

Red lines multiply - but Britain is losing the right to tax

If ministers were really serious about tax and other 'red line' issues there would have to be an entirely different constitutional text

The Government has suddenly discovered so many "red line issues" to defend in the on-going negotiations on the European Constitution that according to rumour there is to be a special budget item to cover the bulk purchase of felt-tip pens. These are being wielded furiously by ministers as they pore over a text that presented no problems back in December when its early ratification was said to be in Britain's interests in an enlarged EU.

Speaking on the Today programme on 18th June, however, Jack Straw, the Foreign Secretary, wielding several red pens in both hands, said that he was "not going to apologise" for the fact that he was now "batting for Britain". Who asked him to apologise?

Referendum Matters

According to Mr Straw, the red line issues about over which Britain is now said to be fighting were not pursued with the same vigour in December because the negotiations were in any case collapsing as a result of Polish and Spanish objections to the proposals on voting rights. To put it mildly, this is disingenuous. For it was not clear until the last minute that the talks - with which Britain had expressed broad satisfaction - would fail.

Why then he is 'batting' so unapologetically for Britain now? Well, it's the referendum, of course. A no vote would break the back of any government that sought to win public support for a constitutional treaty - and

failed. So in order to win the vote the impression must now be given that Labour ministers are fighting desperately over the red line issues - and winning.

The problem is of course, as Lord Howell pointed out in a debate in the House of Lords on 11th May, that if the Government is serious about its red lines - which seem to multiply rather in the manner of Falstaff's adversaries on Gadshill - there will have to be a completely different text.

In Lord Howell's words: *"That is what we really want to know: will they really do those things or is this just talk? Are they going to let us down again? The reason that we are entitled to be a little cynical about all those promises is that if even half those undertakings are to be achieved, that will require quite a different treaty from the one in draft"*

Tax Advantage

Consider briefly the issue of tax. The reddest of red lines has been drawn around tax: Gordon Brown would apparently sooner die than add or subtract a penny on tax to please Brussels. In the White Paper of September 2003, the government stated: "...the right of member states is a fundamental one". Article III-63 of the constitution, however, allows the European Council to act by QMV to avoid the 'distortion' of competition. This would allow the Commission to introduce legislation to reduce any tax advantage arising from the UK tax

system.

But even without the constitution Britain's freedom to tax as it wishes has been eroded. The European Court has already taken unto itself to judge the effect of company taxation and to rule accordingly. EU Commissioners maintain that Britain's zero-VAT on kiddies' clothing is illegal. The French, German and Swedish governments are threatening the Baltic states with all kinds of penalties for "tax-dumping". Britain can expect to be in line for punishment by virtue of its similarly relatively low taxes.

Common Measures

Meanwhile, according to AFP on 13th May Germany and France are reported to be about to unveil a plan to harmonise corporate tax by formal means. And in an interview with *Le Figaro* the French Finance Minister Nicolas Sarzkozy (widely seen as a successor to Chirac) has said that France Germany and the UK are ready to include "common measures" in their national budgets. According to M. Sarkozy these will include measures "to arrange together how our tax systems operate" as well as other measures of macro-economic harmonisation.

The picture is a complicated one, but the trend is clear: Britain is steadily losing the right to tax. Once the constitution is in place this process will proceed at a faster pace, but it is happening anyway. The sorry truth is that a parallel process can also be observed in every other policy area.

Has the EU really kept the peace in Europe?

In the first of an occasional series we expose one of the most influential myths about the EU

By Helen Szamuely

This myth has its variations. One that we shall hear more of in the next few months goes something like this: the EU has kept the peace in Europe for almost sixty years and if it did not exist, there would undoubtedly be war.

The facts point to an unresolvable paradox at the heart of the European project. Its aim is supposedly to preserve European values and ideals. From whom? Why, the Europeans, of course, since the main reason for the formation of the European Union, according to numerous preambles to treaties, is the bad behaviour of Europeans. Unfortunately, the values and ideals were also created by those badly behaved Europeans in conditions that the European Union is now desperate to abolish, that is small and medium-sized, competing political entities.

Hence the peculiar notion that 'Europe' will keep the peace against the Europeans. The truth is that by the time Monnet, Schuman and the others got going on the 'European project' the world had changed irrevocably. As early as the Schuman declaration of the need for European integration (actually written by Monnet) in 1950, it was too late. The problem for which Schuman was putting forward a solution no longer existed.

American Help

In fact, with the development of nuclear weapons and the growth of the two superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union, the question of possible Franco-German wars became a non-issue. The enemy of the West was further east, just as the enemy of the West now is in the south and the east. European integration became an unimportant side-issue. Not the EEC, not the EC, not even the EU could protect anyone from the Soviet Union

without a great deal of American help; they could not fight communism world-wide; and they cannot fight terrorism now. The EU can ensure that Denmark does not invade the Netherlands and that's about it.

The early founding fathers' aim was European integration because that is what they believed in. But the notion had to be sold and the idea of peace was a powerful one. There is another paradox here: the need to control aggression was propounded by historically the most aggressive state in Europe: France. The French, having been defeated in three successive wars by the Germans, were, therefore, the victims and could point to the Germans as the eternal aggressors who had to be controlled.

Political Reality

It needs to be remembered that it is not political structures that create political reality but the other way round. The reality was that the West, and within not too many years West Germany became part of the West, was not going to indulge in internecine warfare; the reality was that France and Germany neither could nor would fight each other again.

What is the truth about the origins of Europe's peace?

Fact number one: peace was kept only in a small part of Europe, which happened to be under NATO protection and the nuclear umbrella.

Fact number two: this part of Europe also had American troops stationed in it and was amply provided with American military hardware. Like it or not, and many in western Europe, particularly in France do not like it, a great deal of American foreign policy in the fifty years after World War II was taken up with the problem of protecting Western Europe.

Fact number three: the countries that contributed most to the protection

of Western Europe and keeping the peace in it were not always those involved in the European project. Apart from the UK, the main contributions came from Turkey and Norway.

Fact number four: the main crises of the post war period happened outside the whole European project even if they happened in Europe. Where were the peace-keeping qualities of 'Europe' when the Berlin blockade was defied, when Eastern Europe rose in revolt, when the Berlin wall went up? Discussing the Common Agricultural Policy, that's where.

Arms Ban

Fact number five: the actual creation of a European Union in the Treaty of Maastricht coincided with the break-up of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. While the EU's influence on events in the former USSR was strictly limited, in the former Yugoslavia it played a baneful part: by trying to construct a common foreign policy through encouraging Serbia under Milosevic to keep the 'country' together at whatever cost and by imposing an arms ban on all the other participants, the EU helped to prolong the war and increase the number of victims. It was NATO, led by the Americans that imposed some kind of a temporary solution.

Fact number six: The EU is now systematically undermining the one successful alliance that did keep the peace in Western Europe: NATO, without putting very much by way of protection in its place. And all for what? To give itself a purely notional and structural foreign and security policy.

How the voting system will work on 10th June

eurofacts tries to dispel some of the ignorance surrounding the elections to the European Parliament

There is probably more ignorance about the EU elections taking place in Britain on 10th June than about any previous election - the only possible exceptions being previous elections to the EP.

Ignorance appears to extend to all aspects of the election and to all sections of the population including those with greater than average knowledge of political and public affairs generally. Among a random selection of friends and acquaintances quizzed by *eurofacts* there was little knowledge either of the voting system or the candidates or their parties' affiliations within the EU Parliament. There was near total ignorance about manifestos. Those quizzed on the subject included a British MP, a member of the House of Lords, two political journalists, and the director of a political think-tank. Only one of these could give an accurate and comprehensive reply to the question: "Do you know who represents you in the European Parliament?"

Such pervasive ignorance prevents voters casting their votes on the basis of an MEP's record since the public appears to have no knowledge of candidates or their records.

Asked to explain details of the voting system even a spokesman for the Electoral Commission seemed uncertain: "I'm awfully sorry, but I am afraid I don't fully understand it myself. It is very complicated".

Well surely someone must understand it?

"Oh, yes," the spokesman said. "There is one person here who is an

absolute expert". *eurofacts* hopes that this remarkable repository of knowledge remains fit and well at least until June 10th.

As a guide to readers we provide the following explanation of how the voting system will work.

The 78 British MEPs who will be elected on June 10th will be chosen on the basis of the Regional List system of proportional representation using what is known as "*the pure d'Hondt formula*". This is a closed list system in the sense that it prevents voters from choosing from different party lists. Prior to its introduction some argued strongly for an open-list system which would, for example, have enabled a eurosceptic to vote for eurosceptic candidates from two or more political parties. Much of the opposition to allowing the voters such a choice came from the parties themselves, especially from party managers and whips.

Unlikely Event

In common with the other 24 European states, the UK is divided into regions. Each of these elects a set number of MEPs according to population. For the 2004 election London will elect nine MEPs, the South West seven seats and Scotland seven seats.

Each party publishes a list of candidates ranked in order to match the number of seats being contested. Once the votes are in, the first seat is allocated to the party or individual candidate with the highest number of votes. In the unlikely event of an

independent candidate obtaining the highest number of votes he is duly elected. In the much more likely event of the seat being allocated to a party the seat goes to the first-ranked member on the list. That party's total is then divided by two and the second seat is allocated to the next party or independent candidate with the highest number of votes. The process then continues until all seats have been allocated.

One vagary of the system is that small parties such as UKIP stand a much better chance in a populous region such as the South East, which will return 10 MEPs, or the North West, which will return 9, than in less heavily populated regions such as the North East which will return only three.

Nevertheless, the usual justification for the system is based on fairness: it ensures that the number of MEPs elected for each party roughly reflects its share of the votes.

So there it is gentle reader: whether you vote and how you vote is, of course, entirely up to you.

Note to London readers: You will also have four other votes: a first choice for Mayor of London, a second choice for Mayor of London, one vote for a London-wide member of the London Assembly, and one vote for a constituency member of the London Assembly. And just to make things simple and straightforward each institution is elected according to a different system!

'Reform' of the CAP

You may have heard the Government claiming that the Common Agricultural Policy has been "reformed". It is true that the method of divvying-up the subsidies within a member-state is being changed. But the overall amount of subsidy continues to

rise.

On 28th April 2004 the European Commission published its draft budget for 2005. It plans to spend 109.5 billion that year. Just under half - 46 per cent to be exact, or 50.1 billion - is to be spent on agricultural subsidies. Since the UK is a substantial and

perennial net contributor to the EU Budget, British taxpayers will continue to subsidise farmers in France, Italy, Spain, Ireland and elsewhere in the EU. So the much-trumpeted CAP "reform" won't be of much use to the British.

Russia goes cold on EU membership

From the inner sanctums of the Kremlin eurofacts brings an exclusive report of a most revealing conversation between a Russian europhile and a Russian eurosceptic

Until recently Russia appeared desperate to join the queue of nations waiting to join the EU. No more, it seems. It now worries that the consequence of joining would be loss of sovereignty and the problem of conforming to all those laws that emerge from Brussels. The veteran Russian affairs correspondent Victor Yasman of Radio Liberty described the change in public attitudes in a feature article on the RFE/RL webpage on 5th May. “*Naturally, Russians do not share the Euro-enthusiasms of the Central and Eastern Europeans, both those who have already become citizens of a united Europe and those that aspire to do so,*” he wrote. While the public had lost their enthusiasm for the EU the Russian political elite now believed that eventual Russian membership was neither possible nor desirable.

Candid Exchange

Yasman quotes an article by Fedor Lukayanov, the editor in chief of *Izvestiya* on 27th April: “The consensus is that the present political course of Vladimir Putin, which is supported by the majority of the population, excludes the possibility of integration with the EU, because Russia is not prepared to sacrifice part of its sovereignty or adopt European legislation...”.

From deep within the Kremlin, eurofacts has obtained a verbatim report of a candid exchange between a Russian europhile and a Russian eurosceptic, both senior apparatchiks in the Putin administration:

Boris: You know Sergei, I think it’s a big mistake to go cool on the European project. We surely all belong to the European House, as Mikhail Gorbachev liked to say.

Sergei: Why so, my friend.

Boris: Well, membership confers many advantages.

Sergei: Which particular advantages do you have in mind?

Boris: Well I think it’s a mistake for Vladimir to say we would *lose* sovereignty. Membership of the EU

means *pooling* sovereignty in the greater interests of all. I learned this from Chris Patten. Think of it like that.

Sergei: You have to be very gullible, very stupid or very dishonest to think of it like that. Either we Russians decide what to do about Chechnya, about relations with the US, what to do about the economy, whether or not to modernise our nukes - or someone else does. You cannot surrender sovereignty and retain it, anymore than you can have your vodka and drink it.

Boris: But we could put ourselves at the heart of Europe.

Sergei: Please Boris, buy an atlas. Our vital interests depend in part on inescapable geographical realities. If you manage to find the right page you will realise that these are very different from those countries which are at the heart of Europe in a strict geographical sense.

Boris: But Sergei we need to be modern, democratic, accountable, transparent!

Sergei: Boris, you are giving me a headache. I have been looking at the decision-making process of the EU Commission and the European Council. Compared to them the old Soviet Politbureau was a model of democratic accountability.

It’s just inevitable

Boris: Sergei, let us be frank; you and I are survivors from the old regime. We are realists. Look, the EU started off as six, then it was twelve, then 15. Now it is 25. Half a dozen more are in the queue. Everyone is joining. It’s inevitable we will go in; otherwise we’ll be isolated.

Sergei: Whenever I come across the notion of “historical inevitability” I don’t know whether to laugh or reach for my sick-bag. Right up until the day Mikhail Gorbachev was locked up in his dacha and the Soviet empire started to tumble down, we all subscribed to the inevitable victory of communism over capitalism. We could even prove it by reference to the immutable laws of history. Now, I know that you do not

care for geography, but please Boris try to remember a little history. Next you will be telling me that the best way to preserve peace and stability is by imposing a top-down federal system on a disaffected populace.

Boris: Well at least consider the implications of belonging to the single currency.

Sergei: I do Boris, I do. The euro has been bouncing up and down like a demented yo-yo. Now they have tossed away the rules because the French and Germans didn’t like them, the euro will bounce even more. Meanwhile the rouble has stabilised sufficiently for us to contemplate full convertibility. But even if the euro was the soundest currency in the world do you imagine that when setting interest rates a European central banker is going to take into account the interests of a tractor manufacturer in Kirkutsk?

Economic Morgue

Boris: The bottom line Sergei, is growth: we need growth and the EU will help us obtain it.

Sergei: Boris, I am beginning to fear that your mind has been rotted by cheap vodka. We *have* growth - lot’s of it. Last year it ran at 8 per cent - it will probably work out at the same rate this year. How much growth is there in the EU? The EU is an economic morgue from which none leave standing.

Boris: But think about jobs, Sergei!

Sergei: Jobs! Jobs! The EU destroys jobs more quickly than you can say the word. Production is being switched from the eurozone to the Punjab, to China, Indonesia, south America, even to Russia. There are even more unemployed Germans than there are Norwegians and American law students. Are you mad?

Boris: No, Sergei, I was referring to jobs that *we* might fill. We have friends in high places. We could expect senior positions in the Commission. We could even stand as MEPs. Think of the expenses, the generous pensions, the lavish dinners in the Grande Place, the

Continued on p. 5

British over-55s work almost twice as many hours as their Italian counterparts

Statistics published recently by the SOECD illustrate starkly the huge problems faced by the so-called Franco-German-Italian “core”, now stalled, in getting the Eurozone economies back on a growth track. As the table shows, only a third of French over-55s have paid jobs, compared with over half in the UK and around sixty per cent in Japan and the USA.

And those with jobs work fewer hours per year than in the UK. In fact, the total number of hours worked per year by both employed and jobless British over-55s is 95 per cent greater than in Italy, 72 per cent more than

in France and 64 per cent more than in Germany.

Of course, if you’re over 55 in Italy,

2002: People aged 55-64

	% of 55-64 year olds employed	Annual average hours worked
Japan	61.6	1809
USA	59.5	1815
UK	53.3	1707
EU average	40.6	n.a.
Spain	39.7	1807
Germany	38.4	1444
France	34.2	1545
Italy	28.9	1619

sitting in warm sunshine with a glass of wine in your hand, you might feel you’re better off than the poor Brit sitting in an office watching the rain pouring down. Especially in the comforting knowledge that in the EU, sooner or later, British taxpayers will be called upon to pay for Italian (and German, and French) pensions in the name of EU “solidarity”. The principle - that the UK pays for others - was conceded years ago. After all, if we have to subsidise other countries’ farmers - which we do - why assume that we will be able to avoid subsidising other countries pensioners?

European recovery ‘unlikely to impress’

When the European economic recovery finally arrives it could be even less impressive than anticipated, according to Jean-Philippe Cotis, Chief Economist of the OECD in its bi-annual Economic Outlook.

This reports that the recovery is still, to a large extent bypassing Continental Europe where domestic demand and household expenditure remain “surprisingly weak” and where core countries are still struggling to revive their economies. Meanwhile, the US economy which has been growing above potential and those of the other English-speaking countries (which hardly participated in the slow-down)

are reported to be “cruising ahead”.

Mr Cotis said that consumer confidence remains low in Continental Europe with the result that precautionary saving is at high levels and demand at low levels. *“This lack of confidence is driving a wedge between incomes and effective demand that may blunt the stimulus from the world economy. Thus the European recovery could be even less impressive than expected,”* he says.

Mr Cotis argues that because of lingering uncertainties about the strength of the recovery there is a strong case for lower interest rates. But in the manner of an exasperated

school teacher, he says that there is an urgent need for the large Continental countries to better understand why they are underperforming in comparison with other OECD countries and to act accordingly.

The OECD expects the world economy to grow by 3.4 per cent during the present year compared to an expected growth rate of 1.6 per cent for the Euro area and 4.7 per cent in the US. Next year world economic growth is likely to be 3.3 per cent compared to 2.4 per cent in the Euro area and 3.7 per cent in the US.

Continued from p.4

Russia goes cold on EU membership

sweeteners from lobbyists if only we are prepared to be reasonable and see things their way.

Sergei: You mean it would be just

like the old times: we could screw the people while lining our own pockets - and no one could hold us accountable!

Boris: Exactly! And we have got just

the right experience for the job.

Sergei: Pass the vodka. That’s the first intelligent thing you have said all day!

Making ourselves plain

In the front page story of our last issue, “Howard threatens candidates with de-selection”, a clumsily crafted sentence failed to convey our intended meaning. The sentence read, “The bitterness has been compounded because it has been made plain that no

such threat will be applied to europhile Tory MEPs who may be unwilling to support the manifesto commitment to oppose a referendum on the Constitution and who are being asked for no equivalent guarantee.”

What, of course, we meant is that no

such threats are being made to europhile candidates who refuse to follow the manifesto commitment to oppose the European constitution during the course of a referendum campaign.

LETTERS

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

How the EU Impoverishes the Third World

Dear Sir,

In this, the tenth year of Fair Trade, one aspect of the EU's activities that deserves greater publicity is the way it militates against the interests of the impoverished workers of the Third World. As well as having to compete with generously subsidised farmers in Europe, Third World producers have to surmount tariff barriers erected by the EU, and currently these average 16 per cent.

But even more scandalous are the so-called partnerships the EU has entered into with several African countries to allow EU fishermen to Hoover up fishing stocks from African waters, destroying livelihoods, and sometimes the lives, of indigenous fishermen who are forced further out to sea to fish in dangerous waters in order to survive. The money paid to African governments for these fishing rights does not find its way into the pockets of the poor.

Nigel Farage tells me that whenever he has raised this in the European Parliament, he meets with indifference from Commissioner Fischler (whose policy it is) and aggression from the Spanish, whose fleets are the largest beneficiaries of these spurious "partnerships".

As a member of UKIP, I am pleased that it is one of our MEPs who is constantly raising this subject, but it should not be a party matter. Regardless of our party affiliations, anyone who has an ounce of compassion for the poor of the Third World should be lobbying their MPs and MEPs to bring pressure to bear on the wealthy EU to end these morally indefensible practices.

GERRY HANSON
Buckinghamshire

Business Turns Against EU

Dear Sir,

An ICM survey of 1,000 Company

Chief Executives, just published, reveals that 73 per cent of business leaders believed that the European Union was clearly failing and Great Britain would be more successful if it kept the Pound and reclaimed powers ceded to Brussels. The same survey reported that just 18 per cent of those interviewed believed that the proposed EU constitution would be good for their businesses - 59 per cent said it would be bad and 23 per cent did not know.

The survey's findings will dismay those europhile politicians who have long argued that the majority of British businesses support the core economic policies at the heart of the European project - no wonder that Conservative and Labour grandees have expressed dismay that the Prime Minister has now announced (under pressure) that the British people will actually be able to vote "Yes" or "No" in a Referendum on the Constitution to be held in 2005. For it was never part of their plan that there should be any element of democracy in the progress towards a nation named Europe.

It has been evident, for a very long time, that the CBI, the Institute of Directors and the Federation of Small Businesses were adamantly opposed to swapping the pound for the euro. These organisations show little confidence in the ability of the European Central Bank to run the economies of the twelve countries that signed up to the euro. How much more difficult it will be for the ECB to cope with the enlargement that occurred on 1st May 2004.

DAVID OWEN
Devon

Blair's Secret Agenda

Dear Sir,

Many people are mystified as to the reasons behind Blair's "amazing U-turn" on the question of a referendum on the proposed European Union Constitution. It may be useful to remember that he did not use the 'R'

word in his statement to the House. On these matters I do not trust him and I suggest that a peep into his diary could well reveal the following agenda:

- 1) June 2004: Sign up to the EU Constitution.
- 2) Oct. 2004: Start debate in Commons on EU Constitution.
- 3) March 2005: Obtain Parliamentary approval for EU Constitution.
- 4) March 2005 Call General Election for May.
- 5) May 2005: Win General Election.
- 6) Announce referendum on EU constitution to be held at some future date - after a referendum on the euro.

Meanwhile we will be well and truly bound by all of the restrictions and conditions of the new European Union.

JOHN HORROCKS
Devon

Rallying Cries

Dear Sir,

I would suggest the following slogans for use during the forthcoming referendum on the Constitution:

Democracy yes, Bureaucracy No!

and

Democracy yes, Eurocracy No

JULIAN WILLIAMS
Wales

Seize the Moment!

Dear Sir,

Your article, "Howard threatens candidates with de-selection" (makes it very clear that all eurosceptics, like myself must seize the opportunity to vote for UKIP in the euro-elections on 10th June. That vote will have no direct effect on our UK parliament. But, if enough of us seize this rare chance of voting for what we believe in, then it might very well have a substantial indirect effect by showing that we are many and not - as the europhiles love to assert - a mere handful of extremist fanatics.

PROF ANTONY FLEW
Berkshire

MEETINGS

UK Independence Party
01922-631970

Monday **7th June 2004**, 11.00 am

Speakers include;
Graham Booth MEP
Nigel Farage MEP
Roger Knapman
Robin Page,
Jeffrey Titford MEP

PUBLIC RALLY
Emanuel Centre, Westminster, London
Admission £5
(Advance tickets from **UK Independence Party, Election Office, Down Lane, Bramshot GU30 7QZ**)

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

Wednesday **9th June 2004**, 7.00 pm

Professor Roland Vaubel

“Why the European conventional wisdom is a threat to freedom”

PUBLIC MEETING
The British Academy, 10 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1
Admission £10 on the door - or in advance (Refreshments included)

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

Tuesday **13th July 2004**, 7.00 pm

Sir Andrew Green KCMG, Chairman of Migration Watch UK

PUBLIC MEETING
The British Academy, 10 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1
Admission £10 on the door - or in advance (Refreshments included)

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

BBC
www.bbc.co.uk
[/info/bbc/complaints.shtml](http://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
www.bsc.org.uk

Independent Television Commission
33 Foley Street, London W1P 7LB
Tel: 020-7255 3000
E-mail: programme@itc.org.uk or
advertising@itc.org.uk
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

Radio Authority
Holbrook House, 14 Great Queen Street, London WC2B 5DG
Tel: 020-7430 2724
Fax: 020-7405 7064
www.radioauthority.org.uk

DIARY OF EVENTS

2004
European Parliament Elections (MEPs) **10-13th June**
Netherlands takes over EU presidency **1st July**
Lib-Democrats Party Conference Bournemouth **19-23rd September**
Labour Party Conference Brighton **26-30th September**
Conservative Party Conference Bournemouth **4-7th October**

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

Monday **4th October 2004**
12 noon - 1.30 pm

Rt. Hon Lord Lamont of Lerwick John O'Sullivan

CONSERVATIVE FRINGE MEETING
The Terrace Ballroom, The Marsham Court Hotel, Russell-Cotes Road, East Cliff, Bournemouth
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **8th June 2004**, 5.00 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The State of the Economy and Economic Policy, Long Term and Short Term* from Digby Jones - Director General, and Ian McCafferty - Chief Economist, CBI.

Wednesday **9th June 2004**, 11.00 am
Evidence may be heard on *Towards a Sustainable EU Policy on Climate Change*.

Thursday **10th June 2004**, 10.45 am
Evidence may be heard on *Foreign Affairs, Defence and Development Policy*.

Wednesday **16th June 2004**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *Towards a Sustainable EU Policy on Climate Change* from Jeroen Brinkhoff, Senior Policy Advisor, Director-General for Competition and Energy; and Paul van Slobbe, Senior Policy Advisor, project Manager CO2 allocation plan, Director-General for Enterprise, Netherlands Government.

Tuesday **22nd June 2004**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Outcome of the Brussels European Council of the 17th and 18th June* from Dr Denis MacShane MP, Minister for Europe, FCO.

Wednesday **23rd June 2004**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *Towards a Sustainable EU Policy on Climate Change* from Steve Howard, Chief Executive, The Climate Group.

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

What if we say No to the EU Constitution?

by Lord Blackwell. **£5.00**

Britain can and should settle an arrangement with the EU that preserves its political, economic and constitutional independence.

The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union

by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£20.00**

A comprehensive history of the European Union project.

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 Trojan Hearse

by J. Brian Heywood. **£9.99**

Although a work of fiction - or is it? raises a multitude of awkward questions and some uncomfortably 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.

Britain and the European Project

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

Reflections on sovereignty, history, politics, psychology and economics. How they point to the UK regaining her independence.

A Critical History of Economics

by John Mills. **£19.99**

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

The Fate of

Britain's National Interest

by Professor Kenneth Minogue. **£4.00**

The author argues that the national interest is being undermined by legal activists and international bureaucrats.

OverCrowded Britain

by Ashley Mote. **£8.95**

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

Health and the Nation

by Dr Lee Rotherham. **£2.00**

How the future of the NHS will be directed at a European level.

The Making of Europe's Constitution

by Gisela Stuart MP. **£6.95**

An insider's insight into the proposed EU Constitution and a call for greater democratic scrutiny.

VIDEO

Shockwaves

by Sanity

Video £5.00

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

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	020-7491 3072
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

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020-7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk	
New Frontiers	020-7494 3000

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020-7222 9000
Rt Hon Michael Howard 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	0121 333 7737
Mr Roger Knapman	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006