

## New elite threatens EU project, admits Lib-Dem peer

*An emerging breed of highly privileged eurocrats operates outside domestic law and enjoys a remarkable range of perks and legal immunities*

In *Conningsby*, Disraeli's fictional hero Egremont declares: "...I was told that the Privileged and the People formed Two Nations, governed by different laws, influenced by different manners, with no thoughts or sympathies in common; with an innate inability of mutual comprehension."

William Wallace, formerly of Chatham House, now a Liberal Democratic peer is plainly no Disraeli, but he is to be commended for having pointed to the existence of a new social divide that has opened up - between the population at large and a new breed of unaccountable and highly privileged eurocrats.

According to Lord Wallace, the extension of privileges and legal immunities to senior EU officials and their families carries with it "the danger that the population would be divided into two classes - those of us who are subject to domestic law and pay our taxes and an increasing number who do not."

However, it appears that Lord Wallace is not so much concerned about the emergence of this new elite and the impressive list of privileges, perks, tax concessions and immunities that it enjoys, but about a possible public backlash and the consequent damage to the European project. His concerns have evidently become more acute as the result of a new Bill which will further increase the growing number of senior officials who receive diplomatic privileges and immunities.

Speaking in the House of Lords on

16th December during the second reading of the International Organisations Bill Lord Wallace - a passionate and long-time supporter of European political integration - urged the Government to think again about extending diplomatic privileges and immunities to EU officials.

"There is a real danger of a popular backlash against the emergence of this privileged elite," he said. "In this House we hear the noble Lord, Lord Pearson of Rannoch, going on endlessly about the privileged pensions received by former Commissioners. It is easy to imagine the press campaign which could build up as more and more EU bodies develop."

### Steadily Growing

Lord Wallace listed the European Medicines Agency in London, the ECB in Frankfurt, a new food standards agency, the European Monitoring Centres on Racism and Xenophobia and a number of new agencies operating under Europol, Eurojust and the new European Defence Agency as being among the steadily growing number of EU agencies whose officials have come to enjoy the full range of diplomatic privileges and immunities or will come to do so as a result of the Bill.

According to the Government such rights need to be given to EU officials as well as those of other international bodies in order that they can function effectively. But it seems that even

some ardent europhiles recognise that this is complete nonsense.

Lord Wallace told his fellow peers: "The European region does operate under the rule of law, and therefore, here as in other places, we should be moving towards the assumption that, as one moves across the European Union, partly as European citizens, we do not need extra privileges in order to be able to operate."

Lord Wallace owned up to the fact that as the husband of Helen Wallace, the director of the Robert Schuman Centre - part of the European University Institute - he was classified as a dependent spouse and his wife received a dependent spouse allowance on his behalf "for which I am deeply grateful."

"I have mixed views on her immunity from domestic taxation and on the lower rate of notional taxation which she is forced to pay on her salary," he added with obvious irony.

Lord Wallace declared himself a strong supporter of further European political development but admitted to ambivalent feelings regarding the powers, privileges and status of the Commission and its agencies. "I refer to the salaries of those involved, their access to duty-free sales and the extent to which the Commission and the various agencies are outside the remit of employment law and regulations which the Commission itself imposes on member states and candidate countries," he said. He urged the

Continued on P 2

**INSIDE:** London dominant, sterling resurgent in global foreign exchange p.2 - **Backing the wrong horse** p.2 - Brown's spending could lead to new pressure to join euro p.3 - **Still wasting our money** p.3 - The importance of words p.3 **City threatened by EU harmonisation** p.4 - German jobless p.4 - **Review of "The European Constitution in perspective"** p.5 - Countries we love and those we don't p.5 - **What De Gaulle wanted the EU to be** p.5

# London still dominant, sterling resurgent in global foreign exchange

In the global wholesale foreign exchange ("FX") markets, the world market has grown by 57 per cent since 2001. In April 2004, the UK (essentially London) was still the single largest trading centre, with a 31 per cent share of the world market (all currencies combined), broadly

unchanged since 2001. The USA was some way behind, with a 19 per cent share of the world market, followed by Japan, Singapore and Hong Kong.

By currency, the US Dollar is still by far the most traded currency worldwide (see table). Its global market share has increased slightly since 1998. The euro is the second most traded currency

worldwide, though its share has declined sharply since 1998. The Japanese Yen comes third. Sterling comes in fourth, but its share has been rising since 1998 and is now not far behind that of the Yen. The Aussie Dollar is the other significant currency which is gaining market share.

**Global FX Turnover by currency: per cent\***

	1998	2001	2004
US Dollar	87	90	89
Legacy currencies + Japanese Yen	52	38	37
<b>Sterling</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>
Swiss Franc	7	6	6
Australian Dollar	3	4	6
Canadian Dollar	4	5	4
Others	16	21	21
<b>Total*</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>200</b>

*\*Two currencies are involved in each transaction, so the sum totals 200%*

The figures derive from the tri-ennial survey of the global FX markets carried out under the supervision of the Bank for International Settlements.

Source: Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin, Winter 2004, Vol 44 No4: The FX & OTC Derivatives Markets in the UK, by Peter Williams [www.bankofengland.co.uk/qbcontents/index/html](http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/qbcontents/index/html)

## “Backing the wrong horse”

Ian Milne's new pamphlet for the Centre for Policy Studies, published on 15th December 2004, reviews developments in the world trading system, and concludes that the UK would be better off if it adopted the model - used by the rising Asian

superpowers and all of the developed world outside the EU - of interlocking networks of user-friendly free trade agreements. It recommends the UK adopting Swiss-style sectoral (industry-by-industry) free trade agreements for its trade with the EU,

and joining a multi-country free trade agreement alongside the USA for its trade with the rest of the world. This would mean the UK withdrawing from the EU as far as trade was concerned.

The pamphlet may be downloaded free at [www.cps.org.uk/](http://www.cps.org.uk/)

Continued from P 1

## EU elite opens up new social divide

Government to take “a more restrictive view” of the matter.

It is both sad and revealing that what most worries Lord Wallace is a press campaign on the issue and a consequent further hardening of public hostility to the EU, rather than the potentially explosive gulf that has opened up between European elites and the people. This is a gulf which is more visible in this country than in all other EU countries because after half a

century of sleep-walking the British are at last waking up to the reality of political integration.

In raising the matter, Lord Wallace has illuminated a small part of a wider stage. On this the most significant political event is the transfer of power from democratic nation states to an interlocking network of undemocratic and unaccountable trans-national organisations over which an increasingly remote and arrogant

political class presides. Of these the EU is perhaps the most striking example. On that depressing note we wish our readers a happy new year - but we also take the opportunity to express the hope that they will display renewed vigour in a battle that has the potential to begin to reverse this process. We refer, of course, to the forthcoming fight over a European constitution.

# Brown's 'feckless spending' could lead to new pressure to join euro

Pressure to join the euro could grow again if the recent housing boom results in an economic hard landing, or if Gordon Brown's "feckless" spending policies pull the rug from under sterling, David B. Smith, the chief economist at Williams de Broë, has warned.

One reason that the debate on British membership had dampened down had been the perception that the Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee had done an excellent job, he says in an Occasional Paper from the Institute of Economic Affairs.\* But the situation could change if the British economy deteriorated. "Britain might end up participating in EMU because it had once again lost faith in its ability to manage its own affairs," he writes.

"Whether Britain does eventually sign up for EMU presumably depends on political events and people's

perceptions of the relative competence of the MPC and the ECB. Britain tends to huddle closer to the European project when its self-confidence is low, but looks to the wide blue seas beyond when it is feeling bullish.

Mr Smith says that the real case against UK participation is not that EMU, has been, or will be, a disaster. Rather, it is that political realities are such that this would lead to two further steps that would do irreparable, and possibly massive, damage to Britain's national interest.

"The first such step is that participation in EMU could lead to the acceptance of tax harmonisation and the full panoply of EU labour market interventions, something that would be highly damaging to the real economy, even after the present government has thrown away so much of its golden inheritance. It is hard to see why any

well-intentioned person would want to take a country such as Britain, with an employment rate of 74.7 per cent and an unemployment rate of 4.75, on standardised international definitions, and force upon it the tax and regulatory burdens that have left the euro zone with equivalent employment and jobless rates of 66.1 per cent and 9.0 per cent respectively.

"The second and even more dangerous step that would follow from British participation in EMU would be the adoption of the European Constitution. This would destroy both Britain's entire common-law tradition, which underpins our liberties, and the legal basis for Britain's existence as a sovereign independent state."

*The ECB and the Euro: The First Five Years* by Otmar Issing; commentary by David B. Smith, IEA Occasional Paper No 134.

## Still wasting our money

It's often forgotten, what with the Constitution, Turkish accession, the Chancellor's alleged "euroscepticism" and so on, that HM Government's official policy is to join the euro. They're certainly still spending taxpayers' money on preparing to join. HM Treasury has just published a luxurious 76-page book in two colours called *Report on euro preparations: December 2004\**, full of tables, diagrams, flow charts, graphs and schedules. In his foreword, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Stephen Timms MP, talks about the "third outline National Changeover Plan" and a "Managed Transition Plan" which will be "made available for informal consultation shortly". What's

more, a "Consumer Protection Framework" is being developed "to ensure the public would be fairly treated", and an "Integrated Communication Plan" is also being developed to ensure that there would be "clear communications" during any changeover. Exciting stuff. One can only assume that Gordon really does want to take us in.

The resolutely upbeat tone of the booklet is rather spoiled though by an obscure paragraph on page 29:

"...the euro is quite widely used in the UK's external trade, **though not as widely as sterling or US dollars**. The most recent figures published by HM Customs & Excise for the currency in which UK trade is invoiced show that,

in 2002, around 27 per cent of UK imports were invoiced in euro (compared with 33 per cent in sterling and 37 per cent in US dollars); and around 21 per cent of UK exports were invoiced in euro (compared with 51 per cent in sterling and 26 per cent in US dollars). **The shares of imports and exports invoiced in these currencies have remained broadly stable since the launch of the euro.**" [bolding by eurofacts]

Doesn't that suggest that the euro's not very significant for the UK economy, and that if we should join any single currency at all it should be the dollar?

\*www.hm-treasury.gov.uk

## The importance of words

It has been widely assumed that the Electoral Commission would play a major role in determining the question to be put in the forthcoming referendum on the European Constitution. This, however, cannot be taken for granted. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer was interviewed on

the Today programme on 9th December he was asked: "I suppose that exactly how the question is to be asked will be decided by the Electoral Commission." Mr Brown replied: "It will be decided by Parliament," and promptly changed the subject.

As we have pointed out on previous occasions the precise wording of the

question is crucial since different formulations are likely to yield different responses (a future article will deal with this issue in much greater depth). Mr Brown's response raises profound concerns that the question will be worded in such a way as to maximise the yes vote.

# City prosperity threatened by the ‘most complex and intrusive regulations ever devised’

*EU harmonisation will destroy London’s distinctiveness and drive business out of Europe altogether*

A devastating account of how the EU Single Market impacts on UK financial services has been published by the New Frontiers Foundation. Written by David Lascelles, former banking editor of the FT and director of the Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation, a City think tank, the study focuses on the effects of the Financial Services Action Plan (FSAP) which is the centrepiece of the EU’s attempt to create a “single market” in financial services.\* The key findings include:

- Far from losing out by Britain keeping the pound, the City has strengthened its dominance in the EU and increased its market share viz Frankfurt - contra the predictions of the pro-euro campaign and politicians such as Patten and Clarke.
- Instead of opening up trade among members “by knocking down barriers and streamlining regulations ... in practice it [the FSAP] often has the opposite effect”.
- The declared intention behind the FSAP was to create a “passport” for EU institutions so they could operate more easily in other jurisdictions. Theoretically, greater access to other members’ markets would help the City, given its dominance in so many areas. Instead, the FSAP “actually imposes a worse regulatory regime on many members of the EU than they had before, the UK in particular”.
- The FSAP is so far removed from the original promise of minimal regulation that it might have sprung from a completely different source. For all practical purposes, the principles of mutual recognition,

harmonisation and subsidiarity have been pushed into the background.

- Instead of helping members recognise each others’ rules, the EU has effectively moved into the heart of the rule-making business.
- The FSAP must be one of the most complex and intrusive pieces of regulation ever devised: its micro approach reaches deep into virtually all walks of financial life, from how much capital banks must have to the way that pensions and unit trusts are managed and stock exchanges list shares.
- The sheer cost of the FSAP is already offsetting the efficiency gains it was supposed to create.
- It will narrow the scope for regulatory competition.
- Other EU measures threaten the City’s competitiveness such as developments in tax, accounting, and health and safety. Particularly threatening are those which affect labour markets: the Working Time Directive, the Social Chapter, and the Charter of Fundamental Rights which is enshrined in the proposed EU Constitution.”
- “Devious motives” are behind French and German attempts to prevent other countries offering more lightly regulated regimes.
- The new danger for the City is that EU ‘harmonisation’, with its heavy emphasis on common rules, will not just erode the City’s distinctiveness within Europe but drive a lot of its business out of the EU altogether... The big gainer ... would undoubtedly be New York [not the EU].”
- The Corporation of London 2003 report found that the single biggest

reason why London was (just) behind New York was EU regulation - i.e. the EU is seen as a net negative rather than a positive.

- The largest banking presence in London is American - not European - and a large degree of market integration has occurred between the UK and US markets without any arrangement such as the FSAP. The City’s global regulatory structure is shaped by the WTO’s General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) which operates far better than the EU’s FSAP because it does not harmonise and is based on a network of voluntary agreements. International finance “does not need supra-national harmonisation; it works best with voluntary agreement” - exactly the sort of “messy” approach the EU always rejects in favour of a supra-national harmonising approach.
- An arrangement whereby the EU accounts for only about a third of the City’s business but sets about 70 per cent of relevant rules on 100 per cent of City institutions is inevitably going to damage the City and UK in the medium-term and demands a different relationship with the EU and Single Market.
- The UK should “explore the implications of opting out of the FSAP altogether and repatriating control of financial regulation.”

*\*The City and the EU: There has to be a better way can be downloaded from the NFF website [www.newfrontiers.org](http://www.newfrontiers.org).*

## German jobless could top five million

Unemployment rose sharply in Germany last month, according to statistics published on 4th January, bolstering fears that the country could

have a record 5 million unemployed this year. The number of jobseekers rose by a seasonally adjusted 17,000 to 4.48million in December - the biggest

such rise in three months - putting the jobless rate at 10.8 per cent of the active population.

# The European Constitution in perspective

*The Cowgill partnership achieves 'gold standard' in objectivity*

The father and son team at the British Management Data Foundation (BMDF), with this new publication, has once again produced an immensely valuable and authoritative encyclopedia of the development of the many EC/EU treaties. It comprises the full text of the Treaty signed in Rome on 29th October 2004, together with a comprehensive subject index, chapters explaining how the Constitution would come into effect if ratified, a section on British business concerns, summaries of its contents, a history of all EC/EU treaties since 1957, notes on the text, and a particularly lucid chapter titled "Principal Issues and Key Points". Particularly useful are tables of equivalence, one tracing the numbers of the articles from the numbering of the old treaties through Maastricht and Amsterdam to the Constitution, the other the changes in the numbering of articles in successive drafts of the Constitution itself.

There are also chapters on EU Legislative Procedures and on which areas would change from unanimity to

---

## The European Constitution in Perspective Analysis & Review of 'The Treat Establishing a Constitution for Europe'

*By Anthony & Andrew Cowgill*

British Management Data  
Foundation, 2004 Paperback 384 pp  
Available from *The June Press*  
Price £27.50 + p&p  
(see back cover)

ISBN 0-9520366-7-3

---

qualified majority voting, plus the texts of the Laeken Declaration of December 2001, (which set the Convention ball rolling), the report of Giscard d'Estaing, the president of the Convention, to the European Council of July 2003, and the contemporaneous pithy and astute "Alternative Report" of the minority of members of the Convention who were critical of its

conclusions.

The text of the Constitution was still being revised right up to the 29th October, when heads of state and government signed it in Rome. Nevertheless, BMDF brought out this huge, complex and beautifully printed and bound book in just three weeks. As with its previous publications in this series, the book will become the reference book, the absolute 'gold standard', for ministers, parliamentarians, civil servants, businessmen and all those who need to have at their hand an irreproachable source of EU law and regulation.

The book is impeccably neutral on the question of whether the Constitution would be a good or a bad thing. It sets out fact after fact, with explanations where necessary. Tellingly, it is produced by private citizens in the private sector. How extraordinary, and what a commentary on the low standards we have come to expect from British governments, that ministers prefer BMDF publications to those of the Foreign Office and other "official" bodies funded by the taxpayer.

## Countries we love - and those we don't

Somehow the attempt to create a European sense of togetherness doesn't seem to be working out. When asked by pollsters from YouGov which country they would most like to live in, 49 per cent of Britons plumped for their own country, followed by Australia (37 per cent), Canada (28 per cent), New Zealand (27 per cent), and

the United States (22 per cent).

Well, perhaps the British regard their continental partners as being the most beautiful countries in the world. Not so. The British regard New Zealand as the most beautiful country (48 per cent) followed by Canada (35 per cent), Britain (27 per cent), Australia (19 per cent).

Well, maybe the Brits find our EU

neighbours as being the most friendly people they encounter. Alas, quite the reverse. We think of the Australians, the Irish, our fellow Brits, the Americans and the Canadians as being the most friendly - in that order. And we think of the French and the Germans as being the least friendly. (Source: *Daily Telegraph* 3rd January 2005).

## What De Gaulle wanted the EU to be

General de Gaulle's son, retired Admiral Philippe de Gaulle published a two-volume memoir of his father in 2003 and 2004 which has unexpectedly turned out to be a best-seller in France. Talking of the historic Franco-German rapprochement of 1962, the Admiral says: "*De Gaulle wanted above all that each of the components of Europe should keep*

*their identities. That there should be no fusion between the fatherlands of Chateaubriand, Dante and Goethe, but a 'harmonious concert'. He was against a supranational system which would have subordinated Europe to the United States, as Jean Monnet, the 'factotum of Washington', would have wanted. Neither did de Gaulle want an integrated Europe on the model*

*favoured by Robert Schuman and Alcide de Gasperi. What he wanted was an 'independent Europe' made up of states politically united but separate, cooperating between themselves and organised as a confederation."*

Philippe de Gaulle, *Entretiens avec Michel Tauriac, De Gaulle Mon Père*, Vol II, Plon, 2004.

# LETTERS

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

## The Point of UKIP

Dear Sir,

Anthony Hoyle misinterprets the purpose of UKIP (letter December 3rd). He says that UKIP could not win a seat at a general election and *'to hope for any better at this stage would be absurdly hubristic'*. I agree. But is winning general elections really the point of UKIP?

The point of UKIP (to me at any rate, and I assume almost everybody) is to reveal mass disaffection, or, if you like, fury. It is to provide a focus for those who wish to buck the all-party consensus on big government. It is unwilling, but with resolve, to occupy the democratic deficit disgracefully opened up by Conservative negligence. It is justifiably to object to being disenfranchised. And for what reason? Why, obviously to acquire enough votes finally to give the Conservative Party the backbone it so lamentably lacks to change its policy. Who knows how long this doleful process must continue? But let it continue. It is a noble enough aim.

(I have to say that personally I wish UKIP ran on the lines of Jimmy Goldsmith's Referendum Party, simply offering a referendum followed by dissolution rather than adopting ridiculous high-faluting party characteristics and 'policies'. I will also find it quite impossible to vote UKIP if it is led by Mr Kilroy-Silk whose political philosophy, if any, is quite different to mine).

UKIP must be visible and dangerous to Conservatives. This is why: the preferred position of the Conservative Party is one milli-micron to the right of Labour, so that the proverbial visitor from outer space would have trouble telling them apart. They are Socialist Party B. They have historically preferred a lazy ambivalence to firm policy (the Thatcher period was merely a historical aberration) and made a virtue of recoiling from idealism. (To

them, F. A. Hayek might never have existed.) They can be shifted from this comfortable, non-aspirational position only by rebellion by enough of their electorate. That is the function of UKIP in respect of the EU.

Is that function, awkwardness and dissent, the injection of political risk to the concept of voting for 'least harm' justified? I know that it is.

Almost a nation, the EU is beginning to exert geo-political power in its own right. A simply vast landmass is to be ruled by an unelected and unaccountable bureaucratic elite where the final arbiter is a court dedicated to advancing the *acquis communautaire*. It rests on a new doctrine of political infallibility. It is deeply statist and socialist. Its prime movers are scheming, opportunist and anti-American. It is disgustingly corrupt and profligate. Those who vote for UKIP differ from the majority of the electorate in finding these characteristics dangerous. It is the danger that is the crucial point of departure for us from mainstream politics.

Conservative policy under Michael Howard remains the same. It is to denounce as 'extreme' the assertions that European socialism or the EU is utterly incompatible with British Conservatism and that the country could perfectly well be run from Westminster without handicap or loss. But many of us hold a quite different view: that, quite contrary to the EU's aims, competition for freedom between small democracies where the population is free to walk has a better historical success rate, especially in Europe, than statism and that devotion to the free market, light government and agreeable treaties with friends is an altogether safer way for fallible humans to organise themselves. Holding this view, we have no alternative to continuing to vote for the largest party, however small, offering

exit.

Mr Howard has weakly chosen to hold a referendum on the EU constitution rather than leading his party in rejecting it outright. (Are we surprised? We are not.) So be it. He can nevertheless still destroy UKIP right now by ceasing to deny the people a voice on the supreme and overriding question of the time by promising to append a second question to the first:

1. Should the UK adopt the EU Constitution as negotiated by the government?

2. If not, should the UK remain within the EU?

S. H. MURRAY WELLS  
Gloucestershire

## Who does UKIP hate most?

Dear Sir,

Does the UKIP dislike the Conservative Party more than it dislikes the EU? If not, why does it intend to contest seats, which are currently held by eurorealist Conservative MPs? A blatant example of this illogical policy is the recent announcement that Bill Cash is to be challenged by a UKIP candidate in the 2005 General Election. No MP has fought harder for the eurosceptic cause than he. If UKIP, Labour and the Lib Dems unseat him, a rabid europhile will replace him. Is that what UKIP voters want?

LORD DERAMORE  
Yorkshire

*[The debate between Conservatives and members of UKIP over which party provides the best vehicle to achieve eurosceptic objectives has raged on - sometimes magnificently - for several issues. In the next few editions of eurofacts priority will be given to those of our readers who wish to discuss other EU-related issues - Ed.]*

## Happy New Year to all our readers

# MEETINGS

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
Newcastle-under-Lyme Branch  
01270-820987

Tuesday **18th January 2005** 7.30 pm

“Regional Government”

**George West**, *Expert on Regional Government*

PUBLIC MEETING

Bignall End Cricket Club, Boon Hill,  
Bignall End, Stoke on Trent

**Admission Free**

(Advance tickets available)

---

**Gresham College**  
020-7831 0575

Tuesday **25th January 2005**, 6.00 pm

“The Human Rights Act: cornerstone of a new Constitution”

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

Tuesday **5th April 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Devolution and the territorial Constitution”

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

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

**Admission Free**

---

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
North Cornwall Branch  
01288-361130

Thursday **27th January 2005** 7.30 pm

**Trevor Coleman**, *Member of UKIP NEC, producer of many videos*

**Alan Eastwood OBE**, *Former Chairman of the Police Federation of England and Wales*

**Ian Milne**, *Director of Global Britain, co-Editor of eurofacts, author of “A Cost To Far”*

PUBLIC MEETING

Wadebridge College, Wadebridge,  
Cornwall

**Admission Free**

**Bruges Group and  
Democracy Movement**  
01300-341788

Thursday **3rd March 2005** 7.30 pm

“The European Constitution - Why Britain should say NO”

**Marc Glendening**, *Democracy Movement, Campaign Director*

**Rt. Hon Oliver Letwin MP**, *Conservative, Shadow Chancellor*

**Cllr. Steve Radford**, *Liberal Party, President*

PUBLIC MEETING

Town Hall, Corn Exchange, High East Street, Dorchester DT1

**Admission Free**

---

**The Freedom Association**  
01746-861267

Saturday **19th March 2005**

10.30 am - 4.00 pm

Spring Conference

**Speakers to be announced**

SPRING CONFERENCE

The Burlington Hotel, Birmingham  
(Adjacent to New Street Railway Station)

**Admission £40 before 31st January - £50 thereafter**

(Includes morning coffee, two-course lunch and afternoon tea)

---

**Campaign for an Independent  
Britain**  
020-8340 0314

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

“Defeating the EU Constitution”

**Speakers to be announced**

The Emmanuel Centre, 9-13 Marsham Street, London SW1P 3DW

**Admission Free**

## SELECT COMMITTEES

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **18th January 2005**, 4.15 pm  
Evidence will be heard on the December European Council, from Dr Denis MacShane MP, Minister for Europe, FCO.

Wednesday **19th January 2005**, 11.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Future Financing of the CAP* from:

(a) representatives of the National Farmers Union; and (b) representatives of the Country Land and Business Association.

Wednesday **19th January 2005**, 3.45 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *Energy Efficiency* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **19th January 2005**, 3.45 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *Proposed European Union Action Programme for Life-Long Learning* from:

(a) DfES; and the British Council; and (b) David Coyne, Directorate A - Education, European Commission.

Wednesday **19th January 2005**, 4.15 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *European Contract Law: The Way Forward* from Professor Geraint Howells, and Which.

Wednesday **26th January 2005**, 11.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Future Financing of the CAP* from witness to be confirmed.

Wednesday **26th January 2005**, 3.45 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *Proposed European Union Action Programme for Life-Long Learning* from:

(a) Universities UK with Baroness Warwick of Undercliffe; and (b) Dr Anne Corbett (and possibly others), University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES).

Wednesday **26th January 2005**, 4.15 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *The Hague Programme* from Caroline Flint MP, PUSS, Home Office.

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

---

## DIARY OF EVENTS

**2005**

UK takes over

EU presidency

**1st July**

**Germany's Four Reichs**  
by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Idiosyncratic history of Germany by Englishman, El Alamein, Burma, Bletchley (codebreaker), who knew Adenauer well.

**The European Constitution In Perspective**

by *British Management Data Foundation*. **£27.50**  
Analysis and Review of 'The Treaty Establishing A Constitution for Europe'.

**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.

**Saving England**

The Case for Independence: Why England Should Declare UDI  
by *Vernon Coleman*. **£8.99**  
Coleman, inimitably and deadly accurately spells it out in 85 short chapters.

**Voting on the Constitution: What Britain should know about the consequences**

by *Daniel Hannan*. **£7.00**  
The implications of a British 'No' vote.

**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.

**The Missing Heart of Europe**

Does Britain hold the key to the future of the Continent?  
by *Thomas Kremer*. **£11.99**  
Can nation states flourish in an integrated Greater Europe? A European businessman's view of the likely impact of divergent national cultures.

**The Essential Guide to the European Union**

by *Ruth Lea*. **£12.50**  
A detailed yet accessible picture, right up to date, of how the European Union works now and in the future.

**EUROPE**

**A Concise Encyclopedia of the European Union**

by *Rodney Leach*. **£14.99**  
The fourth update of this highly informative and necessary directory.

**A Cost Too Far?**

by *Ian Milne*. **£8.50**  
A fully worked out cost/benefit analysis of Britain's EU membership.

**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.

**Galileo - The Military and Political Dimensions**

by *Dr Richard North*. **£4.00**  
A European satellite positioning technology that has hidden implications for the whole world.

**The Need for Nations**

by *Roger Scruton*. **£8.50**  
Why the nation states of Europe need to regain their sovereignty, to keep peace, prosperity and defend human rights.

**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"

<b>European Commission</b>	<b>020-7973 1992</b>
European Movement	020-7940 5252
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020-7735 4000</b>

AGAINST "EU"

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403-741736</b>
British 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	020-7491 3072
<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

**Congress for Democracy 01372-453678**

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

<b>Bruges Group</b>	<b>020-7287 4414</b>
Global Britain	
Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk	
<b>New Frontiers</b>	<b>020-7808 7772</b>

## 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>0121 333 7737</b>
Roger Knapman MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771 361 413006