

## No giving up: peers to continue fight for inquiry into EU

By Nigel Vinson

The Prime Minister repeatedly asserts that there are huge benefits to be derived from membership of the European Union, but does not provide the factual basis for his assertion. He says that a decision to leave the EU would be "inconceivable", but he does not begin to explain why. Soon, however, the Government must make a formal decision on whether to ratify the text of the proposed new Constitution for Europe. This will lay the foundations of political and legal authority in this country for decades, under which the EU will have its own legal personality, superior to that of the nation states. Given that the Government is holding out against a referendum on the issue, it is truly astonishing that Parliament should be asked to approve such a hugely significant step without being provided with objective information about the benefits of EU membership and the consequences of withdrawal.

For this reason, I have been one of fifty members of the House of Lords who have been pressing for a parliamentary inquiry into the advantages and disadvantages of Britain's continuing EU membership. Among them have been Baroness Thatcher, the former Prime Minister, Lord Wetherill, the former speaker of the Commons, Baroness Mallalieu, former Labour spokesman on home legal affairs, as well as several influential cross-benchers such as Lord Moran. Our request was turned down on 11th November by the House of Lords Liaison Committee - but we wish to make it plain that we believe that the issues are so momentous that we are most unwilling to take no for an answer.

In turning down our proposal, the

Liaison Committee offered what I believe to be quite exceptionally poor arguments: "We consider that such a Committee would not be timely in view of the current Intergovernmental Conference on the draft Constitution for Europe. The establishment of such a committee is likely to be regarded as a negative intervention in the process by the House and we doubt whether it would be possible to isolate the Committee's deliberations from wider political considerations." This is simply another way of saying: "We won't allow the House to find the answers that it needs to make an informed judgement because the very act of seeking these could be construed as criticism of the EU or the proposed European constitution. Better to remain ignorant!"

As to the timing of our request, it is precisely the IGC which makes an assessment of EU cost/benefits a matter of compelling urgency.

It is true that there is a growing feeling in the Lords that a revised relationship with the EU *might* be a better alternative than continuing along a route which will destroy what remains of national sovereignty. But we have also received substantial support from those who simply want to know the facts before they make up their minds. and who, like me, regard the Government's recent White Paper as woefully inadequate.

As I wrote to the clerk of the Liaison Committee on 29th: "*Opinion polls increasingly indicate that there is wide public disquiet over the realities of membership of the European Union. The democratic deficit is manifest and growing. Currently a sensible debate on the realities of reform within or life outside the EU is impossible due to*

*lack of factual analysis of the latter situation.*

"Such a report could clearly show that withdrawal would be unrealistic, impractical and economically and politically damaging. Alternatively, it might indicate that - as with Norway and other countries - an associate relationship with the EU would be both achievable and advantageous. Only an in-depth analysis of those options can help the debate..."

I write as one who vigorously supported British entry into the European Communities in the 1970s. But in present circumstances it seems to me that the choice the country must make is not between the EU as it was then (or even as it is now) on the one hand and lonely isolation on the other, but between a new and mutually beneficial relationship with our EU partners and participating further in the creation of a unitary European state. In order to determine which of those routes Britain should take, Parliament and the country need a rigorous analysis of economic and political realities.

We shall now insist on a House of Lords debate on the reasons for the rejection of our demands. If this does not lead to a change of heart on the part of the Liaison Committee, there may be other ways of fulfilling our aims. Certainly, it would be an act of colossal irresponsibility for Parliament to proceed to ratify the new Constitution without having all of the relevant information.

*Lord Vinson is co-founder of the Centre for Policy Studies and a member of the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee.*

# Germany: the new sick man of Europe

*Economic stagnation and unemployment may lead Germans to question their policies - and their commitment to the European Union*

By Tim Congdon

In the 1970s apparently chronic economic weakness caused the United Kingdom to be described as “the sick man of Europe”. The phrase is still used, but now it applies to Germany. This surprises some people who have difficulty understanding how such a complete change in the relative economic fortunes of the two nations can be possible. Is Germany really in such a mess?

Germany’s economic troubles today are just as worrying as the UK’s over 25 years ago, but they are very different in character. In the 1970s the central economic problem in the UK was the control of inflation, which briefly accelerated in early 1975 to over 25 per cent a year and was at over 10 per cent a year for nearly all the decade. The UK had a slow rate of economic growth, but the indefinite future continuation of economic growth was widely (and correctly) taken for granted. By contrast, in Germany today inflation - as measured by the annual increase in retail prices - is less than one per cent and can hardly be deemed a significant concern for policy-makers. Instead their major anxiety is the collapse in economic growth. Indeed, if recent trends in the rate of improvement in output per head (i.e., in productivity) were to persist, there is a high probability that German economic growth would come to a complete halt over the next 15 or 20 years. Germany would be the first leading industrial country to suffer this fate.

## High taxes

Why is the position so bad? First, German companies and citizens face high taxes and excessive regulation. If the compulsory payment of insurance premiums to finance the largely private provision of health is regarded as taxation, taxes are over half of national income. The tax burden is therefore much heavier than in the years of the *wirtschaftswunder* (or “economic

miracle”) in the 1950s and 1960s, when taxes were typically a third or less of national income. Meanwhile the costs of too much regulatory interference are most obvious in the labour market, where the difficulty of firing employees discourages companies from employing them in the first place. It is the burden of over-taxation and over-regulation that explains why the growth rate of productivity has fallen to little more than 1 per cent a year, a sad comedown from the rates of 4 or 5 per cent a year enjoyed during the miracle.

## Population Decline

Secondly, since the mid-1970s Germany’s women have on average had fewer than two children. As they need to have 2.1 for the population to be replaced, and as the low fertility rate has now lasted for slightly longer than one generation, a period of population decline is almost certain. Over the next 20 or 30 years the fall in the total population will be much less than the fall in the working-age population, as increased life expectancy adds to the numbers of elderly people. But of course it is the number of people of working-age, and the proportion of them that actually does work, which is crucial to any nation’s capacity to produce. Germany is in big trouble on this front, as the working-age population will start falling by over half a per cent a year from about 2010 and by over 1 per cent a year in the 2020s. Further, the additional taxes needed to look after the elderly may reduce the proportion of the working-age population that wants to keep a job.

One does not need to have a Nobel prize in economics to see that, if the growth of output per head is 1 per cent a year and the decline in employment is also 1 per cent a year, the growth of output stops altogether. That is the

essence of Germany’s economic plight. In principle the problem should not be too bad in the current decade, as the working-age population should be roughly the same in 2010 as today and the proportion of the working-age population to the total population is high by European standards. However, the last three years have been most disappointing. Gross domestic product went up by only a half a per cent in 2001 and a mere quarter of a per cent in 2002, and it seems likely to increase by under half a per cent again in 2003. If that is the best that Germany can do in a relatively benign demographic context, the warnings of stagnation from 2010 have added cogency.

The 20th century proved that history does not proceed in straight lines. The economic and political fortunes of Europe’s different nations soared and plunged as the decades passed. In the 1950s and 1960s Britain - the complacent victor in two world wars - was handicapped economically by the socialist policies introduced by the Labour government between 1945 and 1951, whereas Germany made a spectacular recovery as policy-makers supported free trade and low taxes. When Sir Keith Joseph and Mrs. Margaret (now Lady) Thatcher founded the Centre for Policy Studies in 1974, its opening statement referred with admiration to “the social market economy” in West Germany.

## Economic Reforms

But in the closing quarter of the 20th century better policies were adopted in the UK and a mild degree of economic dynamism was maintained. By contrast, German governments became too interventionist and too welfare-minded. Large-scale economic reforms are to be expected as the prospect of economic stagnation comes closer. Is it too optimistic to hope that one change may be a more critical and

**Continued on P.3**

# Anglo-German trade: a tale of divergent economies

## Summary

Over the last few years the big Eurozone economies, Germany especially, have grown sluggishly. The UK has grown quite fast (though not as fast as the other main Anglo-Saxon countries, the USA, Canada and Australia). The UK has sucked in imports of goods from Germany while its own exports of goods to Germany have grown very slowly. Consequently, over the last six years, the British deficit (and the German surplus) on trade in goods with Germany has ballooned, so that in 2002 Germany sold the UK roughly half as much again as the UK sold to Germany. Indeed, without the UK acting almost as Germany's "importer of last resort", the German economy would today be in even worse shape than it actually is. And if the increasing consumer-led imbalances in the British economy persist, and recession ensues, Germany will suffer collateral damage.

Goods account for a much higher proportion of all German exports to the UK than in the other direction - not surprising given that, proportionately, manufacturing "weighs" more in the German economy than it does in the UK.

German and French politicians and commentators, still talking up the Franco-German "locomotive" as the "motor" of EU integration, still assume that Germany and France are each other's main customer and main supplier. That assumption is no longer true. Germany's biggest single export market is the USA; and the UK is Germany's second-biggest export market (and biggest export market in

the EU). If current trends persist, with German exports *outside* the EU growing much faster than *to* the EU, German foreign policy, still seemingly obsessed with the EU, and German commercial interests, increasingly turned to the Anglo-Saxon world, will soon be pulling in opposite directions - with, potentially, some quite surprising results.

## Detailed figures

*In 2002, the value of German exports\* worldwide was 872 billion (£610 billion @ £1= 1.43), fifty per cent higher than the value of British exports worldwide, which were £408 billion. The population of Germany is thirty-seven per cent higher than Britain's, so per-capita German exports worldwide were higher than per-capita British exports worldwide.*

*The UK is Germany's second-biggest export market, accounting in 2002 for 10 per cent of all German exports. In the other direction, Germany is the UK's second-biggest export market, accounting in 2002 for 9 per cent of all British exports.*

*The USA is the biggest export market for both Germany and the UK, accounting in 2002 for 12 per cent of all German exports, but a far higher proportion - 19 per cent - of all British exports. So the British economy is significantly more involved with and exposed to the American economy, and to the US dollar, than is Germany's. France is the third-biggest export market for Germany and the fourth-biggest export market for the UK. In 2002, 57 per cent of British exports to Germany consisted of goods. Another 25 per cent consisted of income, and*

*almost all the remaining 18 per cent of services. The British import pattern was rather different, with 70 per cent of German exports to Britain consisting of goods, 17 per cent of income and almost all the remaining 13 per cent as services.*

*The UK is in structural deficit on its trade with Germany: Germany consistently sells more to the UK than the UK sells to Germany. In the period 1997-2002 inclusive, the overall cumulative British deficit on trade with Germany was £28 billion. Within that overall figure, the British overall cumulative deficit on its trade in goods with Germany was £38 billion; but offsetting British surpluses on trade in services and income reduced the overall deficit to £28 billion.*

*The British deficit on trade in goods with Germany more than doubled between 1997 and 2002, from £4.9 billion in 1997 to £10.2 billion in 2002. During that period, British imports of goods from Germany grew faster - at an average annual compound rate of 4.7 per cent - than the rate at which British exports to Germany grew - only 1.3 per cent. By 2002, Germany was selling almost 50 per cent more goods to the UK than the UK was selling to Germany (£32 billion from Germany to Britain compared with £22 billion from Britain to Germany).*

\*"Exports" consist of exports of Goods & Services, plus receipts of Income & Transfers. Transfers typically account for only one per cent of total Exports (and Imports).

Sources: the German and UK Balances of Payments 2003, at respectively [www.bundesbank.de](http://www.bundesbank.de) and [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk).

Continued from P.2

## Germany: the new sick man of Europe

parsimonious attitude towards "the European construction"? Germany's taxpayers have subsidised European integration heavily since the creation of the European Economic Community in 1958. As Europe's finance ministers

debate a possible fine on Germany for its excessive budget deficit, these taxpayers may start to ask whether their investment in good relations with their neighbours has been such a good

deal.

*Tim Congdon is chief economist at Lombard Street Research and honorary professor at Cardiff Business School.*

# A vocation to self-destruct

*Europe's political development can best be interpreted by reference to the interests of the EU salariat*

What is the fundamental purpose of the European constitution? Bill Jamieson, the author of this Bruges Group pamphlet, suggests that there are three. The overall purpose is to create a powerful economic and political presence on the world stage in the belief that the rise of integrated economic blocs is inevitable. The second is to promote the development of a corporatist dispensary model of social democracy. The third is to increase the power, income, and opportunities of the EU bureaucracy.

Jamieson is surely right to suspect that the first aim is not the one that is taken most seriously in Brussels; if it were the Commission would favour quite different policies to the ones which it is promoting. As for the second, this is at odds with the first; even among europhiles, few believe that the welfare state is compatible with high levels of growth or full employment. It is, he believes, the uncompromising drive to achieve the third of these aims which provides the key to current developments. For, as Jamieson argues, the process of supra-national construction creates any

---

## A Constitution to Destroy Europe

By Bill Jamieson

EU Constitution Briefing Paper 02  
Pamphlet, 23 pp

Available from *The June Press*  
£2.00 + p&p see back cover  
ISBN 0-9541909-6-3

---

number of new functions and competences to advance the career opportunities, employment, resources and power of the EU salariat. He writes: "*The new supra-national platform is a quantum leap for Europe's political class. It may be seen as the means to effect one of the most self-serving and self-interested seizures of power in modern times. It is draped in the justification of advancing a massive welfare and social solidarity model...*

*"The elite is set on building a European polity for the advancement of itself and its burgeoning salariat under the guise of appeals*

*to civilisation, inviolable rights, fundamental laws, closing the democratic deficit, social democracy and the exercise of a European demos. All this is a rhetorical cloak for a self-interested aim."*

But, Jamieson points out, such blind hubris threatens to destroy the entire project. Until now it was possible for two distinct European camps - the dirigiste, highly politicised, and introspective group led by France and Germany, and the looser, less integrated, less interventionist group comprising the UK and several accession countries - to co-exist (rather along the lines of the Chinese 'one country, two systems' model). But pushing ahead with the constitution will ensure that the law of unintended consequences kicks in. For its adoption will make internal change harder to achieve while sharpening the divisions between the two camps. In the end, the constitution will intensify conflicts that could destroy the EU as we have known it. And along with it, of course, the career prospects and free lunches of the EU salariat.

## Living in a world of illusions

Mr Schröder is a gifted and ruthless opportunist, with an acute ear for the mood of his fellow Germans. But the anti-Americanism which he has helped to promote may prove a force that even he cannot control...

*The German opinion polls show rapidly increasing support for the idea of a European superpower, to act*

*as a check on US ambitions: 70 per cent of Germans now favour that idea, compared with only 48 per cent only a year ago. No matter that they are not prepared to spend the money which alone could give substance to that project. The Germans are going the way of the French, intent on a kind of Gaullism that puts every possible obstacle in*

*Washington's way. Unable to bear the reality of American power, they have opted instead to live in a world of illusions.*

Andrew Gimson, former Berlin correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph* writing in *The Spectator* on 13th September 2003.

## Germany rules out a referendum

Germany, the largest EU country, will not hold a referendum on the EU constitution. A proposal in favour of a plebiscite from the FDP was decisively rejected in the Bundestag on 6th November. Those voting against included the Social Democrats (SPD), the Christian

Democrats (CDU) and the Greens. Germany is the first country to make a formal announcement that it will not allow its citizens to have a say in the matter. Six countries have said that they will definitely have a referendum on the issue. These are the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ireland,

Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain.

Those who have not yet reached a formal decision are: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

# Giscard Who? We've never heard of him

Sixty seven per cent of those living in the EU '25' support the idea of an EU constitution (though not necessarily the existing draft treaty) according to the EUbarometer, a survey of public opinion commissioned by the Commission carried out in October. A press release from the Commission proudly trumpeted this finding but here are some other findings from the survey on which less stress is placed:

■ Sixty one per cent of EU 'citizens' have never heard of the Convention on the Future of Europe which produced the treaty - or presumably the treaty

itself; this is seven per cent fewer than in June, despite lavish spending on public 'education'. UK subjects came bottom of the poll - only 17 per cent have heard of the Convention (down eight per cent on the June survey).

■ A majority in six countries - Swedes, Poles, Lithuanians, Britons, Danes and Slovenians - don't want a constitution whatever its contents. In several others - Finland, the Czech Republic, and Cyprus - it was a close run thing.

■ Forty nine per cent believed that a referendum on the issue is essential while an additional 36 per cent though

it would be "useful but not essential" (the wording of the questions plainly favoured the Federalist cause); in other words 85 per cent would like a referendum.

■ Forty five per cent never intend to read the constitutional text

In passing, *eurofacts* cannot fail to notice countries most in favour of an EU constitution - Greece (which is described as 'model' in this regard), Spain, Italy - have constitutional histories which might lead their subjects to suppose that any constitution would be better than the one they already have.

## Danes in a fix over referendum

Swedish and Finnish diplomats have warned the Danish government that it is in danger of losing a referendum on the proposed European constitution - expected to be held in 2004 - as a result of its half-hearted support for key Nordic aims to protect the interests of small EU states. "Denmark has ended up on the wrong team in many battles", an EU negotiator from one of the Nordic states told the

Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* (*euobserver* 5th November). "It may turn out to be difficult to win a referendum if the Danish government creates the impression of not making sufficient efforts."

The Danish Government is evidently in a fix. If it supports the Finns and Swedes, it fears that it may lose the opt-outs on the euro and judicial cooperation which it negotiated at Maastricht - which would make

it impossible to win a referendum. If, on the other hand, it refuses to reach common cause with its Nordic neighbours, it will look weak and feeble in standing up to its bigger EU partners - which would make it extremely difficult to win a referendum. The government's dilemma has convinced eurosceptic groups that they have a real prospect of victory whatever the Danish government decides.

## Blair's 'preposterous fraud'

Tony Blair has refused a referendum on the ground that the draft constitution does not amount to a major change in the constitutional relationship between Britain and Europe. That argument is absurd, dishonest, untruthful, crooked, a lie -

whatever one wants to call it. It is the most preposterously fraudulent argument I have ever heard on a major constitutional issue - and the public knows it. Anyone who bothers to read the constitution knows it at once. The referendum will also

come before an increasingly contemptuous House of Lords. It will come before the European elections in June next year. That could be a shattering reverse for the Government.

William Rees-Mogg, *The Times*, 3rd November.

## Huge sums spent on Swedish campaign

An estimated 500 million Swedish krona (55 million euros) was spent on this summer's unsuccessful Yes to the EMU campaign by Svenskt Näringsliv (the Swedish Confederation of Enterprise), according to the Swedish TV channel, ST Aktuelltt. This was five

times the amount distributed by the Swedish state among the yes and no sides.

According to the *euobserver* (25th October) some members of the Confederation are shocked by the size of the sum which the organisation has

so far tried to keep secret.

The Swedish government is currently trying to resist the increasingly confident demands for a referendum on the proposed European constitution. If it gives way, it may well find that the Confederation is unwilling - or unable - to spend on the same lavish scale.

## Driving on to unity

The EU Commission announced on 22nd October that it is to introduce a "harmonised" plastic EU-wide driving licence. A spokesman for the 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 were often used as a form of ID.

# LETTERS

Tel: 01548 821402 Fax: 01548 821574 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## With Friends Like These...

Dear Sir,

As one who has so far resisted the fashionable Francophile trend, I should relish the articles you print from time to time which belittle the ultimate place, role and fate of God's own country in *le projet*. The fact that I don't is because I believe that the French will have the last laugh - whatever happens to or in the EU.

Almost half the cars sold here are French (that many are assembled in the UK is irrelevant). The French control swathes of our water and electricity sectors and much, much more. They conned us into building the Channel Tunnel, then into buying a complete TGV line for the new Cheriton - London link. They habitually infiltrate our passenger train franchises, paying fat dividends to French shareholders until we decide enough is enough and boot them out.

Airbus - civil and military - and other huge space and defence joint projects will see foreign taxpayers (again, mostly British) keeping armies of French workers in clover in near perpetuity. Normal economics don't apply in France. French 'champions' might tremble but they don't fail, as we might finally twig when we can buy only from EADS and Alcatel, and when Air France is a virtual Hobson's choice for flying anywhere.

Those who mock this analysis should (re)visit De Villepin's Dimpleby lecture - insulting in tone and delivery, but a forthright exposé of how the EU WILL ultimately be run as the French

decide - with walk-on parts for their bit-actor 'friends' in London and Berlin. Who is to stop them? Certainly not us Brits: we're too busy expressing our love for them and fretting that we can't push water uphill to be like them.

Mind you, it's not just we who have been so consummately - how you say: *baisé'd*? The nation which thirty years ago fought tooth and nail to deny us Japanese cars today controls Nissan (now profitable, following the sacking of half the workforce) - its Trojan horse for the US markets.

The list is endless your space, sadly, is probably not.

TONY STONE  
Surrey

## Heath Immortalised

Dear Sir,

To the list of neologisms based on the names of those whose notoriety has earned them literary immortality (*eurofacts* 10th October) I would wish to add the following:

**Heathacious** (adj); describes those with the ability to be mendacious when there is a need to deny the truth.

JOSIE H O'WARE  
Sussex

## Who are the Knaves?

Dear Sir,

At the end of the splendid St. Crispin's Day meeting in Exeter, we had a full rendition of the National Anthem.

There was a surge of enjoyment when the second verse appeared on the screen: "Confound their politics, Frustrate their knavish tricks, On Thee our hopes we fix, God save the Queen." Even though the recorded accompaniment vanished after the first verse, the 500-strong audience sang the remaining two verses with gusto. Nevertheless, it is ominous to note that the "knavish tricks" of the original were those of foreign governments, notably the French, whereas today it is the "knavish tricks" of our own parliament that need to be frustrated.

DR. DONALD STEVENS  
Hampshire

## A lesson from Yugoslavia

Dear Sir,

John Papworth writes (*eurofacts*, 7th November.): "We are told that a federal Europe will advance the cause of peace, but does the record of all existing giant federations support this?"

He does not mention the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Though hardly a "giant", surely this is a sufficient example that such entities do not guarantee peace.

GEORGE SASSOON  
Wiltshire

## An offer to *their* readers

**T**imes are hard at Eurostat, the statistical arm of the EU which is currently being investigated by Olaf, the EU fraud squad - largely, it seems, as a result of the 3-5m that have disappeared from its funds. So hard, in fact, that it has just announced that it is unable to produce the remaining 2003 issues of its publication, *Eurostatistics*.

This is not expected to resume publication until 2004.

We have a suggestion for anyone who feels that the suspension of the magazine's publication has left a gap in their lives. There is another publication which seeks to describe the political realities of the EU and which has so far enjoyed eight years of uninterrupted

publication. Not being funded by the taxpayer it is not as lavish as *Eurostatistics*, but it has a discriminating - and growing - readership and it is possible to enter the journal's offices without tripping over a Belgian detective (for details of our extremely modest subscription rates see back cover).

# MEETINGS

**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 include**  
**Christopher Booker**, *Journalist and  
Author*  
**Tim Congdon**, *Economist*  
**Gerald Frost**, *Editor*, eurofacts  
**Daniel Hannan MEP**  
**Michal Kaminski**  
**Barry Legg**

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

---

**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**

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
01283-520502

Wednesday **17th December 2003**,  
3.30 - 6.00 pm

**Graham Booth MEP**  
**Christopher Gill**, *Freedom  
Association, Hon Chairman*  
**Roger Knapman**, *UKIP, Leader*  
**David Lott**, *UKIP, Chairman*  
**Dick Morris**, *American Political  
Strategist*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Hangar 1, The Aviator Hotel, Sywell,  
Northampton  
**Admission Free**  
(Free Tea and Coffee)

8.00 - 11.00 pm  
Evening Dance to Glenn Miller & swing  
music from the 40's & 50's  
**Admission £9.50**  
(Tickets 01283 520502)  
(Licensed Bar & Food Available)

---

## MEDIA COMPLAINTS

**The Advertising Standards Authority**  
2 Torrington Place, London WC1E  
7HW. Tel: 020-7580 5555  
Fax: 020-7631 3051  
complaints page: [www.asa.org.uk](http://www.asa.org.uk)

**BBC**  
[www.bbc.co.uk  
/info/bbc/complaints.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/info/bbc/complaints.shtml)

**Broadcasting Standards Commission**  
7 The Sanctuary, London SW1P 3JS  
Tel: 020-7233-0544 Fax: 020-7233  
0397 E-mail: [bsc@bsc.org.uk](mailto:bsc@bsc.org.uk)  
[www.bsc.org.uk](http://www.bsc.org.uk)

**Independent Television Commission**  
33 Foley Street, London W1P 7LB  
Tel: 020-7255 3000  
E-mail: [programme@itc.org.uk](mailto:programme@itc.org.uk) or  
[advertising@itc.org.uk](mailto:advertising@itc.org.uk)  
[www.itc.org.uk](http://www.itc.org.uk)

**Press Complaints Commission**  
1 Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JB  
Tel: 020-7353 1248  
Fax: 020-7353 8355  
How to complain page:  
[www.pcc.org.uk](http://www.pcc.org.uk)

**Radio Authority**  
Holbrook House, 14 Great Queen Street,  
London WC2B 5DG  
Tel: 020-7430 2724  
Fax: 020-7405 7064  
[www.radioauthority.org.uk](http://www.radioauthority.org.uk)

---

## SELECT COMMITTEES

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **2nd Dec. 2003**, 3.45 pm  
Evidence may be heard on *Science and  
International Agreements*, from officials  
from the Foreign and Commonwealth  
Office.

Wednesday **3rd Dec. 2003**, 11.15 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Draft Council  
Directive on the obligation of carriers to  
communicate passenger data*, from Ms  
Caroline Flint MP, Parliamentary Under-  
Secretary of State, Home Office.

Wednesday **3rd Dec. 2003**, 4.15 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *The  
Accountability of Regulators to Citizens  
and Parliament*, from Stephen Timms MP,  
Minister of State, Minister for e-  
Commerce & Competitiveness, DTI.

Tuesday **9th Dec. 2003**, 11.15 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Science and  
International Agreements*, from Professor  
Calestous Juma, Professor of the Practice  
of International Development, Harvard  
University.

Wednesday **10th Dec. 2003**, 11.15 am  
Evidence will be heard on *New  
Approaches to the Asylum Process*, from  
Keith Best, Director, the Immigration  
Advisory Service; and the Immigration  
Law Practitioners' Association.

Thursday **11th Dec. 2003**, 2.00 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *Science and  
International Agreements*, from Mr  
Andrew Swiger, Chairman and Production  
Director, ExxonMobil International Ltd,  
and Mr Nick Thomas, UK Public Affairs  
Manager, Esso UK Ltd.

Wednesday **17th Dec. 2003**, 3.45 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *The  
Accountability of Regulators to Citizens  
and Parliament*, from Ofcom.

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

---

## DIARY OF EVENTS

**2004**

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

European MEP Elections **June**

**Subsidiarity and the Illusion of Democratic Control**

by *John Bercow MP*. **£2.00**  
How the EU Constitution will speed up the EU's legislative imperialism.

**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.

**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 For Europe**

by *Martin Howe QC*. **£5.00**  
A clear and easy to understand assessment of the EU Draft Treaty by a Constitutional Lawyer.

**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.

**Send Payment to THE JUNE PRESS LTD**

**PO BOX 119 TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Tel: 01548-821402  
Fax: 01548-821574  
Email: [info@junepress.com](mailto:info@junepress.com)

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

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

**OverCrowded Britain**

by *Ashley Mote*. **£8.95**  
This book looks at the facts and consequences of large-scale immigration.

**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.

## 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"

<b>Britain in Europe</b>	<b>020-7233 0123</b>
European Movement	020-7881 8989
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020-7799 2818</b>

AGAINST "EU"

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403-741736</b>
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
<b>British Weights &amp; Measures Assoc.</b>	<b>020-8922 0089</b>
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071-663876
<b>Campaign for an Independent Britain</b>	<b>020-8340 0314</b>
Democracy Movement	020-7610 0865
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>01746-861267</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>
No Campaign	020-7378 0436

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

<b>Bruges Group</b>	<b>020-7287 4414</b>
Global Britain	
E-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk	

## POLITICAL PARTIES

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

ISSN 1361-4134

