be Signed **13-14th December**

2008

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

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

European Reform Treaty to be Ratified **December**

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*. **£11.99**

This book is the most comprehensive history of the EU.

Gordon Is A Moron

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£9.99**

Analysis of Brown's Chancellorship.

The Bumper Book of Government Waste

by *Matthew Elliott and*

Lee Rotherham. **£9.99**

An exposé of the huge levels of waste in Britain and the EU.

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**

An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

A Life of Mayhem Money and Unintentional Treason

by *J Brian Heywood*. **£9.99**

This novel clearly shows how easy it is for good intentions to be used by anyone with ambitions for a world government.

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 General Rule

A Guide to Customary

Weights and Measures

by *Vivian Linacre*. **£12.99**

The author reflects the needs for imperial units in every day usage.

The State Of The Union and Other Articles

by *Christopher Luke*. **£4.50**

A thumb-nail sketch of the issues affecting the throne and constitution of the UK. Including the acts of devolution.

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.

Warning: Immigration Can Seriously Damage Your Wealth

by *Anthony Scholefield*. **£6.00**

Scholefield argues that while immigration increases a nation's GDP it must inevitably reduce per capita income.

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.

Video

Britain On The Brink

by *Sanity*. DVD or VHS Video **£5.00**

Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

Send payment to THE JUNE PRESS LTD

PO BOX 119

TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@junepress.com

WEB SALES www.junepress.com

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)
20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

euofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

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

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

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

Name

Address

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

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

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403 741736
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
CIB	020 8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
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	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Dr Vincent Cable MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

