

## Referendum: How the Government rigged the question - without being noticed!

*The outcome of the referendum on the Constitution could depend on the readiness of eurosceptic politicians to admit they were wrong*

“We do accept the question”, Michael Howard, *Reuters* 26th February.

“It certainly seems a fair question”, Theresa May, *Today* programme 26th February.

“The question seems straight forward”, Michael Ancram, *The Independent* 27th February.

“I think that sounds a very neutral, balanced question to me. It enables the argument to be enjoined fairly and squarely on both sides”, Charles Kennedy, *The Independent*, 27th February.

“EU realists may justifiably breathe a sigh of relief that the question to be asked in the 2006 referendum will be a fair one”, Jeffrey Titford MEP, UKIP, Letter to *The Times* 27th February.

“The Leader of the U.K. Independence Party today said that the referendum question on the EU Constitution was apparently benign, but masked the consequences of a ‘No’ vote. Roger Knapman MEP said that while the question was neutrally worded, it simply raised another question - what does a ‘No’ vote mean?”, UKIP Press Statement, 27th February, 2005.

“It must be acknowledged the question is neutral”, *Daily Telegraph*, 27th February.

How can so many people who ought to have been on their guard have been so wrong? In articles in our two most recent issues we suggested that the question chosen by the Government hands a huge advantage to the “Yes”

campaign. We explained why we believed this to be the case and pointed out that when it was put to voters by the pollsters the result was a tiny majority against the Constitution while polls which employed a genuinely neutral question produced a majority against the Constitution of around two to one. However, at that time we were not aware of a poll carried out by ICM on behalf of the NO Campaign, whose findings (see below) demonstrate even more clearly how cleverly the question has been skewed to get the result the Government wants. The poll shows that if the Government’s preferred wording was put to the electorate the responses would be evenly split between those for and against, while a more neutrally worded question produces a massive majority against.

Q1. Should the United Kingdom approve the treaty establishing a constitution for the European Union?

Yes	39%
No	39%
Don’t know	22%

Q2. If there was a referendum tomorrow, would you vote for Britain to sign up to the EU Constitution or not?

Vote to join	26%
Vote not to join	54%
Don’t know	20%

Quite how the Government

succeeded in both rigging the question while convincing others that it had done no such thing is now a little clearer.

On 20th January the *Financial Times*, perhaps the paper closest to the Blair government, reported that the Government was likely to produce a question that was blatantly biased in favour of a yes vote. Elsewhere in the press, there was speculation that the question would contain a reference to the Constitution’s endorsement by Parliament - with the aim of influencing voters.

When on 25th January the Government published the European Union Bill containing the actual referendum question - “**Should the United Kingdom approve the Treaty establishing a Constitution for the European Union?**” - there was an audible sigh of relief. Perhaps this was because none of the cruder methods for rigging referendums had been used. True, the use of the “yea-saying” phenomenon is quite explicit, and this should have been immediately apparent but otherwise those who drafted the question have been subtle.

Many eurosceptics consequently concluded that the question was fair, or at the very least, that it was a lot better than might have been expected from a government well-versed in spin and media manipulation - and they expressed their satisfaction with it.

**Continued on P.2**

**INSIDE:** “We’ve got to harmonise from the top down” p.2 - **Referendum: Will the Scots win the day for the Yes Campaign?** p.3 - Anti-Western instincts ‘behind Constitution’ p.3 - **French Referendum!** p.4 - If it’s popular - pretend it comes from the EU! p.4 - **Franco-German solidarity** p.4 - Why Spain said ‘Yes’ p.5 - **How the EU takes over nation states** p.5 - Constitution is ‘birth certificate of USE’ p.5 - **Fools led by liars?** p.5

# Referendum: How the Government rigged the question - without being noticed!

Most apparently did not notice that the title of the Treaty - "**Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe**" - has been changed to "**Treaty Establishing a Constitution for the European Union**" or, indeed, that this formulation is a reflection of the Government's strategy. After all, a constitution which governs the European Union has very different connotations from one which controls the political life of Europe. Meanwhile Mr Straw was busy on the *Today* programme assuring listeners that the Constitution was indeed a way of halting the runaway tendencies of European Federalism and that was its great virtue.

On 26th February the *Daily Telegraph* which apparently did not notice the modification of the treaty title declared in an editorial: "*It must be acknowledged that the question is neutral.*" This may go some way to explain why the entire Tory Front bench has taken the same view. Extraordinary though it seems, no one on the Tory benches or the Conservative Research Department and no one in the leadership of UKIP seems to have examined the wording of the question with the intense scrutiny that it undoubtedly warrants.

Five days later - on 3rd March - the Electoral Commission gave the question its blessing - despite the fact that the wording breaches its own guidelines (see *eurofacts* for 25th February). When asked to justify its

conduct by *eurofacts* and by others it has either refused to reply or failed to keep its promise to do so at a later date.

How, precisely the Government came up with the wording of the question remains something of a mystery. It seems inconceivable that a government that has put spin and the manipulation of opinion at the heart of its programme did not road test the referendum question as one of a number of possible questions. We know that it was not devised by the Electoral Commission, and that the Government did not consult Opposition parties or the No Campaign - despite the obvious need to build confidence in the referendum arrangements. But we do not know what professional advice, focus group or polling techniques it employed. A series of questions put down by eurosceptic Labour MP Ian Davidson on these matters has produced a government denial that it used polling data in formulating the wording.

In our last issue we suggested that the government's referendum question is open to criticism on three grounds:

- It exploits the "yea-saying" phenomenon.
- It distorts the title of the treaty in order to create the impression that its purpose is to control EU institutions.
- In the absence of an objective summary or the mailing of the treaty text to voters it is

unintelligible.

Neil O'Brien, campaign director of the *No Campaign* has suggested a further criticism which should be taken seriously: that the Government's wording gives the impression that the Treaty is already in place.

Since the publication of the European Union Bill the Dutch government has published the question it will ask in a referendum. Despite the euophile convictions of Dutch ministers and the major Dutch political parties this is infinitely fairer than the question chosen by the British government. It reads: "**Are you for or against The Netherlands agreeing to the treaty to establish a constitution for Europe?**"

Many of the points made above were made in our two previous issues. We repeat them because it seems unlikely that the passage of the European Union Bill through Parliament will have been completed before a general election is called and that the Bill will therefore have to be reintroduced in the autumn.

It is devoutly to be hoped that by then those politicians who gave the question their blessing when they should most certainly have known better will emerge from their collective stupor and revisit the issue of the referendum question. Britain's political future may depend crucially on their readiness to admit they were wrong.

## "We've got to harmonise from the top down"

*So said the French Minister for "Europe" in Figaro on 11th February 2005.*

The background to this is the so-called "Bolkestein Directive", still a draft, which aims to free-up the services sector throughout the EU by prescribing that the legislation and regulation applicable would be that of the country of origin of the service-provider (for example, low-wage Estonia) rather than the country in which the service is provided (for

example, high-wage France). France has just woken up to the implications, which are already swelling the "no" vote in opinion polling on the referendum on the Constitution, especially on the left. Chirac very publicly told Brussels that the directive was totally unacceptable, and his Minister for Europe was wheeled on to say that

France wants the country-of-origin principle scrapped and replaced by harmonisation to increase every service-provider's costs to French levels. (Chancellor Schröder, with his German electorate in mind, has also adopted the French position.) Commission President Barroso has put the directive on ice until the Constitution's ratified.

# Referendum: Will the Scots win the day for the Yes Campaign?

*Anthony Scholefield analyses recent polling data and describes their implications for the referendum on the Constitution*

The February polls show an upward movement in the Conservative ratings. These were as follows:

Date and Poll	Tories	Labour
8th Feb YouGov	32	36
23rd Feb ICM/Guardian	34	37
25th Feb FT/MORI	37	39
<hr/>		
(2001 Result	32.7	42.0)

Michael Howard's first decisive statement of policies since he became Leader, featuring asylum and immigration and proposing constructive and realistic measures, has been a success. Indeed, Robert Worcester of MORI regards it as remarkable that 23% of the voters spontaneously named asylum and immigration as the single most important issue facing the country, almost double that of health care, which is traditionally the leading issue.

## Extraordinary situation

The MORI poll brings the Conservatives to their first electoral target, to be the biggest party in the popular vote in England. To obtain this they need a swing of 3.1%. In 2001 in England the Tories obtained 35.2% of the vote and Labour 41.4%. It appears that most of the Conservative recovery is in England where the immigration and asylum issues are most prominent.

The Tories also may be closing in on their next target, to be the biggest party in the popular vote in Great Britain (including Wales and Scotland). This

would require a 4.7% swing. However, because of what Peter Kellner describes as "savage pro-Labour bias" in the electoral system, the Conservatives are far away from a majority of the seats in England, let alone Great Britain. For example, he estimates that if both parties got 34% vote in GB, this would win 343 Labour MPs and 201 Conservative MPs. Precisely why this extraordinary situation has not been the subject of Conservative concern and action is not clear.

## English issue

A result where the Conservatives led the popular vote in England but obtained fewer seats than Labour is likely to concentrate criticism on the decaying political structure, as well as returning attention to parliamentary boundaries, proportional representation, the House of Lords and the question of an English Parliament.

The 'English issue' may also be a factor in the proposed referendum on the EU Constitution.

On 26th and 27th February, the leaders of the Conservative, Liberal Democrat and UKIP parties endorsed the government's proposed question on the European Constitution within 24 hours. In all three cases, this was apparently done without any analysis, consultation, professional advice or 'road testing' of the question.

Presented with this unanimity the Electoral Commission managed to also endorse the question within five working days. At this stage we do not know what analysis, professional advice, consultation or polling was done by the Commission or whether the Commission members regarded

themselves as fully qualified to make the endorsement on the basis of their personal competence alone. A request by the NO Campaign to make a submission on the subject was apparently turned down flat.

One matter that was not considered by the Electoral Commission or by the party leaders was the possibility of a different result in the four countries of the United Kingdom. Yet this is exactly what is now a possibility. Asking the exact government question the Vote NO campaign carried out a split sample poll on the 8th February and this showed an exact split 39% YES and 39% NO (see page 1). A closer examination of the figures revealed that in England there was a slight NO majority (38% YES, 40% NO) while in Scotland there was a substantial YES majority (49% YES, 22% NO).

## Wag the British dog

Is England going to be taken into the EU Constitution by the vote of Scotland? This could happen if the result is close. Feelings about such an outcome might run high if this followed a general election in which the Tories achieved a majority of the popular vote in England - but failed to win office because of a poor showing in Scotland. A situation in which the Scottish tail appeared to wag the British dog could have profound political and constitutional implications. Is it not time that the leaders of the opposition parties insisted that in the case of the referendum "the full-hearted consent" of the British people required a majority in each of the four countries of the United Kingdom?

## Anti-Western instincts 'behind Constitution'

*"From a liberal view, the EU Constitution remains a questionable document. It's bulky, difficult to understand, and includes requirements that are more likely to hurt a free, competitive, western-oriented Europe than to help it... It creates an un-economic zone, whose competitiveness will be reduced and whose anti-western instincts will be written into law... nothing could be worse in view of the economic problems which the states of Europe currently face". Die Welt, 23rd February 2005.*

# French referendum: two cheers for the Government!

*At least there's one government left in the EU with a shred of self-respect*

At the time of going to press the date of the French referendum on the Constitution hadn't been announced, but it's likely to be in late May or early June this year.

The Ministry of the Interior is in charge of organising the referendum. It plans to send through the post to every voter in France, all 42 million of them, a big envelope containing the full text of the Constitution (180 pages), the question (expected to be similar to the proposed British one), two voting forms, one for a "yes", one for a "no", the decree authorising the referendum, five pages of explanation of the text, and finally the written opinion of the (French) Constitutional Council on the conformity of the French Constitution (presently being revised so that it does so conform) with the EU Constitution. In total, French voters will each get 192 pages of material to help them make up their minds. The whole

operation is likely to cost more than 150 million.

Meanwhile, citizens are already being invited in ads in the press and on radio and TV to ring a help-line (0810-2005-25 if you're in France) to find out about the Constitution, and to visit a web-site: ([www.constitution-europeenne.fr](http://www.constitution-europeenne.fr)). Just for fun, your correspondent tried the web-site, and to his utter astonishment found a highly-detailed, seriously-informative package of propaganda-free material about the Constitution and the referendum. He clicked on "*Les Grands Arguments: Pour ou Contre?*" and again was astonished to find a scrupulously fair presentation of the main arguments for and against. The "yes" page has links to the web-sites of four campaigning bodies for a "yes"; the "no" section has links to the web-sites of five campaigning bodies for a "no".

Notwithstanding, it looks (no surprise

here) as if there will be far more state funding in France for the various mainly party-political "yes" campaigns than for the other side. Brussels will be weighing in with its "information" campaign, which won't exactly be pitching for a "no".

French politics, and politicians, are subject - deservedly - to much criticism, not least in *euromagazine*. Nevertheless, how refreshing to find at least one national government that, when it comes to "Europe", a) respects the intelligence of its electorate and b) itself retains a shred of self-respect.

Would that one could say the same of the current British government. It seems it won't be sending full copies of the Constitution to British voters: far too risky. Recent statements about the Constitution by the Foreign Secretary and the Minister for Europe indicate that the campaign will be dumbed-down to a bundle of sound-bites.

## If it's popular - pretend it comes from the EU!

Has the order gone out from Whitehall that civil servants must win support for the EU by associating it in the public mind with arrangements and programmes that are popular - even if these have little or nothing to do with the EU? Or has our political culture become so corrupt that civil servants automatically seek to do their masters' bidding without being told to?

These possibilities are suggested by a flier published jointly by the Post Office and the Department of Health which describes changes to the E111 form which must be completed if travellers to Europe are to be eligible

for free or reduced cost state health care.

The heading reads: "*Get medical care in the European Union with an E111 form.*" The sub-heading reads: "*The free E111 form entitles you to free or reduced cost-state healthcare if you fall ill or have an accident in a European Union country.*" So that's three mentions of the EU in three dozen words.

There is, however, no mention of the EU in the body of the text which announces that later this year the UK will be adopting the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC). And nor

indeed should there be - for the fact of the matter is that the new system, like the old, will also operate in some non-EU European countries such as Switzerland, Norway, Iceland and Lichtenstein.

No doubt the career prospects of the civil servant who wrote the copy for this particular announcement will not have been harmed by his dubious choice of words. Although a really smart operator would surely have suggested changing the name of the E111 form to the EU111.

## Franco-German solidarity in action?

French unemployment figures broke through the symbolically important 10 per cent level last month compared to a Eurozone rate of 8.9 per cent, according to French government statistics (*Financial Times* 26th February). The figures suggest that the Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin's promise to cut unemployment to 9 per cent by the end of the year cannot be met. Compounding the bad news were disappointing figures on French business confidence mirroring falls in the mood of German and Italian companies.

# Why Spain said 'Yes'

*It's hardly a surprise that Spaniards approved the Constitution - their interests and conditions differ hugely from the UK*

In preparing for the referendum campaign on the Constitution eurosceptics will have many concerns to attend to. But the result of the Spanish referendum - the first of an expected ten national plebiscites - should not be among them. Indeed, political and economic conditions in Britain and Spain diverge so greatly that there may be few lessons to learn from the Spanish campaign.

However, it is likely that by the time the UK Referendum campaign gets seriously under way Yes Campaigners are likely to stress that many - may be all - of our EU partners will have already voted yes. So from time to time we intend to remind readers how Britain's interests differ from the other 24. In the case of Spain the following differences may be observed:

- Spain is the biggest net beneficiary, Britain is the second biggest net

contributor.

- The Common Fisheries Policy has nearly destroyed Britain's fishing industry, but has provided huge opportunities for the Spanish fishing industry.
- The CAP is popular in Spain because of the huge inflow of funds which it produced but unpopular in Britain (even in the Labour Party) because it is blamed for high food prices and reinforcing Third World poverty.
- In Spain EU membership is associated with Spanish conversion to modern democracy following the Franco era; in Britain an increasing number recognise that the EU's 'democratic deficit' is not just a minor design defect but reflects the essential nature of the EU project.
- As a result of this vastly different historical perspective 'Europe' is closely associated in the Spain with progress and modernity; to an

increasing number of Brits the EU appears to be based on an outmoded and discredited economic model.

- Many Spaniards - and especially businessmen - believe that the EU, and particularly the single market, is responsible for Spanish economic prosperity; a growing number of British, including businessmen believe that the EU stifles enterprise and limits growth.

The extraordinary thing about the Spanish referendum is that despite the identifiable economic benefits Spanish membership of the EU has brought, and despite the best efforts of the Government to interest voters in the campaign only 42.3 per cent of those eligible to vote actually did so. It seems that even in the country which is most keen on 'Europe', EU issues fail to resonate with voters.

## How the EU takes over nation states

Readers will not quarrel with the following description of how the EU destroys national sovereignty. The remarkable thing is that it was written by a highly active and influential Europhile - Mark Leonard of the Centre for European Reform, whose candour, we suspect, will not have impressed his allies in Whitehall and

Westminster.

*Europe's power is easy to miss. Like an 'invisible hand', it operates through the shell of traditional political structures. The British House of Commons, British law courts, and British civil servants are still here, but THEY HAVE ALL BECOME AGENTS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION implementing European law. This is no*

*accident. By creating common standards that are implemented through national institutions, Europe can take over countries without necessarily becoming a target for hostility.*

Mark Leonard, Centre for European Reform.

<http://www.cer.org.uk/articles>

## Constitution is 'birth certificate of USE'

Hans Martin Bury, the German Minister for Europe, said in a debate in the Bundestag on 24th February that, "This Constitution is, in spite of all justified calls for further regulations, a milestone. Yes, it is more than that. I think, the EU Constitution is the birth certificate of the United States of Europe." (Source *Die Welt*, 24th February)

## Fools led by liars?

"So long as our government takes us for fools, we have every reason to take them for liars." William Rees-Mogg, commenting on the claims of Jack Straw, Foreign Secretary that the EU constitution signalled "thus far and no further on European integration". *The Times*, 28th February.

# LETTERS

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

## Extraordinary Tory Failure

Dear Sir,  
After its behaviour in the North East referendum, the Electoral Commission's approval of the Government's choice of question in the Referendum Bill was hardly unexpected, but the Conservative leadership's endorsement of the question is extraordinary.

As you say, the question implies the Treaty establishing the Constitution is something remote from the British citizen - like say the treaty which established the International Maritime Organisation - while the reality is totally different. As big a difference in fact as lies between the two questions, "Do you approve of the marriage of the Prince of Wales to Mrs Parker Bowles?" and "Would you like to marry the Prince of Wales/Mrs Parker Bowles?"

Any referendum question should reflect the reality of the change in the status quo. In this case the simplest question which does this is: "*Do you agree the proposed Constitution for the European Union should apply to the United Kingdom?*" This question, with its focus on the application of the Constitution to the United Kingdom, would also force the Electoral Commission to tackle the issue of informing the people about the main provisions of the Constitution, e.g. Clauses I-6 to I-16.

PROFESSOR STEPHEN BUSH  
Cheshire

## A Vital Question

Dear Sir,  
The decision of the Electoral Commission to pronounce the proposed question in the EU Constitution referendum as intelligible has been undermined by the results of the split sample poll undertaken by ICM for the NO campaign on 8th February.

Prior to this there had been an unnecessary rush by Tory and UKIP politicians to endorse the proposed question as fair.

Many would consider that for the Electoral Commission to have acted

lawfully it would have had to prepare a written analysis of the question, consult widely including with other EU countries, take professional advice from pollsters and road-test the question itself.

Yet the Commission announced the result of its consideration within five working days.

The Commission's statement refers to advice it had taken on the Welsh language version, admitting it needed professional advice in that area but no other reference to outside advice or consultation is made.

It appears therefore that the Electoral Commission's consideration of the question was merely cursory, having been taken without advice, consultation or analysis.

The ICM poll shows the form of the question is vital and that the proposed question is favourable to the YES side.

The speedy and apparently superficial process by which the Commission reached its decision needs the most thorough scrutiny.

ANTHONY SCHOLEFIELD  
London

## We're Just too Kind!

Dear Sir,  
Prompted by *eurofacts*, I have obtained the so-called "Guide to the European Union and Constitution" from the Minister of Europe (FCO, London SW1 2AH). Your headline "Dishonest, evasive, contemptible" was too kind: if any investment company were to publish such a catechism of fantasy and sophistry the Government's own Financial Services Authority would fine it millions for mis-selling and ban its directors from holding office ever again.

What further evidence is needed to condemn the EU and its Constitution, if our Government needs to sink so low in defending it?

But this cunning disinformation would look very plausible to the uninformed as the FCO intends. So any reader who notices the small blue 'Guide' displayed in his local library with an invitation to take one, and wishes to protect innocent idealists, should encourage so many fellow-

researchers to help themselves that no copies are left (without, of course, making the hard-worked library staff think they need to order more).

ANTHONY HOYLE  
Buckinghamshire

## Italy's Dark Heart

Dear Sir,  
Might I add a footnote to your review of "The Dark Heart of Italy" (11th February)?

Years ago I worked in big business in Italy. I was ordered to attend a meeting of competitors in Milan. At that meeting the selling price of certain products was agreed for the coming month. I protested that such was illegal and against the Treaty of Rome. "*You don't think that matters, do you?*" I was asked. Back at the office I duly priced the next order at the agreed figure. This time I was told: "*Put in a lower figure you fool, you don't think we keep to these agreements!*"

When I asked why they liked the then European Community so much, they said because it was even easier to ignore rules from Brussels than it was from Rome.

STUART SEXTON  
Surrey

## Historic Dilemma

Dear Sir,  
R.S Galliano is correct in stating that there is no effective alternative to repealing the 1972 European Communities Act (letter *eurofacts* 11th February).

It is my belief that the country has woken up but, at this election many are faced with an unpalatable choice.

The only way to stop the Labour-EU juggernaut is to vote Conservative; this time round it's a game of numbers. However, can sufficient numbers believe Howard's demands for change (while he insists we will not leave the EU) and if he is voted into power would he keep his promises?

Never has an electorate had to face such a crisis of confidence and dislike for our elected representatives.

JOSE H O'WARE  
Middlesex

# MEETINGS

## The Freedom Association

01746-861267

Saturday **19th March 2005**

10.30 am - 4.00 pm

“In Defence of Freedom”

SPRING CONFERENCE

**Theodore Dalrymple**, *Author and journalist*

**Marc Glendening**, *Director of the Democracy Movement and No 2 ID campaigner*

**Neil Herron**, *Metric Martyr and Hero of the Counter-Revolution*

**Gerald Howarth MP**, *Shadow Minister for International Affairs*

**Brian Mooney**, *New Alliance Campaigns Co-ordinator*

**Mike Natrass MEP**, *Deputy Leader of the UKIP and Birmingham businessman*

**Derek Turner**, *Editor; Right Now! magazine*

SPRING CONFERENCE

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

**Admission £50**

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

## United Kingdom Independence Party

01962-711112

Friday **1st April 2005**, 7.30 pm

“Don’t be FOOLED by the EU!”

**Dr David Abbot**, *UKIP PPC for Winchester*

**Nigel Farage MEP**

(Questions and Answers)

PUBLIC MEETING

(April Fools Day)

Guildhall, Broadway, Winchester

**Admission Free**

## Gresham College

020-7831 0575

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

“Devolution and the territorial Constitution”

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

Wednesday **25th May 2005** 6.00 pm

“The integration of Europe: Britain out, Britain in, Britain on the fence”

**Professor Kathleen Burk**, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London

**Admission Free**

## Democracy Movement Southeast Sussex Branch

01424-848964

Tuesday **5th April 2005**, 7.30 pm

**Roger Helmer MEP**, *Conservative*  
**Bryan Smalley**, *Former submarine Commander, independent speaker and analyst*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Manor Barn, Junction of Upper Sea Road with De la Warr Road, Old Town, Bexhill-on-Sea, East Sussex

**Admission Free**

## Democracy Movement and Campaign against Euro-Federalism

020-8340 0314

Saturday **9th April 2005**

10.00 am - 5.00 pm

“No! to the EU Constitution”

**Bill Cash MP, John Cryer MP, Bob Crow, Damian Hockney, Brian Denny, Ulla Klotzer, Majbrit Berlau, Neil Herron, Jens-Peter Bonde MEP, Thomas Rupp**

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London WC1

(nearest tube Holborn)

**Admission Free**

## UKIP Cities of London and Westminster Association

Thursday **14th April 2005**, 12.30 am

“EU Membership - A Cost Too Far?”

**Ian Milne**, *Director Global Britain and eurofacts, author, chairman of publishing company, former merchant banker*

PUBLIC MEETING

St Olave’s Church Hall, Mark Lane, London EC3

(close to Fenchurch Street Station)

**Admission Free**

## Campaign for an Independent Britain

020-8340 0314

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

“Vote No to the European Constitution”

**John Cryer MP**  
**Nigel Farage MEP**  
**Daniel Hannan MEP**

PUBLIC MEETING

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

**Admission Free**

## SELECT COMMITTEES

### House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Wednesday **16th March 2005**, 11.00 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Future Financing of the CAP* from (a) Professor Michel Petit, Institut Agronomique Mediterranéen de Montpellier; and (b) witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **16th March 2005**, 3.40 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *Energy Efficiency* from Mr Steve Nancarrow, Managing Director, Inspector Home; and Mr Nick Gooderson, Head of Standards and Qualifications, CITB Construction Skills.

Tuesday **22nd March 2005**, 3.45 am  
Evidence will be heard on *The Economics of Climate Change* from Professor Paul Ekins, the Policy Studies Institute.

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

**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'.

**EUSSR The Soviet Roots of European Integration**

by *Vladimir Bukovsky & Pavel Stroilov*. **£4.75**

Reveals secret discussions between Western and Soviet Union leaders.

**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 on the proposed European Constitution.

**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 ECB and the Euro: The First Five Years**

by *Otmar Issing*. **£10.00**

Provides an upbeat assessment of the euro by a member of the ECB.

**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.

**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.

**A Guide to the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe**

by *Stuart Sexton*. **£5.00**

A layman's guide explains the essentials of the Treaty in simple language.

**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

## euofacts

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 *euofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....  
to *euofacts: 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

**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-1@globalbritain.org](mailto:globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org)  
**New Frontiers 020-7808 7772**

## 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**  
Roger Knapman MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771 361 413006