

## EU Presidency: the democratic deficit yawns still wider

It is seldom that a eurosceptic finds him or herself in agreement with Margot Wallstrom, the EU communications commissioner. Her words are so politically correct that Ms Wallstrom sometimes gives the impression that she is the fictional creation of a political satirist. However, when Ms Wallstrom recently expressed indignation at the back-room manoeuvring taking place to fill the top European jobs of EU President and Foreign Minister it was impossible to withhold a degree of sympathy.

Condemning what she described as "a regime of old men", she declared with feeling: *"It's so very bad for public opinion. The people always see male politicians scheming behind closed doors, and that old men choose old men, as always"*.

Ms Wallstrom, who does not seem to mind that EU policies are made in much the same way, said that although the decision about who becomes the EU President would be formally approved by the European Council the reality was that the matter would be settled by a nucleus of grey-haired male politicians. Their decision would subsequently be presented as a *fait accompli* to member states.

Of course, it would be out of character for Ms Wallstrom to get things entirely right. The matter of age is scarcely an issue. Dismissing the notion that she might wish to be a candidate - she apparently believes she has already made sufficient "sacrifices" in order to serve the people - Ms Wallstrom, 53, said her preferred candidates for president were Mary Robinson, the former President of Ireland, Tarja Halonen, the present

Finnish President, and Emma Bonino, a prominent Italian politician and former EU commissioner.

These ladies may be very good at hiding the evidence of the passing years but it should be pointed out that Mrs Robinson is 63, Ms Halonen is 64 and Ms Bonino is 60 - all older than our own youthful former Prime Minister and presidential hopeful Tony Blair who, at 54, is only one year older than Ms Wallstrom.

### Big Sister or Big Brother?

Nor indeed is the issue of sex of any relevance: the present Commission is the most egalitarian so far with eight women commissioners out of 27. The atmosphere in the smoke-free rooms may, as a result, be more fragrant than formerly, especially when Ms Wallstrom is present, but there is no evidence that EU decision-making processes have become more open or democratic. If anything the reverse would appear to be true since the "scheming" to which Ms Wallstrom refers covers an ever-expanding policy area; this will expand still further once the Lisbon treaty has been ratified. The EU also spends more money on PR and goes to greater lengths to manipulate public opinion through its worrying investment in the media, a process vigorously promoted by Ms Wallstrom. There is no reason to think that the Big Sister state would be any more open or democratic than the Big Brother state.

No, what is objectionable about the present competition for the top EU

jobs is the extent to which the views of the electorate have been entirely excluded from the process and the degree to which the leading candidates have insulated themselves from risk. At least two of these, Bertie Ahern and Jean Claude Juncker, are campaigning for high office while Prime Ministers of their countries. A third - Tony Blair - appears to have dreamed of high European office while still in Downing Street. Recently, he has appointed a serving EU Commissioner - Peter Mandelson - to act as his campaign manager; it is not only Mayor Ken who appears to fund his political campaigns from the public purse. Still more extraordinarily, an unnamed spokesman for the former Prime Minister has suggested that if successful in winning the EU crown he might even be able to continue drawing his huge salaries from J P Morgan and Zurich - all of which gives new meaning to the phrase about having your cake and eating it.

Indeed the contrast between the the squalid struggle for the top EU political jobs and the presidential campaign now taking place in the US could not be greater. In the case of the latter, huge numbers of ordinary Americans are engaged in a political process which requires those who aspire to be their party's candidate to take real risks and to submit themselves to a most searching process of public scrutiny. In the past, at the campaign end, the losers in this process have often found themselves in personal debt as well as physically, mentally and emotionally exhausted.

This knock-down, drag-out style of

**Continued on p.2**

**INSIDE: Who precisely scrutinises our laws? p.2 - Conditions too dangerous for EU peace-keeping force p.3 - The sixty four thousand euro question p.3 - A major betrayal of Britain's interests p.4 - French ratification leaves unpleasant taste p.5 - Europe is out of step with the world p.5**

# Who precisely scrutinises our laws?

Who precisely scrutinises our laws? As we have pointed out in the past, the House of Commons does not have the opportunity to scrutinise the seventy or eighty per cent of our laws which originate in Brussels. Members of the European Scrutiny Committee are charged with this task but individual members of the committee have complained that they lack the time and resources to carry it out. Moreover, while the Committee has the right to refer anything deemed politically contentious to one of the European standing committees, the Government has increasingly over-ridden this reserve. There are also occasions when legislation is not scrutinised because the House is in recess. Legislation is consequently approved, often by means of statutory instruments, without any serious scrutiny taking place at Westminster.

The European Parliament remains largely a consultative body but it might be assumed that its members at least acquire some cursory acquaintance with the flow of legislation that originates in the Commission and subsequently comes before them.

Not so in many cases, it seems. A group of reform-minded MEPs has complained that as a result of the enormous pressure faced by each six-month presidency to complete a piece of legislation under its watch there is no proper examination of legislative proposals (*EUObserver* 6th February).

A paper produced by the group shows that 64 per cent of the EU laws passed during the present legislative period were approved at first reading; 28 per cent at second reading and eight per cent at third reading. During the previous parliamentary term 1994-2004 the figures were starkly different. For that period the figures were 28 per cent, 50 per cent and 22 per cent respectively. In other words, the situation is getting steadily worse.

The paper also points to "serious concerns" about the "potential lack of transparency and democratic legitimacy" inherent in the backroom deals between a few MEPs, members of the Council and the Commission.

*"A pre-negotiated agreement reached at informal meetings between a small number of representatives of the three institutions (...) does not increase*

*parliament's visibility in the public and the media"*, it states.

It notes that lacklustre coverage of the parliament in national media is due to the lack of confrontation between MEPs on clear political lines.

The document confirms what most of us suspected that the EU is run by the Directors General and their close senior colleagues. The Commissioners come and go and there are photo-opportunities, foreign travel, media interviews and a great deal of eating and drinking to fit in. As Günter Verheugen the EU Commissioner revealed in some indiscreet remarks in October 2006 the DGs dictate the agenda and the Commissioners find it impossible to control or to fire them, even though this may be theoretically possible.

The reality is that the EU is run by a new political class of bureaucrats whose faces and names we do not know. Indeed, the EU equivalent of the Whitehall Mandarin is quite as devious and manipulative as Sir Humphrey but he is even less accountable, less visible and, as a consequence, more sinister.

Continued from page 1

## EU Presidency: the democratic deficit gets wider

politics is how the Americans - and the British - have customarily liked to conduct their affairs.

At every British General Election a substantial number of candidates have been obliged take real risks; the element of risk is vital; without it there can be no possibility of fundamental change of political direction, as occurred in Britain in 1945, 1979 and 1997.

The contenders for high European office appear to have insulated all risk and to have distanced themselves as far as possible from the process of democratic accountability.

If there are important policy differences between the leading contenders for the EU Presidency we have not so far learned of any; none is

offering a distinctive alternative to present policies. The British public does not even know the names of some contenders. What is abundantly clear is that none of them will be advocating a return of powers to nation states and that any one who did so would immediately exclude him or herself from the reckoning.

Spokesmen for the British government are apt to play down the importance of the EU presidency suggesting that the post will be largely symbolic. In contrast, Giscard d'Estaing suggested that George Washington should be the model (in the sense that the first office-holder will be able to define the role of president and to complete the final stages of a grand political project).

Whatever his shortcomings (and they are too numerous to list here), Giscard has been a far more reliable guide to European political trends than the public statements of British politicians. Moreover, as a leaked paper from the present Slovenian presidency shows, huge gaps in the Lisbon treaty mean that the role of the EU President does indeed remain undefined (*eurofacts* 8th February). Thus, to a remarkable extent, the job will be what the first incumbent makes of it. There will be constraints on what he can do but in the post-democratic world into which we are rapidly moving these will depend upon the interests and goals of a new political class (see above) and will have almost nothing to do with the principle of democratic accountability.

# Conditions too dangerous for EU peace-keeping force

*Tragically, the announcement that an EU force would protect refugee camps in Chad may have had exactly the opposite to the intended effect*

The history of the EU's plans to intervene militarily in Chad, as part of a wider plan to carve a role for itself in Central Africa, has its comic aspects, but as we go to press the story has already been overshadowed by tragedy.

In the summer of last year the EU agreed to send a peace-keeping mission to Chad to prevent escalating violence turning into a major humanitarian disaster. It was feared this could be similar in scale to that which occurred in Rwanda when hundreds of thousands of civilians were slaughtered or died from disease or malnutrition.

Under a UN resolution EU forces were supposed to have arrived in Chad at the end of the rainy season in October 2007, but there were no helicopters to take them; there was also a shortfall of medical assistance and practical support. Britain and Germany declined to contribute national contingents because of their commitments in Afghanistan. An emergency meeting of EU officials in November failed to resolve the problems; meanwhile the violence steadily escalated.

A French-led EU force of 3,700 from 14 countries was finally ready to be airlifted into Chad at the end of January, but conditions were deemed "too dangerous".

*"The deployment is postponed until the security situation stabilises"*, a spokesman for the planned EUFOR force stated on 3rd February, while adamantly denying that the plans might have to be scrapped entirely.

Chad presently provides shelter for more than 400,000 refugees and for more than a year aid organisations had

been calling for international action to defend them. More than half of the refugees are from neighbouring Darfur and, according to UNCHR, the violence has followed them across the border with attacks by Janjaweed Arab militia leaving hundreds dead and many thousands homeless.

Eastern Chad and Darfur have similar ethnic make-ups, with nomadic Arab groups and black African farmers competing for land and water.

Chad and Sudan have both accused each other of supporting armed rebel groups.

In late January armed groups were reported to have surrounded Chad's capital of N'Djamena in an attempt to topple President Idriss Deby who had directly blamed Khartoum for being behind the rebellion in his country.

According to media reports, the Sudanese-backed rebels had driven 600 miles across Chad in order to attack the capital and to fight their way to the gates of Mr Deby's palace. Aid organisations and Western embassies immediately launched plans to evacuate their staff.

## Western Presence

In the past Sudan has blamed Deby for supplying arms to African rebel groups.

The question that EU officials must face up to is whether or not the EU plans made a desperate situation still more desperate. The regime in Khartoum is strongly opposed to any Western presence on its borders, fearing that the West might seek to punish those deemed guilty of human rights violations. By escalating the violence Khartoum successfully

prevented the intervention of the EU force.

If the Arab militias now turn their attention to the refugee camps in Eastern Chad the consequences could be very similar to those which occurred during the Rwandan genocide of 1994 which, in turn, was followed by a series of further bloody regional conflicts.

Europe's autonomous defence capability is supposed to be able to fulfil the full range of Petersberg tasks. These include peace-making as well as peace-keeping. But it is quite evidently incapable of achieving the first of these tasks and consequently not able to begin to perform the second. Indeed, by announcing a plan, which in the circumstances was beyond it, it seems very likely that the EU has worsened the violence which it was supposed to prevent.

In the long term the beneficiaries of this humiliating military and diplomatic failure will be the Chinese (who are prepared to do business with whatever African regime happens to be in power irrespective of its legitimacy or human rights record). In recent years China has stepped up its diplomacy offensive in oil-rich African states such as Chad. A second and wholly unintended consequence is that the US is likely to beef up AFRICOM, its newly created unified combat command for Africa.

The immediate consequence, however, appears to have been an acceleration in the violence and a rising death toll. Whether judged on grounds of morality or *realpolitik* this is scarcely something of which any European government can be proud.

## The sixty four thousand euro question

*"We do not want swivel-eyed isolationism but we would like change. Once Lisbon is on the books, the question is whether or not there is a party leader out there capable of giving us back the self-confidence we require to take what we want."*  
Ian Martin writing in the *Daily Telegraph*, 10th February 2008.

# A major betrayal of Britain's interests

*During a debate on the European Communities (Finance) Bill the former Conservative Home Secretary Lord Waddington provided this authoritative account of how Britain came to lose a substantial part of its EU rebate*

**Lord Waddington:** In plain language, the Bill puts the stamp of legality on a major betrayal of this country's interests. It seeks to legitimise the act of Tony Blair in surrendering a part of our rebate, which was protected by our veto and which no one could touch without our agreement, for precisely nothing. We have a duty to put on record what happened and to explain in simple terms what led up to Mr Blair's abject surrender before history is rewritten.

It all started honourably enough with Mr Blair championing the expansion of the EU into eastern Europe and his acknowledging that the new members would need help as they shed socialism. The money could only come from the farm budget and that would lose the French money. But, thought Mr Blair, the French would be persuaded to agree to the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy and to a drastic decline in farm payments if Britain sacrificed at least part of its rebate. It is not, as you will see, quite what Mr Blair told the British people, but it is clear when one pieces together his utterances that that is what he had in mind.

It is fairly difficult, if not impossible, to understand how Mr Blair ever persuaded himself that the plan would work because back in 2002 he had persuaded Monsieur Chirac to agree to enlargement by promising the French president that French interests would be protected and, to that end, he had signed up to a Common Agricultural Policy settlement which promised farmers continued subsidy to the tune of 40 per cent of the total EU budget right through to 2013. Inevitably, come 2005, the French were having none of Mr Blair's plan.

Faced, however, with the inevitable, "Non", there was not the slightest need

for the Prime Minister to do what he did, which was, with great alacrity, to abandon his call for a budget freeze, abandon his call for a fundamental reform of Europe's finances, and hand over part of our rebate on a plate. That is what he did, and no amount of ministerial waffle can disguise that fact. What, of course, he should have done was to take the rebate off the table, pack his bags and return home. But he surrendered.

The tale now is that all this was necessary to secure enlargement and we could not "will" enlargement without being prepared to pay for it, but that really is rewriting history. Mr Blair told the Commons:

*"The UK rebate will remain and we will not negotiate it away. Period".* [Official Report, Commons, 8/6/05; col. 1234.]

## Existing System

When the then Chancellor of the Exchequer was asked in an interview whether the rebate was non-negotiable, he answered in one word: "yes". Mark you, this was all said in 2005 when enlargement was already a *fait accompli*. With enlargement a done deal, Mr Blair was still saying the rebate was non-negotiable. He knew enlargement was going to cost money, but some of the money would have to come, he thought, from reform of the EU finances and reform of the CAP; as to the rest, everyone would have to chip in under the then existing system, which involved of course the continuance of Britain's rebate. That is what he was, in effect, telling the British people.

That was the plan, that was the promise, but it is certainly not what he finished up with. If the rebate had remained, Britain would have paid

over the next seven years an extra £12 billion. Because of Blair's surrender we stand to pay an extra £19 billion over the period, with things set to get worse after 2013 because the limit on the cost to Britain of the reduction in the rebate ends in that year and, of course, there is no meaningful reform of the EU's finances, let alone any reform of the Common Agricultural Policy.

Now we come to perhaps the most dismal part of the story. Where has the extra money gone? Scandalously, it is not, in the main, going to the main entrants. Unbelievably, Ireland, whose per capita income is 30 per cent higher than the EU average, is to get more per head than Lithuania, Slovakia or Poland. Furthermore, France, while becoming a net contributor, will remain the EU's biggest recipient and the UK will remain the smallest.

Mr Blair surrendered. As Philip Hammond in another place put it, that is something we have grown used to, and every surrender carries with it the same lame excuse. It is always said that we had to surrender; failure to do so would have precipitated a crisis and, even worse, shown our lack of commitment to the EU. We have heard that so many times. French critics of the French Government do not call it anti-EU when the French Government fights to protect the interests of their own taxpayers and citizens, and the British people are entitled to expect the British Government to fight for the interests of Britain in the same way as all other countries in the EU fight for their people's interests. That Mr Blair signally failed to do. No wonder the President of France wants him to become President of Europe.

*Source: House of Lords Hansard, 4th February 2008.*

# French ratification leaves unpleasant taste

*Even Sarkozy's friends describe his methods as "a sort of democratic dirty-trick"*

**I**n France, the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty by the French Parliament took place in an atmosphere of uneasy embarrassment, not to say shame.

As in the UK, the Sarkozy position is based on a bundle of lies. First lie (propounded enthusiastically by the President even before his election last May): the new treaty is a "mini-treaty" (it's even longer than the old one). Second lie: it's a "simplified treaty" (not if you've ever tried to read it). Third lie: it's a completely different animal from the Constitution. Fourth lie: it gives more power to national parliaments. Fifth lie: the Lisbon Treaty was created at the instigation of Sarkozy in person and the French government in general (whereas it had been on the stocks within the Commission ever since the French and Dutch referendums of 2005 and only needed dusting off - in secrecy - by Angela Merkel during the German EU presidency of the first half of 2007). About the only thing Sarkozy didn't lie about was that he'd ratify it through parliament and not by referendum.

Everyone in France knows that Sarkozy is lying through his teeth; and Sarkozy knows that the French know. Hence the absence of official celebration of what is genuinely - whatever your view on the EU - an

historic event. Hence the scarcity of analysis and comment in the mainstream French media, which is leant on as heavily by the presidency as the British media were in the Alistair Campbell/Blair heydays.

Nevertheless, in an editorial in what is the unofficial Sarkozy house-mag, *Figaro Magazine*, on 9th February, Alexis Brézet described the failure to hold a referendum as a "*sort of democratic dirty-trick*". Only a new referendum, he said, could undo the result of the previous one, when France decisively voted No. And, he added, Sarkozy, whose opinion-poll ratings are plummeting, could one day have recourse to an "appeal to the people" - a referendum, not necessarily on "Europe" - to shore up his legitimacy. (Brézet was mindful no doubt that another autocratic French president, Charles de Gaulle, resorted to popular referendums on two occasions in the 1960s.)

Another reason why there has been little overt fuss in France over the ratification of the new treaty is the pitiable state of the official opposition, the Socialist Party. In meltdown since losing both the presidential and parliamentary elections last summer, with a lame-duck leader and split down the middle over both "Europe" and the referendum question, they voted

against the revision of the French constitution needed to ratify Lisbon, only to vote a few days later for the very ratification their first vote had been supposed to scupper. The inanity of their posture is comparable to that of the British Lib-Dems, who appear to be in favour of a referendum on "Europe" so long as it's not on the Lisbon Treaty.

Meanwhile, the paradox of how Sarkozy can combine fervent Europhilia with fervent French nationalism becomes more striking. Lisbon, by giving massive new powers to Brussels (where France, like the UK, has only 8 per cent of the votes in the Council of Ministers) will further reduce nation-states' autonomy. The six-month French EU presidency, beginning in July, which Sarkozy promises will bring about a common EU defence policy, a common EU immigration policy, all combined with more "protection" for the French, will, if Lisbon goes through, be the last ever French EU presidency. A majority of the French people know all this. As the *Figaro* editorialist intimates in his concluding paragraph (to paraphrase slightly): "*Let's hope we won't be disappointed when we get what we prayed for*".

## Europe is out of step with the world

*In the end, it may be the undermining of our long established democratic traditions which may be the biggest political cost of our EU membership. The EU is not a democratic organisation. Too much power rests with the Commission, the European Central Bank and the Luxembourg Court of Justice, all of whose members are unelected. The European Parliament is not really a parliament at all; it is a consultative assembly. The power and sovereignty of national parliaments right across the EU, including of course our own, is being*

*steadily eroded in favour of the Brussels bureaucracy. The gap between a narrow political European elite and the mass of the people is widening all the time, most recently exemplified at Lisbon by the way in which the EU Constitution was rail-roaded through with no democratic endorsement, because it would almost certainly not have been forthcoming. All the evidence across the world suggests that it is only the nation state which is really capable of running itself in a truly democratic and accountable way. This is why there is*

*such a strong tendency for all peoples who feel that they have their language, traditions and culture in common to want to be recognised as a nation and to be able to run their own affairs. Only in Europe are we moving resolutely in the opposite direction. Against this background, one can only wonder for how long the European Union will be able to stand the test of time.*

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign Bulletin, January 2008.

# LETTERS

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

## BBC Bias

Dear Sir,

The Wilson Report, January 2005, heaped the most devastating criticism ever on the BBC because its reporting of the EU betrayed a "mind-set of ignorance". It therefore insisted the BBC staff should have remedial training. Yet as your article of 19th October 2007 stated: "*BBC bias: it's getting even worse*". This degeneration has now been thrown into stark relief by the gross imbalances of its special political programmes at the New Year. In *Correspondents look ahead* (Radio 4, 29th and 30th Dec 2007); in Andrew Marr's special *Start the Week* (31st Dec 2007); in Edward Stourton's wide-ranging interview with Brown (*World at One*, Radio 4, 1st Jan 2008) there was not a single reference to the EU, its Constitutional Treaty or the implications of Brown's renegeing on the promised referendum.

In its *Review of the Year* (Radio 4, 30th December) we did have an interview with the BBC's special European Editor (a post required by Wilson) and this illustrated the extent of the BBC bias. On his appointment Mardell had started well enough with the unique admission: "*Important voices question the legitimacy of the EU...Once it seemed as if deep suspicion of the EU was confined to Britain and with no rejectionist party in parliament that side of the argument tended to get ignored*". (*Guardian* 30th August 2005).

However, he disdainfully dismissed the crucial question about the efficacy of the 'red lines': "*Oh no, I'm not going to get caught in that. The public is absolutely bored with all this detailed stuff*".

He then added his EU zealotry: "*What people don't understand in Britain is that most of Europe look upon it as the Saviour of Europe*". For him the Constitutional Treaty is an absolute necessity and "*The rest now agree with the British that there shouldn't be any further such organisation*". He then added, "*For*

*now*", apparently unaware of the contradiction. Next day, in a childish image of the EU as Santa Claus, he plumbed further depths of naiveté by saying one of the presents was "*wholesale reform of the CAP is on the way*".

So three years after Wilson we have endemic BBC bias to Brussels epitomised. Consequently, with its unique power to influence the public, the following financial arrangements are of crucial concern. The BBC has borrowed £141 million on special terms from a bank which describes itself as set up to "*finance capital investment furthering European integration by promoting EU policies*".

Further, the BBC has received, from the EU, direct grants of £1.4 million over the past ten years (*Sunday Times* 27th January 2008).

C.FRANCIS WARREN  
Lancaster

## Dereliction of Duty

Dear Sir,

The Machiavellian progress of the European Amending Treaty through the dysfunctional House of Commons underlines the pressing need to reform the House of Commons rather than the House of Lords.

How is it that throughout the debates over three hundred dominant Labour MPs are voting to pass wide ranging powers into the hands of the Council of Ministers and the European Court of Justice without bothering to sit in the chamber, listen to the arguments and contribute in any way to the debates?

Come the next general election this dereliction of duty to the electorate and blind obedience to government whips will ensure that such MPs must be held accountable by the British public, and replaced by representatives prepared to honour party manifesto commitments, their Oath of Allegiance and our Constitution.

It is contemptuous that they crowd into the chamber to sit through Prime Minister's Question Time for half an hour once a week yet cannot be

bothered to return to the chamber a mere three hours later to consider matters of grave national importance affecting the future of our country and generations to come.

GEORGE WEST  
Leicestershire

## The Lesson for Tories

Dear Sir,

I'm disappointed to read that Anthony Hoyle has interpreted my letter in the 11th January edition of *eurofacts* as an invitation to vote for UKIP. I didn't mention UKIP once. I pointed the way for the Conservatives to win the election, principally by being honest, for a change. I referred to the Party's dishonesty throughout this whole sorry period of Britain's history. I referred to Heath's dishonesty but didn't identify it. In April 1971 a secret paper (FCO 30/1048) written for Heath, revealed the truth. Here are some extracts:

1) "*Membership of the Communities will involve us in extensive limitation upon our freedom of action.*"

2) "*The loss of sovereignty will increase as the community develops.*"

3) "*After entry there would be a major responsibility on HMG and on all political parties not to exacerbate public concern by attributing unpopular measures or unfavourable economic developments to the remote and unmanageable workings of the Community.*"

The latter point is still practised by the three major political parties who, for example, deny that the decimation of our postal services and the chaos on the railways is caused by EU diktat.

I concluded by saying that the Conservatives will win the next election hands down if they become honest and also stop sitting on the fence. I will now add that if they don't, UKIP will eventually start winning seats. The only other alternative is civil disobedience which the man in the street is already beginning to discuss.

BRYAN SMALLEY  
Hertfordshire

# MEETINGS

**Freenations**  
freenation@freeuk.com

Tuesday **26th February**, 6.30 pm

“The totalitarians who founded the European Union - and their impending triumph”

**Rodney Atkinson**, *Author*  
*Chairman* - **Philip Davies MP**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Committee Room 9, House of Commons, Westminster, London  
**Admission Free**

---

**Democracy Movement,**  
**‘I Want a Referendum’ group**  
**and Trade Unionists**  
**Against the EU Constitution**  
020 7603 7796

Wednesday **27th February**,  
starts 11.00 am ends in the evening

Mass Lobby of Parliament

**Plus speakers in Westminster Central Hall**

**ALL WELCOME**

---

**Marlborough Group**  
01672 515275

Sunday **2nd March**, 2.00 pm

“Is our UK membership of the EU legitimate?”

**Lindsay Jenkins**, *Author*  
**Michael Shrimpton**, *Constitutional expert*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Court Room of the Marlborough Town Hall, Marlborough, Wiltshire  
**Admission Free**

---

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**

**eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65**  
**or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com**

**UK Independence Party**  
01626 831340

Saturday **8th March**, 10.00 am

“Let the People Speak”

**Speakers will include;**  
**Nigel Farage MEP, Christopher Gill RD, Marc Glendening, Lord Pearson of Rannoch**

SOUTHWEST RALLY  
The Great Hall, Exeter University, Exeter, Devon  
**Admission Free**

---

**Hurlingham Club**  
0207 736 8411

Tuesday **11th March**, 7.30 pm

“Is it in Britain’s best interest to be a member of the European Union?”

For the motion;  
**Peter Luff**, *Chairman of the European Movement*

**Denis MacShane MP**, *Former Minister for Europe*

Against the motion;  
**Christopher Booker**, *Journalist and author*

**Daniel Hannan MEP**, *Columnist, Daily Telegraph*

PUBLIC DEBATE  
The Hurlingham Club, Putney, London (100yds from Putney Bridge)  
**Admission £30 (Includes Supper)**  
**{Tickets from the Hurlingham Club}**

---

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **16th April**, 6.00 pm

“The British and American Constitutions”

**Vernon Bogdanor CBE FBA**, *Gresham Professor of Law*  
**Professor Cristina Rodrigues**, *New York University*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Royal College of Surgeons of England, 35-43 Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London  
**Admission Free**

---

## SELECT COMMITTEES

---

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **26th February**, 10.40 am  
Evidence will be heard on *The Future of European Structural Funds* from Pat McFadden MP, Minister of State for Employment Relations & Postal Affairs, Department of Business, Enterprise & Regulatory Reform.

Tuesday **26th February**, 11.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Waste Reduction* from Mr John Whittall, Lead Technologist, Sustainable Technologies, Technology Strategy Board; Mr Arnold Black, Network Director, Resource Efficiency Knowledge Transfer Network; Mr Tim Curtis, Director of Delivery, AEA Technology; and Research Councils UK (witness tbc).

Thursday **28th February**, 10.10 am  
Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into the EU Commission’s Communication on organ donation and transplantation* from Dr Paul Murphy, Intensive Therapy Unit Consultant, Leeds General Infirmary; and Jayne Fisher, Chair, UK Transplant Coordinators’ Association (UKTCA).

Tuesday **4th March**, 11.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Waste Reduction* from (a) Dr Forbes McDougall, Environmental Manager, Proctor and Gamble; Ms Jane Bickerstaffe, Director, Industry Council for Packaging and the Environment (INCPEN); Mr Robert Chilton, Board Member, National Consumer Council; and Unilever (witness tbc); and from (b) Mr Paul Ozanne, National Recycling Coordinator, Salvation Army; Tesco and Asda/Walmart (witnesses tbc).

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

---

## DIARY OF EVENTS

---

**2008**

UK Government Budget **12th March**

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

**Thinker Tailor Soldier Spy**

by Harry Beckhough. **£18.99**  
A remarkable book about a soldier, code-breaker, intelligence officer, teacher and political activist.

**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.

**Scared To Death**

by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **Hdbk £16.95**  
This latest book by the famous duo explores the tricks used to extend EU power and control.

**Gordon Is A Moron**

by Vernon Coleman. **£9.99**  
Analysis of Brown's Chancellorship.

**The Problems for Post-Communist Countries in the Context of the EU**

by CRCE. **£11.95**  
Papers from the 2006 colloquium in Bled.

**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 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.

**Lost Illusions: British Foreign Policy**

by Ian Milne. **£4.00**  
Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.

**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.

**Allegations**

Selected works by Alexander Litvinenko  
Edited by Pavel Stroilov. **£12.95**  
Translated from Russian with an introduction by Vladimir Bukovsky.

**Video**

**Britain On The Brink**

by Sanity. **DVD or VHS Video £5.00**  
Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

Send payment to  
**THE JUNE PRESS LTD**  
**PO BOX 119**  
**TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Tel: 08456 120 175  
Email: info@junepress.com

**WEB SALES www.junepress.com**

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

## eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

**RATES**

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

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

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

Name .....

Address .....

.....

Postcode .....

Date .....

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

<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 7603 7796
<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

<b>Congress for Democracy</b>	<b>01372 453678</b>
-------------------------------	---------------------

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

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

POLITICAL PARTIES

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>020 7222 9000</b>
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
<b>English Democrats</b>	<b>01277 896000</b>
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
<b>Green Party</b>	<b>020 7272 4474</b>
Richard Mallender	
<b>Labour</b>	<b>020 7783 1000</b>
Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP	
<b>Liberal</b>	<b>01562 68361</b>
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	<b>020 7222 7999</b>
Nick Clegg 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



9 771361 413006