

EU Constitution: Germany piles on the pressure

For the first time Germany has linked negotiations on the constitution with the issue of EU funding

Germany has stepped up its campaign to force through the present draft of the European constitutional treaty by implicitly threatening to reduce its contributions to the EU budget if it does not get its way.

Speaking to the European Committee of the German Parliament in Berlin on 21st October, the German Chancellor, Gerhard Schröder declared that Europe's decision-making procedures would be "put into order" by the end of the year following agreement on the terms of the treaty. Linking the funding of the EU with the treaty negotiations for the first time, he added: "*If this [agreed treaty text] is not placed in an acceptable form by the end of the year, what happens then to the future financing of the EU?*"

Germany remains the biggest EU cash cow with an annual net contribution of five billion euros. According to the German newspaper, *Die Welt* on 22nd October, in German eyes, the two countries creating the biggest "difficulties" over the draft are Spain and Poland - not Britain. Last year Spain received 8.8 billion euros from EU coffers, while Poland is likely to be the greatest future beneficiary among the Accession Countries because of the size of its agricultural sector.

The implications could not be clearer: if the critics do not fall in line and allow the constitutional treaty to be adopted in a form acceptable to the Franco-German leadership, i.e.

without significant change, Germany will either cut its contribution or seek a new funding formulae that punishes those, like Spain, who have stood in its way. It remains to be seen whether the Spanish prime minister, Jose Maria Aznar, who took a brave but highly unpopular stand over the Iraq war, will prove equally brave in continuing to object to aspects of the constitutional text that he doesn't like.

Herr Schröder's threat could not be credibly applied to Britain because the UK is the second largest EU net contributor, having handed over an average of £4.1 billion net a year during the period 1999-2001.

Thespians Talents

Indeed, it does not seem to have occurred to anyone - including Herr Schröder or Tony Blair - that the game that Germany is now playing could also be played by Britain. Yet it remains open to Mr Blair to threaten to reduce its contribution unless he gets his way over the so-called "red-line issues" of tax, defence and foreign policy. Although it may be late in the day he could use also the threat to demand that the constitutional text reflects the Laeken commitment to give national parliaments a greater say in EU decision-making and thus go some way to meet the scandalous "democratic deficit". Such an approach would allow Mr Blair to present himself as the conscience of European democracy, a role which

would enable him to give full vent to his thespian talents.

It is not difficult, however, to guess what the reaction of the Foreign Office to any such suggestions might be. There would be a look of distaste on the face of FO spokesmen as they rejected such crude sentiments as "unhelpful", "negative" or "not communautaire".

The extraordinary passivity of the British posture is a reflection of the Prime Minister's belief - in which he appears to have been strengthened by his former foreign policy guru, Robert Cooper - that the nation state is washed-up. European foreign policy circles are full of people with views like those of Mr Cooper, but to varying extents, most EU governments continue to believe in the concept of national interest even if they no longer believe in the nation state. Extraordinarily, the British government seems to believe in neither. In its view, membership of the EU requires the subordination of British interests to 'higher' European interests. This peculiar amalgam of public school ethos and European ideology has led the FO to conclude that we must all play the European game, irrespective of the impact on the UK's vital interests. Herr Schröder's threats, along with President Chirac's recent bullying of the Accession States, reminds us that the French and Germans do not see matters that way at all.

Europe's destiny in British hands

There can be no Europe without European defence, and no European defence without Britain Dominique de Villepin, French Minister of Foreign Affairs delivering the Dimbleby lecture on BBC1 on 19th October, 2003.

Trichet's poisoned chalice

Ian Milne describes the ECB's inevitable difficulties in finding an interest rate that suits all

Middle-of-the-road newspapers with headlines such as "Can the euro survive?" are now commonplace. They seem to be taking it for granted that the process of creating and managing the euro has pushed the zone's two biggest economies into recession. And they're having to grapple with the uncomfortable fact that, far from guaranteeing "stability", the euro is turning out to be extremely volatile, having lost about 30 per cent of its value against the dollar in its first three years, only to gain about 40 per cent in the last two years. Worse, many analysts predict an even weaker dollar. This would make euro-zone exports to the dollar zone more expensive; and unless China decouples its currency from the dollar it would also make euro-zone exports to much of Asia more expensive as well: the last thing the recession-bound euro-zone needs.

How, against such an unpropitious background, do the six members of the Executive Board of the European Central Bank decide on a single interest rate for the whole of the euro-zone - literally from Lapland to Andalucia?

When they sit down in Frankfurt each month they have in front of them a table similar to the one set out above, showing the individual GDPs of each of the euro-zone countries. This is their main macro-economic grid, around which all the other indicators: unemployment rates, export performance, balance of payments, inflation rates, money supply growth and so on, are interwoven. What this table shows is how large Germany and France loom in the Executive Board's collective mind.

Germany alone accounts for almost a

third of euro-zone output; France for over a fifth. Together, they account for over half the euro-zone economy. So when the Executive Board meets, its first, overwhelming responsibility is to set the right interest rate for Germany and France. If it can't get it right for those two then the whole euro-zone economy is at risk.

particular month. Should they do what's right for Germany and let France suffer? Or vice-versa? Or should they go for a classic euro-fudge and spread the pain of a wrong interest rate evenly between Germany and France?

What about the other euro countries? Their economic requirements have been and will be ignored. Privately, the Executive Board members say to themselves each month: "Who cares about Italy? Italy only accounts for 18 per cent of euro-zone GDP. Who gives a damn about Spain? They've only got 10 per cent. What if Ireland, with just 2 per cent of euro-zone GDP, needs an interest rate twice as high as the one she's stuck with? Tough."

It's not that the Executive Board members are heartless or uncaring. Theirs is a ghastly and demoralising job. They know that every month they're going to set an interest rate that's wrong for most, if not all, euro-zone countries. And it can only get worse, when the candidate countries due to join the European Union next year turn in their zlotys, forints, korunas, leus and tolaras for the euro. Their economic requirements will be ignored too - just as Spain's and Ireland's are now. No wonder the smaller euro-zone countries are digging in their heels over the planned big-country stitch-up of the EU Constitution. And no wonder, when it comes to the euro, the Swedes, Danes and Brits, if they've got any sense, will go on saying "Thanks, but no thanks".

This article is an up-dated version of "How the One-Size-Fits-All Interest Rate is Set", eurofacts, 15th June 2001.

Euro-zone: Breakdown of GDP in 2002

Country	GDP \$bn	%	Cumul. %
Germany	1984	30	30
France	1431	22	52
Italy	1184	18	70
Spain	653	10	80
Holland	418	6	86
Belgium/Lux	266	4	90
Austria	204	3	93
Greece	133	2	95
Finland	132	2	97
Portugal	122	2	99
Ireland	120	2	100
Total euro-zone	6647	100	100

Source: OECD Main Economic Indicators, September 2003. GDP @ current prices & exchange rates. Percentage columns do not sum due to rounding.

At present, both the German and the French economies are in deep trouble, and need different interest rates. (They also need different exchange rates, but that's another story.) So what does the Executive Board do? Essentially, it has three alternatives - and it has to choose between them every month:-

- It can set an interest rate for the euro that's right for the Germans, and let the French take the rap
- Or, it can set an interest rate for the euro that's right for the French, and let the Germans take the rap
- Or it can split the difference and set an interest rate that's the weighted average of the rates that would be right for each of the two big euro-zone countries separately.

It's a no-win situation. Whatever choice they make is wrong, either for Germany, or for France, or both. The only difference is how badly wrong their choice is going to be in any

Easier than taking sweets from children

The latest revelations suggest that the culture of EU fraud stretches even further than eurofacts had supposed

In a previous article, (*Why the EU will remain mired in corruption*, 10th October), we suggested that fraud and corruption among EU officials is systemic and that the culture of graft is consequently now so pervasive that it will be impossible to eradicate without dismantling EU institutions. This analysis is strengthened by the latest revelations about corruption within the EU that suggests the problem has gone further - and deeper - than even we imagined.

On 27th October a leaked report by EU auditors into the allegations of fraud at Eurostat showed that it is simply impossible to know how much taxpayers' money had disappeared or where it has ended up. Meanwhile, the EU's anti-fraud office, Olaf has confirmed allegations of fraud and financial mismanagement at the EU body that represents the local and regional authorities. On top of this, investigators have revealed 'irregularities' at the EU Publications Office which are believed to be similar to those discovered at Eurostat.

While these investigations continue the Belgian police have made three arrests, including that of one EU employee, following allegations that major grain companies have been tipped off about price changes ahead of announcements by the Commission.

The leaked auditors' report on Eurostat demonstrates that it is easier

for EU officials to commit fraud and to cover up their crimes than it is to steal children's sweets. Eurostat kept no central register of its contracts and records were missing or destroyed in 54 per cent of cases. Incredibly, not even bank statements were kept.

The auditors widened the report beyond Eurostat, but according to Ambrose Evans-Pritchard of the *Daily Telegraph*, they were refused documents by some EU departments. Mr Evans-Pritchard, who received a copy of the confidential report, writes: "*Caustic remarks jump out on every page: 'very little documentation to support contracts', 'no check-up on accounting information', 'progress and final report missing in files' or simply 'no contract files'.*"

Other reporters who saw the leaked document said this showed that while the problem had improved since the Santer Commission was forced to resign in 1999, 'irregularities' in the granting of contracts continued even throughout 2002. Commission spokesmen have consistently maintained that the alleged offences occurred before Mr Prodi took over; the leaked report strongly suggests that this is not the case.

The rules relating to contracts were changed by Mr Prodi - who promised a policy of "zero tolerance" when it came to fighting fraud - but it seems that these were not always

implemented. "*Management failed to provide a proper audit trail and transparent procedures*", says the auditors report. "*No supervision or monitoring took place.*"

Among Commissioners and high-ranking officials who have dispensed with the formality of competitive tendering is apparently Chris Patten. He chairs Aidco, the Europe Aid Co-operation Office, which authorised £24 million in contracts "without tender" to one firm. The company was kept as sole contractor, mostly for projects in the former Soviet Union, despite objections by Aidco's own finance director.

As a result of the seemingly endless allegations of fraud and nepotism, hardly a week passes now without one or more MEPs calling for the resignation of Mr Solbes, the economics commissioner, or Neil Kinnock, the vice-president charged with administrative reform. But no one in Brussels expects either to resign, any more than either is expected to root out corruption. Papers revealing the extent of the problem are leaked to the press because it is feared these will either be watered down, or their findings covered up. It is a sorry and scandalous state of affairs, but it would not go away even if Mr Kinnock and Mr Solbes were twice the men they are.

Ice-cream war hots up

Ireland's 'ice-cream war', which has been hotting up in recent months, has reached a sorry conclusion.

The conflict broke out when Van den Bergh Foods, a subsidiary of Unilever, started to give away freezers to shops in Ireland on condition these were stocked only with the company's ice-creams. Mars objected that this represented a cruel violation of EU competition policy - and was backed by the Commission. On 23rd October the European Court of First Instance in

Brussels ruled against Unilever and in favour of Mars

This decision reflects a curious view of competition. Instead of going to law Mars could have responded by giving away its own freezers and maybe a few free ice creams, too. The Court found that the exclusivity clause breached competition law because many Irish shops do not have room for more than one freezer. But others evidently do, and even those which don't still have to compete with their more spacious

rivals, and presumably also with mobile vendors with noisy chimes. There is no evidence that Unilever has captured the Irish market in ices, lollies and the like.

To flourish, a market economy needs a light framework of sympathetic laws and institutions - not administrative/judicial busy-bodying. The ultimate loser in the ice cream war is likely to be those who love ice cream, which probably means the majority of the Irish population.

The limits of economics

Economics, says John Mills, is a discipline against which serious charges need to be laid: that it has still not developed a generally accepted comprehensive theory about how to achieve, in combination, the major economic policy objectives which the vast majority of people evidently want to see attained. These are full employment, a good-ish growth rate, low-ish inflation, the alleviation of poverty and a sustainable future.

Mills' history of economic thought starts with the Ancient World, moves through the Mediaeval Church, the French Physiocrats and Mercantilism to Adam Smith, whose *Wealth of Nations*, in 1776, was, and still is, a fundamental building block of modern economics. In a chapter called "Dissent", Mills discusses the critiques of capitalism and imperialism by Marx and Lenin in particular and by the Left in general. In the 20th Century John Maynard Keynes and Milton Friedman stand out as the two most influential figures. The fact that their respective theories were only regarded as successful in practice for a few decades - Keynesian policies being associated with the failure of the British political

A Critical History of Economics

By John Mills

Palgrave MacMillan, 2003

Pbk, 228 pp

Available from *The June Press*

£19.99 + p&p see back cover

ISBN 1-4039189-2-9

and economic system in the 1970s, and monetarism, ironically, with the high unemployment and recession of the eurozone today - illustrates Mills' contention that economics has not so far come up with a durable recipe for economic success.

Mills is a highly successful businessman, active in local politics and a significant figure in Labour circles. His feet are thus firmly anchored in the real world. His own recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the dismal science are refreshingly straightforward. He urges policymakers to recognise that developed and developing economies alike need strong manufacturing sectors, because it is there that real gains in productivity are to be had. He believes that misguidedly tight monetary policies have saddled

economies like our own with interest rates and exchange rates far higher than they need to be, resulting in an economy-wide high cost base.

But to get back to Mills' starting point, the need for a comprehensive economic theory: is this desirable, let alone possible? Economics, unlike, say, mathematics or physics, is not a "hard", absolute science. As his perceptive book shows, economics is very much the art of the possible, of the interplay between social, political, cultural and economic pressures; it is also susceptible to passing fashions. The achievement of the great economists has lain in their ability to *describe* this complex aspect of human activity, not to construct over-arching theories or formulate laws which would enable forecasts to be made with certainty. The striving for comprehensive theories will go on; but hopefully this will not discourage non-economists, untrammelled by formal training in contemporary economics, (as were Adam Smith, a philosopher, and Keynes, a mathematician) from bringing fresh insights to bear on economic matters.

New members bullied into giving up liberty

Joining the EU will make the eight Accession States from Central and Eastern Europe less competitive because of the impact of the 97,000 pages of regulations they will have to sign up to and the additional taxes required to implement them, concludes a study* from the Washington-based Cato Institute (www.cato.org)

"The EU has become a powerful trading bloc that can determine conditions by which smaller, non-member nations gain access to EU

markets", says the author, Marian Tupy, assistant director of the Project on Global Liberty. *"In a protectionist fashion, which the EU masquerades as a desire to create 'a level playing field', the EU forces poor countries to adopt rules and regulations inappropriate to their level of economic development. Those unnecessary burdens will result in sub-optimal economic growth... Unfortunately, the incoming EU members had to choose between the common market on the one hand and*

economic liberty on the other.

"Complying with the EU's regulations on labour, agriculture and the environment will raise the costs of production, while future harmonisation of taxes looms as an additional threat to the new members' comparative advantages."

**EU Enlargement: Costs, Benefits, and Strategies for Central and East European Countries, published by the Cato Institute, Washington DC.*

Driving on to European Union

The EU Commission announced on 22nd October 2003 that it is to introduce a "harmonised" plastic EU-

wide-driving licence. A spokesman for the European Commission said that the new permit would contain a smart chip, would eventually replace national

licences, and would help to crack down on fraud since driving licences "are often used as a form of ID".

City analysts warn of euro chaos

Scenarios involving the departure of Germany from the single currency are being taken seriously in the square mile

It is no longer just eurosceptics who say so: a report from Henderson Global Investors, a leading City asset management company warns that repeated violations of the EU's economic rules could trigger the collapse of the euro in an atmosphere of recrimination and mutual suspicion. Such a situation might occur if it became known that a country was thinking of quitting the single currency. This in turn would result in chaos in the currency market with capital pouring out of the euro zone, it states.

The report, which says that the survival of the euro can no longer be taken for granted, follows the announcement on 23rd October that Germany's budget deficit will remain above three per cent of gross domestic product in 2004, thus breaching the EU Stability and Growth Pact for the third successive year. Some German

analysts are already warning that the limit will again be breached in 2005. Hans Eichel, the German finance minister had previously claimed that the three per cent target would be "difficult but not impossible to achieve" in 2004.

Germany is widely expected to avoid the 'automatic' fine which is supposed to follow breaches of the pact, especially since France has again just been given a further year to comply.

The report from Henderson, written by Farida Hassan, a staff economist, points out an obvious but important truth: "If one person cheats (and gets away with it) everyone will cheat and the pact will totally unravel. This could lead to political infighting and a loss of confidence from the outside world."

If the European Central Bank (ECB) countered the loosening of fiscal policy by raising interest rates, as many economists have argued, eurozone

growth would continue to stagnate. This might cause a vicious circle of even more fiscal loosening and higher interest rates, eventually causing the euro to collapse as credibility vanished and bond yields surged.

One possible break-up scenario would see Germany deciding that it was in its own best interests to abandon the euro: "This would happen if the country is facing huge domestic unrest and tensions due to sharply rising unemployment and recession and the party in opposition looking to capitalise on the country's misfortune blaming the incompetence of the ECB and the whole euro experiment."

Chaos would ensue if in those circumstances it became known that the country was contemplating leaving the euro followed by a major currency flight from the eurozone, the report states.

Europe-wide demand for referendum

A Europe-wide day of action to demand a referendum on the proposed EU constitution will take place in major European cities on 6th December.

The event has been planned by the European Referendum Campaign, a loose network of 320 non-

governmental organisations representing more than five million members including those in favour of an EU constitution as well as those opposed to it.

The date for the event, which will include press conferences and photo-shoots has been chosen to coincide

with the run-up to the IGC which will meet in Rome in the second week of December.

Readers who wish to participate can obtain information on line at: www.european-referendum.org/action/day1.htm.

Constitution will destroy jobs

The Prime Minister has been privately warned that the section on energy policy in the proposed EU constitution will destroy British jobs and reduce the flow of oil from the North Sea. The warning has come from Sir Ian Wood, chairman of the oil services company John Wood.

North Sea output makes Britain the largest oil and gas producer in Europe, generating eighty five per cent of the

energy consumed in the United Kingdom and supporting more than a quarter of a million jobs. According to *The Business* (26/27 October) Sir Ian has told Downing Street that the EU energy chapter introduces "a whole range of new uncertainties and delays which will definitely damage our ability to attract investment."

Sir Ian continues "We believe these uncertainties will reduce investment,

accelerate job losses and significantly reduce the amount of oil and gas eventually recovered from the UK continental shelf."

Among other things, the constitutional draft seeks to enshrine in European law the commitment to "promote energy efficiency ...and renewable forms of energy."

LETTERS

Tel: 01548 821402 Fax: 01548 821574 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Tory Infighting Hurts our Cause

Dear Sir,
The infighting within the Conservative Party is conveniently, for pro-Europeans, completely overshadowing the launch of the national petition for a referendum on the draft EU constitution which would, if ratified, end this nation's freedom to govern itself.

The Labour Government have held more than thirty referenda, ranging from local mayoralty to partial self government for Wales and Scotland, since they came to power in 1997, however Tony Blair is adamant that no referendum will be held over such a politically crucial matter as the EU constitution.

The details of the draft constitution extend the EU's considerable existing powers.

It re-states that we are all citizens of the EU and that its laws supersede our own and must be loyally obeyed.

As at present, exercise of the EU's powers would be in the autocratic hands of the non-elected, non accountable Commission, European Central Bank and European Court of Justice, within the broad framework of the laws initiated by the Commission.

Our national veto, already severely restricted, will all but disappear.

There will be an EU Public Prosecutors office, which unlike in Britain, will also investigate crimes.

The ultimate aim is to have a common EU Justice System which if agreed would end our right to trial by jury, freedom from arbitrary arrest, ban on double jeopardy and presumption of innocence.

The EU will define and implement Foreign and Security policy and frame Defence policy.

It will have exclusive powers regarding fishing, competition matters (including free movement of people, goods, services and capital) and the Euro zone's monetary policy and will coordinate economic

policy even outside the Euro zone.

The EU's powers will become limitless.

Mr Blair knows that, historically, we are a fiercely proud independent nation, and, faced with a bureaucratic takeover from across the Channel, the British electorate, if given the opportunity, will defeat his government, something which he could not contemplate.

Of the three main political parties the Conservatives, who under the leadership of Iain Duncan Smith have regained their credibility in the opinion polls, are the strongest critics of the EU constitution. However, left to MPs to decide the future of this nation's democracy the voices of careerism will heavily outweigh the voices of common sense and patriotism unless they are all drowned by the deafening silence of political complacency within the House of Commons.

JOSEPHINE ALLEN
Norfolk

Federalist Myths Exposed

Dear Sir,

We are told that a federal Europe will advance the cause of peace, but does the record of all existing giant federations support this? Does such an assertion do anything to explain why the federal USA has been involved in every major war of the last one hundred years? Or why federal China has aggressively occupied independent Tibet? Or why federal Russia is at war with Chechnya? Or indeed why federal India has had a military confrontation with every one of its major neighbours since the end of British rule?

It ignores not least that each of these giant federations is armed with nuclear weapons; considerations which surely make it imperative that we be informed on precisely what grounds it is assumed that those now already actively engaged in seeking to form a European army can be trusted to be any more peaceful.

It is also said that the surrender of our sovereignty into a giant entity is

essential for economic advance, an assertion which does nothing to explain why millions of federal Americans are living below the poverty line (with over a million in jail), why the people of federal China and India are amongst the poorest in the world, nor why federal Russia continues to stagnate in an ocean of corruption. It is an argument that also appears content to ignore the imposing fact that most of the wealthiest nations in the world have populations of less than ten million.

It is quite evident that the bigger the power bloc the bigger the wars, and the bigger the oceans the bigger the storms, which is why the global economic collapse of 1929 erupted not in tiny Iceland or Switzerland (two of the richest countries in the world) but in giant federal America.

In short, the arguments for a federal Europe are bunk, and yet we are being pressurised to surrender our sovereignty to Brussels when most of us seem to have less and less influence in what currently goes on in Westminster.

JOHN PAPWORTH
London

A Mystery Solved

Dear Sir,

With reference to your article entitled '*So close to God, so far from virtue*' (10th October) perhaps one clue to the possible canonisation of Robert Schuman and Alcide de Gasperi, is that, of late, the post of Devil's Advocate in the canonisation process has been abolished.

I do not think it would have been easy for any candidate for the sainthood to get past that gentleman, zlotys notwithstanding.

CHRISTINE STRAKER
East Sussex

MEETINGS

**Referendum04
Campaign for an Independent
Britain
and
Democracy Movement
01732-359840**

Wednesday **12th Nov. 2003**, 8.00 pm
"Let the people decide"

Colin Bullen, *CIB NEC*
Marc Glendenning, *Campaign
Director, Democracy Movement*
Chairman, **Bernadette Bullen**

PUBLIC MEETING
Hastings Community Learning Centre,
Rothermere House, 59/51 Cambridge
Road, Hastings, East Sussex
Admission Free

**Newcastle-under-Lyme
Conservative Association
07900-438489**

Friday **14th November 2003**, 8.00 pm
"The EU Constitution"

Christopher Gill, *Chairman, The
Freedom Association*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Conservative Club, Merrial Street,
Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire
Admission Free
(Phone for Tickets)

**Campaign Against Eurofederalism
0845-345 8902**

Saturday **15th November 2003**,

10.30 - 12.30 am
"Save our jobs"

1.45 - 4.00 pm
"We must have a say in our future"

Tony Wardle
George West

PUBLIC MEETING
Old Royal Public House, Church Street,
Birmingham B3
(Within 15 minutes walking from New
Street Station)
Admission Free

London Swinton Circle

Tuesday **18th Nov. 2003**, 7.00 pm
"Labour's Constitutional Vandalism"

Rt Hon John Redwood MP

PUBLIC MEETING
The Attlee Suite, Portcullis House,
Westminster, London SW1A 0AA
Admission Free

**The West Dorset Conservative
Association**

Lyme Regis Branch
01297-442642

Annual Dinner
(Black Tie)

Friday **5th December 2003**, 7.30 pm

Guest Speaker;
Christopher Gill, *Chairman of the
Freedom Association*

ANNUAL DINNER
Hotel Alexandra, Broad Street, Lyme
Regis, Dorset
Admission £18
(Includes food with silver service)
Cheques to "WDCA" post to Frank
McGarry, "Lower Ware", Ware Lane,
Lyme Regis, Dorset DT7 3EL

**The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414**

International Conference

Saturday **6th December 2003**,
10.30 am - 6.00 pm

Speakers to be announced

ALL DAY CONFERENCE
The Great Hall, King's College, London
Admission £20 Members
(£25 for non-Members)
Includes lunch and refreshments.

DIARY OF EVENTS

2004
Ireland takes over **1st January**
EU presidency

**United Kingdom Independence Party
01503-230055**

Monday **8th December 2003**, 7.00 pm

Mike Faulkner, *Ex-fisherman and local
businessman*

Ashley Mote, *Author of Vigilance &
OverCrowded Britain*

Chris Venmore, *Chairman of
Crustacea Council for Shellfish
Association of Great Britain*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Queen's Hotel, The Promenade,
Penzance, Cornwall
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

**House of Lords
020-7219 3000**

Wednesday **12th Nov. 2003**, 11.15 am
Evidence will be heard on *New
Approaches to the Asylum Process*, from
Mrs Maeve Sherlock, Director, and
Richard Williams, Refugee Council; and
Jan Shaw and Eva Lester, Amnesty
International.

Wednesday **12th October 2003**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The
Accountability of Regulators to Citizens
and Parliament*, from (a) Sir Christopher
Bellamy, President; and Charles
Dhanowa, Registrar, the Competition and
Appeals Tribunal; and (b) Deirdre Hutton,
Chairman; and James King Senior Policy
Officer; the National Consumer Council.

Wednesday **12th Nov. 2003**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Amended
proposal for a Council Directive on mini-
mum standards on procedures in Member
States for granting and withdrawing
refugee status*, from Ms Caroline Flint MP,
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State,
Home Office.

Thursday **13th November 2003**, 10.45 am
Evidence may be heard on *EU
International Development Assistance*.

Wednesday **21st January 2004**, 3.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The
Practicalities of Renewable Energy*, from
DTI officials.

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

OverCrowded Britain

by Ashley Mote. **£8.95**

This book looks at the facts and consequences of large-scale immigration.

An Analysis of the Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe

by Anthony & Andrew Cowgill. **£15.00**

The definitive guide to the draft of the proposed EU Constitutional Treaty.

England Our England A Nation in Jeopardy

by Vernon Coleman. **£7.99**

Two hundred and ninety five reasons to reject the euro and the EU.

Whip's Nightmare Diary of a Maastricht Rebel

by Christopher Gill. **£17.50**

Former rebel MP gives an insight into the way politics works and why Britain's freedom is being surrendered.

The European Constitution and what it means for Britain

by David Heathcoat-Amory MP. **£7.50**

A review of the enormous scale and scope of the proposed changes. How could any parliamentary democracy subject its citizens to this EU plan?

The Trojan Hearse

by J. Brian Heywood. **£9.99**

This book although a work of fiction - or is it? raises a multitude of awkward questions and provides some uncomfortably plausible answers.

A Constitution to Destroy Europe

by Bill Jamieson. **£2.00**

A financial expert examines the proposed EU Constitution.

A Critical History of Economics

by John Mills. **£19.99**

Mills's questions whether economists really do know the causes of economic growth. He sets out in simple language, the history of economic thought and its major influences.

Pros and Cons of the EMU and EU

by Emmanuel Stiakakis. **£21.99**

Political, economic and philosophical argument, for and against membership.

EU Enlargement: not all it's cracked up to be

by James Walsh. **£5.00.**

Overall EU enlargement is a poor deal for Britain, a poor deal for the EU itself and a poor deal for new member states.

Britain v Europe

by David Winn. **£11.99**

A factual account of Britain's fifty year dilemma over Europe and the development of the EU.

VIDEOS, TAPES & C D s

Shockwaves

by Sanity

Video £5.00

A clear thirty minute presentation of the EU threat to the United Kingdom.

The Euro - The Facts

by an Independent Organisation.

Video £5.00

A clear presentation of the full consequences of adopting the euro.

Send Payment to THE JUNE PRESS LTD PO BOX 119

TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA

Tel: 01548-821402

Fax: 01548-821574

Email: info@junepress.com

www.junepress.com

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY) Ring for foreign rates

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£14
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"

Britain in Europe	020-7233 0123
European Movement	020-7881 8989
Federal Trust	020-7799 2818

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403-741736
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020-8922 0089
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071-663876
Campaign for an Independent Britain	020-8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020-7610 0865
Freedom Association	01746-861267
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020-7691 3800
New Alliance	020-7386 1837
Save Britain's Fish	01224-313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy	01372-453678
No Campaign	020-7378 0436

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020-7287 4414
Global Britain	

E-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020-7222 9000
Rt Hon Iain Duncan Smith MP	
Democratic Party	01684-891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Labour	020-7802 1000
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562-68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020-7222 7999
Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP	
New Britain Party	020-7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	020-7434 4559
Mr Roger Knapman	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006