

Working Time Directive: Britain humiliated over opt-out

For those concerned about the lengthening dole queue the right response to the 17th December vote by MEPs was tears not applause

The European Parliament is reported to have erupted into applause on 17th December when MEPs voted to scrap the UK's exemption from the Working Time Directive. The vote to end the opt-out in three years was carried by 421 votes to 273, with 11 abstentions.

The laughter is not hard to interpret: Britain, along with other countries which make use of the exemption, is to lose an important relative economic advantage and the British government has been made to look foolish and weak. The decision was bound to cheer up all those who live in an economic fantasy-land including the left-wing Labour MEPs who defied their party bosses in order to support the proposal, as well as those whose self-interest depends on the proliferation of controls and regulation and consequently regard Britain as a brake on the achievement of their desires.

Less Flexible

The vote represented a particular humiliation for the UK government which had claimed that the exemption was safe following a deal under which Britain accepted less flexible rules for temporary agency workers. For years the Government had opposed the directive on agency workers which the CBI has said would lead to the loss of a quarter of a million jobs.

In June at a meeting of the European Council it effectively traded those jobs in return for an agreement - which now looks distinctly unsafe - that the exemption from the Working Time Directive (which limits the working

week to 48 hours) would be preserved. John Hutton, the then Business Secretary declared at the time: *"This is a very good deal for the UK...Flexibility has been critical to our ability to create an extra three million jobs over the last decade. That flexibility has been preserved by ensuring workers can continue to have choice over their working hours in future years. This agreement means that people remain free to earn overtime and businesses can cope during busy times"*.

Dismissing suggestions that the threat to end the exemption might re-emerge Pat McFadden, the Employment Minister said in June: *"I don't think it will reappear"*.

On 5th November last year, however, the European Parliament's employment committee took a different view from the European Council by backing an amendment, which would end the UK's opt-out in 2011. It was this revision to the directive which came before MEPs on 17th December.

Lord Mandelson described the EP decision as "absurd".

Freedom of Choice

"Millions of employees and businesses in the UK and across Europe have benefited from freedom of choice on working hours for many years", he said.

Around 10 per cent of the British workforce are said to take advantage of the opt-out. On the basis that between 2.3 and 3.2 million employees work more than 48 hours a week, *Open*

Europe, in an excellent briefing note on the subject, has estimated that losing the opt-out could cost the UK economy between £47.74 billion and £66.45 billion by 2020, with a mid-range estimate of £57 billion. This is equivalent to £2,300 per household and more than five times the UK's annual contribution to the EU budget.

Extraordinarily, the Department of Business and Enterprise has made no assessment of the likely costs on the grounds that *"no one expected the opt-out to come up for renegotiation"*.

The matter will now go to the 'conciliation stage' during which representatives from the EP and member states are expected to reach a compromise. If no deal is struck the revised directive will fail, leaving the British opt out in place. But Britain does not have the right of veto during this process and it is clear the pressure on Britain is becoming increasingly intense.

Question of Time

"I think it is now a question of when the opt-out ends rather than if", Stephen Hughes, the Labour MEP who led the European Socialist Group's opposition to the opt-out told *The Times* on 18th December.

If he is right the grim economic reality is that at the outset of the worst recession for half a century business, and small and medium enterprises in particular, will have suffered a needless double injury. For those concerned about the lengthening dole queue the right response to the 17th December vote was tears not applause.

INSIDE: *Fiscal stimulus p.2 - What the ECB thinks about the credit crunch p.2 - EU staff get a €47 million rider p.2 - Poll shows 71% of British against joining the euro p.2 - Rocketing unemployment raises questions about Spain's political future p.3 - Review of "The Return of History & the End of Dreams" p.4 - Pounds weakness reason for staying out of the euro p.4 - What kind of future is there for the Royal Mail? p.5*

Fiscal stimulus is great news for German and Chinese workers

The continuing massive UK trade deficit means that HMG's anti-recession plan will sustain foreign jobs, not British jobs

In the last five-year period, the UK trade deficit shot up every year, just about tripling between 2003 and 2007 to hit a record £53 billion. (Within that £53 billion, a colossal deficit in trade in goods of £89 billion was offset somewhat by surpluses in services and income.)

Almost all of that ongoing deficit was with the UK's European Union partners: in 2007 for example the UK ran a trade deficit with twenty of her twenty-six EU partners. Over the last five years, cumulatively, the UK was practically in balance with the world outside the EU.

According to the government's Pre-Budget Report of 24th November

2008, the overall trade deficit last year (2008) will drop to around £42 billion, and stay at that level for the next three years, in spite of the 25 per cent devaluation of sterling - the worst since the UK came off the Gold Standard in 1931 - and the so-called "fiscal stimulus".

That fiscal stimulus (coming principally through the temporary reduction in VAT) is designed to increase consumer demand: in other words to get people to buy things. If it works - and it now looks very much as if it hasn't and won't - some job losses in UK wholesaling and retailing may be avoided: but because of the UK's continuing structural trade deficit, the

main beneficiaries will be manufacturing jobs in Germany (in 2007, for every £100 of goods exported by the UK to Germany, she imported £180 of goods from Germany). Other beneficiaries will be workers in the rest of Continental EU and in China.

Earlier this year, government statistics revealed that eight out of ten "British" jobs created since 1997 had gone to foreign immigrants. It looks now as if the main beneficiaries - if any - of the so-called fiscal stimulus will be jobs in Continental EU and China. Quite an achievement for a British government.

What the ECB thinks about the credit crunch

In December 2008 the Frankfurt-based ECB published its semi-annual "Financial Stability Review"*. Usually, this is a dry, rather technical compendium of banking, economic comment and statistics. This time, however, it consists principally of an account of how the current global financial crisis began and evolved - a neutral, unbiased account that is probably the most comprehensive yet published anywhere in the world.

Anyone who's ever wondered what a Credit Default Swap is can find the answer in the Glossary. This contains

succinct non-technical definitions of the most-used banking terms. Elsewhere, there are dozens of charts and graphs. Chart 4.5 shows that, as of 25th November 2008, the combined UK and Swiss share of world bank write-downs was 19 per cent, and higher than the comparable figure for the whole of the eurozone. Similarly, the combined UK and Swiss share of world bank capital injections was 22 per cent, and bigger than the comparable figure for the whole of the eurozone. (Figures for the UK alone aren't given but presumably dwarf

those of Switzerland.)

The crisis isn't over, and in the months to come, as-yet-uncovered losses in eurozone banks may turn out to be worse than those in the UK and Switzerland. Nevertheless, the data and commentaries in this report confirm the verdict of the foreign exchange markets. The notions that the crisis "began in America" and that the UK is "well-placed to weather the recession" are poppycock.

*www.ecb.europa.eu

EU staff get a €47 million ride home for Christmas

An Austrian member of the European Parliament has denounced the European Union practice of paying for employees' Christmas travel home at a time of

financial crisis. Last year the European Commission and Council spent just under 47 million euros on Christmas travel arrangements, which Hans-Peter Martin MEP has denounced as a

"shocking privilege".

Source:

New Europe Open Europe blog, 23rd December 2008.

Poll shows 71% of British against joining the euro

Seventy one per cent of British people are against joining the euro, and 23 per

cent are in favour, according to an ICM poll published by BBC Radio Four on

New Year's Day.

Rocketing unemployment raises questions about Spain's political future

If social unrest explodes - and is seen to do so partly as the result of the constraints of eurozone membership - the consequences will be far reaching

The euro has become the symbol of EU identity and has protected members against the tremendous external shocks since the summer of 2008. So said Joaquin Almunia, EU Commissioner for Economic and Monetary Affairs on the tenth anniversary of the introduction of the euro on 1st January. Predictably, he called for closer coordination of economic policy throughout the EU.

Euro-sceptics would no doubt put matters differently, but it has to be acknowledged that those who argued that the impossibility of finding one interest rate that suited all doomed the single currency to an early death have been proved wrong: for the time being the euro is the second strongest currency in the world.

However, it should also be acknowledged that ten years in the life of a currency is a very short time indeed and provides an inadequate basis for a definitive judgement about its success. The jury is still out and is likely to remain so for some time. However, one of the striking things about statements made on the occasion of the euro's 10th birthday was the sombre mood in countries which have been most enthusiastic about 'Europe': Spain, Italy, Greece, Ireland.

The lack of enthusiasm in Spain is easily explained: unemployment shot up to 12.8 per cent in November; this is a 12-year high and by far the highest in the European Union. According to analysts, it could reach 20 per cent in 2010 as the slump in construction spreads out to ancillary industries such as central heating equipment manufacturing and tile-making. Forecasts that rapidly rising unemployment is likely to be marked by serious social unrest have come from leading economic research institutes in Madrid and Barcelona. There are already signs of acute and rising social tensions between immigrant workers and native job-seekers as the latter compete for jobs such as cleaning, labouring and fruit-picking which, until recently, the

natives wouldn't even have contemplated.

What happens in Spain is important because of its size and because its recent economic successes are widely attributed to its membership of the European Union, which for many middle class Spaniards, remains a symbol of modernity following the Franco era. If social unrest explodes - and is seen to do so partly as the result of the constraints of eurozone membership - the consequences would be far reaching.

Spain is not noted for its social patience: in the 1980s high and rising unemployment led to strikes, violence and country-wide protests: present forecasts suggest that unemployment will peak at considerably higher rates than those experienced 20 years ago. There are special reasons for thinking that this may be accompanied by expressions of public anger.

Unemployment benefits in Spain are now generous, with pay-outs of up to 70 per cent of salaries. But with nearly three million unemployed payments to many of those laid off in 2008 will come to an end in little more than a year and those affected will find it desperately hard to find jobs in a depressed and still inflexible labour market. Around 70 per cent of wages are linked to the inflation rate and so a downward adjustment of wages permitting the demand and supply of labour to move towards equilibrium cannot occur.

The other factor which has changed the character of the workforce is the arrival of five million immigrants, mostly from North Africa and South America, representing around 15 per cent of the workforce over the last decade. Spaniards who have lost their jobs in construction are now seeking jobs formerly performed by immigrants. Thousands of Andalucians applied to pick olives from this year's harvest which runs from December to the end of January, work previously done mainly by immigrants. A possible flashpoint could be the strawberry

harvest in Huelva, work which in recent years has been performed entirely by immigrants.

Some local authorities have offered to pay the return fares of African workers, but according to a Reuters report on 31st December, many are opting to sleep rough or live in makeshift shelters rather than go home. Tensions between immigrant groups and local communities are reported to be rising. Political statements about the problems created by large-scale immigration invariably reflect the liberal and tolerant assumptions of Spain's political elites. But there is an obvious contrast between sentiments expressed by politicians and journalists in Madrid and those of ordinary Spaniards concerned about their economic futures: even in the good years there was little sign of social integration with immigrants remaining separate from their host communities to an extent not known in Northern Europe.

All of this is taking place against a background of worsening public finances. These were in good order when José María Aznar stepped down as Prime Minister in 2004 after years of prudent supply-side reform. In 2007 Spain still had the second largest surplus in the eurozone. But the budget deficit rose to 14 billion euros in the first eleven months of 2008. With tax revenue falling and unemployment payments rising some estimates suggest that the deficit could be around 6 per cent in 2009 and 7.5 per cent in 2010, compared to the EU 'limit' of 3 per cent.

Although few respected Spanish commentators agree with him, Prime Minister Zapatero has promised that the green shoots of recovery will begin to appear towards the end of 2009. If his forecast turns out to be on the optimistic side his own future and the political future of his country may be determined by what happens in the streets of Spanish towns and cities.

History roars back with a vengeance

By Ian Milne

Robert Kagan, now Brussels-based, served in the US State Department for 14 years, from 1984 to 1998. In his previous book, *“Paradise & Power: America & Europe in the New World Order”*, well before Iraq, he foresaw US occupation of a large Middle Eastern country, and coined the phrase *“Americans are from Mars, Europeans are from Venus”*.

His new book begins: *“The world has become normal again”*. Great powers are once again competing for influence. Communism is dead, but a new competition between western liberalism and the great eastern autocracies of Russia and China has re-injected ideology into geo-politics. The expectation that after the Cold War the world had entered an era of international convergence has proved wrong. As Senator John McCain wrote of this book: *“...Kagan shows that ‘the end of history’ was an illusion”*. The illusion was that the clash of traditional national interests was a thing of the past. Such is the illusion - or one of the illusions - on which the EU is predicated. Moreover, after the Cold War, Europeans believed that the new “post-modern” (what they really mean is “post-democratic”) international order would be modelled on the EU. But these hopeful expectations and core assumptions of the post-Cold War years collapsed almost as soon as they were formulated.

Today, says Kagan, a new configuration of power is shaping the international order. Nationalism, and the nation itself, far from being weakened by globalisation, have now returned with a vengeance. *“Instead of a new world order, the clashing interests and ambitions of the great powers are again producing the alliances and counter-alliances, and the elaborate dances and shifting partnerships, that a nineteenth-century*

The Return of History & the End of Dreams

By Robert Kagan

Atlantic Books Hdbk 120pp 2008

Available from *The June Press*

Price £12.99 + p&p

(see back cover)

ISBN 978-184354-811-9

diplomat would recognize instantly”.

Russia’s grand ambition is to undo the post-Cold War settlement and to re-establish Russia as a dominant power in Eurasia, to make it one of the two or three great powers in the world. Like the Russians, the Chinese believe that to be a great power, they must be independent and self-reliant. Both countries have modernised and expanded their military capabilities; both are nuclear powers; both are in space. Both are autocracies. Both can - and do - argue that their models of economic development and autocratic one-party government are preferable to western style “democracy”. Other autocracies, in Central Asia, Africa and elsewhere, see the Russian and Chinese systems as blueprints for how to create wealth and stability without having to give way to political liberalization. Some Europeans, observes Kagan, *“worry that Russia is emerging as an ideological alternative to the EU that offers a different approach to sovereignty, power and world order”*. Now, says Kagan, quoting Russia’s foreign minister, *“For the first time in many years, a real competitive environment has emerged on the market of ideas between different value systems and development models”*. *Americans and*

Europeans may grumble, but “autocracies are not in the business of overthrowing other autocrats at the democratic world’s insistence”.

Russia and China are not of course the only great powers that will rival the USA and become the main players in the “multi-polar world” so ardently desired by those Europeans who resent America. India is becoming a great power; Japan has the wherewithal and may be forced to become one in response to Chinese power. Iran, once it has the bomb, will become a major factor in the Eurasian balance of power, if not itself a “great power”.

And Europe in all this? Recently, France and Germany - and therefore the EU as a whole - have abandoned the fantasy of being a “counterweight” to the USA and have moved closer to the USA, partly because the ten mainly East European states which joined the EU in 1994 have not forgotten what “being close” to Russia involved. But EU countries - not even the UK - are unwilling to strengthen their military capabilities to the point where the USA, let alone hostile powers, would take them seriously. So, as usual, the EU will evolve under the US military umbrella, while proclaiming that “soft power” is more effective than military clout. The problem for the EU is that the great powers of tomorrow, the USA, Russia, China, India, perhaps Japan, don’t believe in the efficacy of soft power, and neither do the lesser countries which swim in their orbits.

It looks therefore as if 21st Century great power diplomacy, after the failed experiments of the 20th Century that were the League of Nations and the EU, is reverting to 19th Century modus operandi. This, hopefully, will result in the revival of the nation-state in Europe. But that can only happen with the break-up of the EU.

Pound’s weakness reason for staying out of euro, says *Economist*

“...the pound’s recent weakness has reinforced the economic case for staying out [of the Euro].” It has

allowed the Bank of England to cut rates decisively and will strengthen British international competitiveness

now and in the eventual recovery”.

Economist 18th December 2008.

What kind of future is there for the Royal Mail?

The Hooper report was meant to identify a brighter future for Britain's universal service provider but this is not possible while the UK conforms to EU law, argues Bryan Smalley

In 2008 many communities campaigned unsuccessfully to prevent the closure of their local post office without knowing that the closures resulted from our EU membership.

Two separate parts of EU law are causing the gradual dismantling of our traditional mail service.

The first is the Amsterdam Treaty which lays down that any state aid to a commercial organisation must be approved by the EU Commission. For over 150 years our mail system has delivered mail to the whole of the country at the same price. To achieve this we have subsidised our less profitable post offices. The Government's request to continue this practice was initially refused, but it is obvious that negotiations followed because in November 2007 David Miliband, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, was told that he could subsidise the Post Office with €460 million provided he closed down 2,500 Post Offices.

The second problem arises from the various Directives which created the EU-wide postal service in 1997. The Royal Mail was appointed as the Universal Service Provider (USP) within the UK with the responsibility for delivering mail to every address in the country. It was also given a monopoly over mail weighing less than a specific amount. Above the specified weight other EU countries were allowed to deliver mail in the UK. Royal Mail's monopoly was gradually reduced until 1st January 2009 when delivery of mail of any weight in this country becomes open to competition, but the Royal Mail still has the responsibility of delivering nationwide.

Following EU directives Britain was the first country to liberalise fully its postal service. Sweden and Finland are the only other member states to do so. Twenty one licensed mail companies from EU member states now compete with Royal Mail. They are known as the Unreserved Sector. These

companies are able to cherry pick the profitable areas of mail services leaving the unprofitable areas to the Royal Mail. Because of this arrangement the Royal Mail's operating profit fell in 2006/2007 to £22 million and in the following year it lost £3 million.

To correct these shortcomings the Government subsidised Royal Mail with the aim of introducing additional and improved mechanical sorting systems. A number of Royal Mail's competitors complained to the European Commission which then launched an in-depth enquiry. To date no result of the Commission's investigation has been announced.

On 17th December 2007 the Government initiated an independent review of the postal services sector to be chaired by Richard Hooper CBE. Its terms of reference were:

To assess the impacts to date of liberalisation of the UK postal services market, including on the Royal Mail, alternative carriers and consumers.

To explore trends in future market development and the likely impact of these on Royal Mail, alternative carriers and consumers.

To consider how to maintain the universal service obligation in the light of trends and market developments identified.

Social Rationale

It is most likely that the Hooper Enquiry was established to find a way out of the dilemma in which the Government finds itself.

The Panel submitted its Report to Parliament on 16th December 2008 with the title 'Modernise or Decline'. It acknowledges that the universal service has a strong social and economic rationale and that customers place a high value on the service. It admits that consumers in different parts of the country would face different levels of service without it. However the Report has many ambiguities and shows some

misconceptions. For example, it states that:

'since the Government owns Royal Mail, it is required to approve all significant financial decisions'

but it misleads the reader by not admitting that it is the EU that has the final word.

When identifying the 'stakeholders' the panel ignores the people at the 28 million business and residential addresses who use the mail service.

The Report acknowledges that the Universal Service is under threat resulting from e-mail competition and other electronic systems, but ignores the Royal Mail's obligation to deliver unprofitable mail and the threat from its unrestrained competitors. It calls for an improvement in efficiency and recommends investment in automation without mentioning that the EU is currently withholding financial approval for this. The Report also states that:

'unless measures are taken to accelerate the process of modernisation, it is likely that the company will need to approach Government for emergency financial support', and then: 'Emergency financial support would lead to forced and rapid restructuring carried out under European rules'. The Report then recommends: 'a strategic partnership between Royal Mail and one or more private sector companies'.

One of the stumbling blocks to a partnership is that the Royal Mail has a pension fund deficit of at least of £6 billion which a partner is unlikely to take on. The Panel then suggests that Royal Mail should expand to cover a wider geographical area, knowing quite well that the protectionist practices of our EU partners would prevent this.

The question arises, will our politicians kowtow to their political masters or will they act in the interests of the people who elected them?

LETTERS

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

Too Gloomy

Dear Sir,

Your lead article of December 19th, *'Dark days for eurosceptics'* was perhaps inordinately gloomy. I believe the next eighteen months will throw up five 'ifs' which, if they all succeed, would open a new chapter in our history; five may seem a lot, but they are all perfectly feasible.

What we have to remember is that the day is simply never going to come when a major party leader and prime minister suddenly rises at the crack of dawn, goes into the office and withdraws the UK from the EU. Cold turkey; slash and burn; nuclear option. It is just not going to be that way.

We will extract ourselves from the present mess the way we got in; by slow and sequential degrees, and in one of two ways. Either we demand exemptions that cannot be granted and refuse to back down; or the giants of the EU decline to indulge our testiness any more and demand a fresh relationship less burdensome to us all. (Giscard d'Estaing and Delors have both already suggested this may be unavoidable.)

If No. 1. The Tories (provided they get their act together in time) plus UKIP and Libertas sweep the board in the June euro elections, reducing Labour and Lib-Dems to a rump. With proportional representation the split vote does not matter so much. It is quite possible if the entire vote becomes our missing referendum on the Lisbon Treaty.

If No. 2. The Tories then fulfil their pledge to quit the EPP and create with others a genuine Parliamentary Opposition. This will need drive and dynamism and good Tory leadership among the MEPs. That will need party member pressure. Remember, you cannot pressure the Tory party from outside, only from inside. But you can drench every Tory MP and the leadership with letters and ultimatums without saying whom you vote for.

If No. 3. Desmond Ganley's Libertas campaign wins in October and the Irish reject Lisbon yet again. With Prague and Warsaw (*and Berlin - Ed.*) still refusing to sign, that will at least kill

the legality if not the reality of the Lisbon EU Constitution.

If No. 4. Brown is toppled in May 2010 and a far more (albeit not enough) EU-sceptic government starts to run this country.

If No. 5. David Cameron is required by huge poll showings to fulfil his pledge to give us our referendum and we, the British people, turn in a 66-34 NO answer.

Number Five simply could not be left hanging in the air. It would trigger a series of falling dominoes culminating in what we seek; a new trade-only relationship. But we are going to have to work like Trojans to secure these five 'Ifs'.

Two things we should never rely on. That the EU will simply implode of its own accord. Nice idea but like putting your all on a Grand National runner because it has a nice name. Second, screaming impotently at the heavens while wasting your vote because you demand the atomic bomb or nothing.

FREDERICK FORSYTH
Hertfordshire

Not Gloomy Enough

Dear Sir,

No-one, and certainly not *eurofacts* (19th December), should be surprised if these days are dark for eurosceptics for the reason is as clear as day: the self-inflicted divide and conquer nature of the movement. Is it any wonder if the cause (of EU withdrawal) fails to advance when some forty so-termed eurosceptic or anti-EU groups, from the cross-party CIB through the Metric Martyrs to the Democracy Movement, are all pulling 'independently' in different directions? If divided parties can't command the respect of the voters what chance has such a fractured movement?

Of course "*There is no major political figure who has made Britain's withdrawal his or her central objective*". How can there be when the leaders of the three main parties are committed to keeping Britain in the EU?

Such eurosceptics as there are in these parties are all (with one commendable exception) more

interested in keeping their careers than standing up for the country; they are mere men and women of straw.

Not that these same three parties should be regarded as equals in the eurosceptic stakes for Labour and Lib-Dems have no EU scepticism worth speaking of. No, the fly in the ointment is the Conservative Party, whose members know the EU score but who persist in contending (a) that Britain needs to be in the EU and (b) that we can reform the EU from within even though they know that both propositions are ludicrous.

Finally, to complete the table of impotence, we have the poor old too-sick-to-thrive, too-well-to-die UK Independence Party - the one party that unequivocally stands for EU withdrawal and the one blessed with the best political orator in the country. But UKIP is more vilified by the bogus eurosceptics, especially the Labour and Tory supporting broadsheets, than the EU itself.

Euroscepticism is not a movement but a credo, to be conducted within the confines and on the margins of the established Westminster parties. No wonder it is all but dead in the water

TONY STONE
Surrey

SDP Backs Withdrawal

Dear Sir,

I am sure that your readers would have an interest in learning that, at its November conference, the Social Democratic Party (SDP) after debating for some two hours proposals to amend its ten stated principles supported the proposals which included the creation of a new principle number six which reads as follows.

The SDP would repeal the European Communities Act 1972 ensuring sovereign powers of government are returned, enabling Britain to be governed in accordance with SDP principles and policies.

The SDP will now be actively campaigning for Britain's withdrawal from the European Union.

PETER JOHNSON
Birmingham

MEETINGS

The British Constitution
01752 312743 or 0781 352 9383

Saturday **24th Jan**, 11.00 - 5.00 pm

“Invoking the British Constitution -
Actions not words”

**John Bingley, David Bourne, Albert
Burgess, Brian Gerrish, John Harris**

CONFERENCE

Kings Hall, Glebe Street, Stoke-on-
Trent ST4 1JR

Admission £12.50 (only 1,000 seats)
Phone or E: roger@thebcgroup.org.uk

Marlborough Group
01672 511385

Sunday **25th January**, 2.00 pm

“Parliamentary Supremacy!”

Michael Shrimpton

PUBLIC MEETING

The Bear, Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **27th January**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidency: Ronald
Regan”

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

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London
Admission Free

Witney Constituency Association
07702 275544

Friday **30th January**, 7.30 pm

“The Financial Crisis: Why we are
lucky to be outside the Eurozone”

Professor Tim Congdon CBE,
Economist

PUBLIC MEETING

The Corn Exchange, Witney, Oxford
Admission Free

Freedom in the City
07979 695611

Wednesday **11th February**, 1.00 pm

Simon Heffer, Journalist

PUBLIC MEETING

The Counting House, 50 Cornhill,
London EC3V 3PD
Admission Free

Marlborough Group
01672 511385

Sunday **22nd February**, 2.00 pm

“Conservatives versus Constitution!”

Dr Sean Gabb

Chairman, **Harry Beckhough**

PUBLIC MEETING

The Bear, Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **24th February**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidency: George
H.W. Bush”

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

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London
EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(Salisbury Constituency Branch)
01722 790839

Monday **2nd March**, 7.30 pm

“UK can’t afford EU”

**Trevor Coleman MEP
Nigel Farage MEP
Dr Julia Reid**

PUBLIC MEETING

The Guildhall, Salisbury
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01626 831340

Saturday **18th April**, 10.00 am

Nigel Farage MEP
**Further details including Speakers to
be announced shortly**

SOUTHWEST CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, Exeter University,
Exeter, Devon
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **20th January**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into
EU Financial Regulation* from Witnesses
to be confirmed.

Tuesday **20th January**, 4.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The priorities of
the Czech Presidency of the EU* from His
Excellency Mr Jan Winkler, Ambassador
of the Czech Republic.

Wednesday **21st January**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Short
inquiry into the Community Civil
Protection Mechanism* from (a) Tom
Watson MP, Parliamentary Secretary,
Cabinet Office, and (b) Johnny Engell-
Hansen, Head of Operations Unit, Joint
Situation Centre (SitCen), General
Secretariat of the Council.

Tuesday **27th January**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *Economic and
Financial Affairs and International Trade*
from Lord Myners, Financial Services
Secretary, HM Treasury.

*Note: Committee Meetings can
change from Public to Private*

DIARY OF EVENTS

2009

European Parliamentary **11th June**
Elections

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

2010

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

Germany's Fourth Reich

by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Beckhough a former code-breaker and intelligence officer, shows how the EU is being formed by the needs of Germany.

The Treaty of Lisbon in Perspective

by BMDF. **£27.50**

Detailed analysis and review together with the full text of the Treaty as signed in Lisbon in December 2007.

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.

The End Of The English

The European Superstate

by David Brown. **£6.99**

As an apology to all grandchildren, it analysis how the EU plans for control of the UK have destroyed democracy. Required reading for all those worried in any way about the EU's power over us.

The Plan

Twelve Months to Renew Britain

by Douglas Carswell and

Daniel Hannan. **£10.00**

Britain is heading in the wrong direction. This book shows how to put our country on the right track to self-governance.

The Return of History & the End of Dreams

by Robert Kagan **Hdbk. £12.99**

A new configuration of power is shaping the international order. Nationalism, and the nation itself, has now returned in Europe the EU model is now in decline.

A Tribute to Ralph Harris 1924-2006

by CRCE. **£9.95**

Lord Harris of High Cross was one of the leading figures in the fight against the EU and injustice everywhere.

Squandered

How Gordon Brown is wasting over one trillion pounds of our money

by David Craig. **£8.99**

An exposé of the huge levels of financial waste by government on Quangos and Advisers, which are self serving at the tax-payers expense.

The Costs Of Regulation

And How the EU Makes them worse

by William Mason. **£4.00**

How by imposing EU regulations power is taken from national Governments.

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.

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.

The Principles of

British Foreign Policy

by Philip Vander Elst. **£4.00**

Should BFP reflect political principles or should it merely be shaped by current conceptions of national self-interest?

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**

FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£18
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

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

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

Name

Address

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

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

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403 741736
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
CIB	0116 2874 622
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
Nick Clegg MP	
New Britain	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006