

## European Union soon an economic sideshow

*Irreversible trends mean Britain's future will increasingly depend on developments taking place in the global economy*

The rise of China, India and other Asian countries is rightly the subject of much media coverage. China will account for a quarter of global output within the next 50 years. India could account for a similar proportion.

What is often forgotten is that the USA, which currently accounts for roughly a quarter of world output (GDP), will most probably continue to keep, or even increase, its share of global output. Meanwhile, according to the European Commission itself, the EU's share of global output will halve over the next 50 years, from its current roughly 20 per cent to about 10 per cent. The EU's output will decline not just in relative terms but probably also in absolute terms - primarily because of its "demographic winter", already begun, combined with the anti-growth economic policies hard-wired into its system of governance.

### Worldwide Trade

The inevitable consequence of all this is that the proportion of British trade done with the other EU countries will decline. It follows that the proportion of British jobs involved in trade with the EU (currently around 10 per cent) will shrink. The same will happen to Germany and France and the other main economies in the EU. They too will see a declining proportion of their worldwide trade, and their countries' trade-related jobs, involved with other EU countries. The other side of the

coin is that the proportion of German and French trade done with the rest of the world - principally China, India and the rest of Asia, but also the USA - will grow.

A glimpse of what we can expect came last week when the European Commission slashed 2005 economic growth forecasts for the eurozone to 1.6 per cent - down from the 2 per cent predicted six months ago. The Commission also revised downwards its prediction for the EU from 2.4 per cent to 2 per cent. By contrast the growth forecasts for the US in 2005 suggest an increase of 3.6 per cent.

### Diminishing Charms

Over time, as it always has, British foreign policy will have to adapt to the pattern of British trade worldwide. For the UK, this will mean that the importance of the rest of the EU will diminish. Sinophiles will be the flavour of the half-century; Europhiles will increasingly resemble historical throw-backs whose diminishing charms hold less and less appeal. In these circumstances the well-being of the British people will come to depend, even more than it does today, on its involvement with the wider world.

For the Germans, the French and the other EU countries, the same thing will happen. For them, the rest of the EU will be of fading importance. This will mean that the emotional and commercial and institutional forces which, up to now, their elites have

cited as having bound the Continental countries together in the EU "project", will weaken. Instead, centrifugal forces will gain the upper hand.

Since the economic future of all European peoples - their jobs, their livelihoods, their standard of living - will increasingly depend on events in Asia and America, the European continent will become a side-show. In the face of these long-term irreversible geo-economic forces, the fonctionnaires of the EU, be they ever so brilliant, will be powerless. The longer they remain in denial the greater the damage to the interests of those they seek to lead. The fate of the EU - especially a politically-unified EU - will be to fade into obscurity.

### Virtue Postponed

So what should Britain do? *eurofacts* readers know the answer. So, in their hearts, do a majority of the British electorate. One major political party, deep down, knows what it has to do - even if, like Saint Augustine, its prayer is "not yet". The other main political party, the one currently in "power", is imprisoned in its europhile stance, the effect of which is to anaesthetise what passes for its thinking on "Europe". The night may be darkest just before the dawn; but the dawn is definitely approaching.

# MEPs act to stifle media freedom

*Members of the European Parliament have sought to screen expenses rip-offs from journalists*

When last year the German government torpedoed plans to scrap the scandalous system for paying MEPs' expenses many suggested that once it had found its feet the new European Parliament would move swiftly to insist on reform - if only to halt the constant stream of media criticism. Instead, MEPs have moved swiftly to conceal aspects of the system from media scrutiny.

Leaked papers from the EP's 'questors' - members of the parliament's management board - show that the board is considering measures to prevent journalists filming and taping particular areas of the EU parliament. These could include the area where MEPs sign on for their daily 'attendance allowance' of around £185 - commonly known as the "sign on and sod off" fee, since payment is not dependent upon participation or even attendance at a parliamentary session. The move follows complaints by MEPs after Austrian MEP Hans-Peter Martin, a tireless campaigner against the present system of pay and expenses for MEPs, secretly filmed his colleagues signing on to receive the allowance.

According to a BBC news report proposals contained in the leaked documents refer to 'the need to respect MEPs' privacy' and suggest that if journalists break the rules they could be banned from the European

Parliament for between six months and two years (Source: *Today* programme 17th March).

When Nicola Stanbridge, a BBC reporter started to record film of MEPs arriving at the Parliament building in Brussels at 6pm on a Monday evening in order to claim their expenses for the day following their return from their home countries, security men were called.

*"I was asked for my press pass and told that security had been called so that deputies would not be bothered", she said. "I asked if I could enter the corridor. I was told absolutely not. Then I was asked to stop recording."*

Dr Martin has estimated that MEPs can make up to 15,000 (£10,435) net out of the expenses system which includes a travel allowance, a general allowance, a staff allowance as well as the daily attendance allowance. He commented:

*"The European Parliament is here to stand up and be accountable to the voters seen through the eyes of journalists, and if the eyes of journalists have been blinded, the public will not even hear what's going on in this building any more. "That reminds me of other so-called parliamentary bodies, but up until now they are located in Beijing and in Moscow, not in Brussels."*

Joseph Liberato, director of media and spokesman for the European

Parliament predictably saw matters rather differently: "Bodies of the European Parliament...are discussing some revision of the rules governing photographers and television crews and sound recording. This is to clarify things: everybody needs to know where it is allowed, and where it is not, and there seems to be some confusion about it."

A reform package which would link payments more directly to expenditure and provide equal pay for all MEPs is likely to come before the full Parliament next month, but having got through the committee stage by a single vote, its fate remains uncertain.

However, the most disturbing aspect of the situation is that what is true of the Commission is largely true of the EP: whenever 'irregularities' or excesses are revealed the instinct is to conceal these beneath a veil of secrecy while seeking to stifle or silence those who speak out about them. In the present case it would seem that measures to restrict the freedom of the media have been taken even before they have received parliamentary approval.

As a prompt to virtue, *eurofacts* promises to publish the names of British MEPs who vote against the reform package and to highlight all attempts to suppress media freedom.

## Confidence dives in eurozone

Gloom about Europe's economic outlook has intensified markedly after a plunge in economic confidence across the continent and further rises in French and German unemployment.

Economic sentiment in the 12-country eurozone and the UK fell to the lowest levels since December 2003, according to the European Commission. Economists fear that eurozone economic growth will slow

in the months ahead, despite a bounce back at the beginning of 2005 after a weak second half of 2004.

In forecasts in line with those to be published by the Commission Euroframe expected eurozone growth of just 1.5 per cent this year, after 1.8 per cent in 2004. However, 2006 would see 2 per cent growth.

The latest data, which reflect the impact of higher oil prices and a

stronger euro, may force the European Central Bank to revise its view that last year's soft patch was "transitory".

German unemployment rose in March by a seasonally-adjusted 92,000 to almost 5m, or 12 per cent of the workforce - although the Federal Labour Agency said 20,000 jobless were due to statistical changes while unusually cold weather was responsible for another 50,000.

# *eurofacts*, the general election and the consequences of a French 'Non'

**W**e at *eurofacts* will not presume to advise its readers how to vote on 5th May. As in the past we shall not endorse particular parties or candidates although we shall examine very carefully what the parties say about Britain's future relations with the EU and we shall, of course, be scrutinising and commenting upon the party manifestos with particular care.

As we go to press, the European issue enjoys low salience among voters. This is partly because voters will have an opportunity to express their view on the European Constitution in a referendum on the European Constitution during 2006, but it also has to do with the fact that none of the three main parties wish to say very much on the issue, while, for whatever reasons, the momentum achieved by UKIP last summer has not been maintained. Predictably, Labour and the Liberal Democrats, the two parties most enthusiastic about the European Union, are those which wish to say the least.

There is no reason why journalists and members of the public should allow them to get away with this. If the French say 'Non' on 29th May there is a widespread belief that there will not be a referendum in Britain. Since a French rejection of the constitutional treaty is certainly a possibility voters

have a right to know how the parties would react to that situation.

The position of the Lib-Dems is clear enough; the party has given an enthusiastic backing for the treaty and would no doubt favour continued integration by other means. The Tory party has made it clear that its priority is to renegotiate the terms of British membership in specified areas (though it is less clear what it would do if its demand for renegotiation meets with predictable resistance).

What is not at all clear is whether in the event of a French refusal to ratify the treaty the Labour government, in common with other EU governments, will continue to press for the goals set out in the treaty text, or whether it will demand a return to the drawing board. Electors surely have the right to know this before 5th May.

The Danish and Dutch governments have already announced that they will go ahead with their planned referendums whatever happens and have strongly implied that they will go on pushing to seek the treaty objectives even if, as the result of a French 'No', the treaty fails.

Speaking in Copenhagen on 31st March the Dutch minister for foreign affairs Bernard Bott said, "If France votes 'No', then other countries must continue the fight for a 'yes'. The more countries supporting the Constitution,

the better chances we have to find a solution."

His Danish counterpart Per Stig Møller said: "There is no plan B". While Mr Bott added for good measure: "Nor a plan C or D".

The Dutch referendum is scheduled for 1st June, just three days after the French vote, while the Danes are set to vote on 27th September.

Most British media commentators have assumed that there will be no referendum in the UK if one or more EU states reject the treaty, but the UK Government's formal position has not in fact changed. Announcing his famous 'U-turn' on the referendum in the House of Commons on April 20th 2004 the Prime Minister said that the British vote would take place "in any event".

Having originally described the constitution as a mere "tidying-up exercise" Mr Blair has said more recently that the referendum provides "a once in a generation opportunity" to determine Britain's place in Europe.

Why should British voters be denied an opportunity extended to the Spaniards, the French, the Danes and the Dutch among others? For once, *eurofacts* finds itself in agreement with Mr Blair: the vote should go ahead "in any event".

## **EU Constitution: what the French are saying**

**V**oting in the French referendum on the Constitution takes place on 29th May. Here are some comments by leading French politicians:

*"The Constitution embodies the French vision of Europe. Voting 'yes' is voting for a more political, more powerful and popular Europe. I am convinced that Europe will protect France."* French Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin quoted in *Le Monde* 31st March.

*"The treaty is everything except a liberal treaty. For the first time, a European treaty takes account of*

*social issues. The real progress of the text is in the affirmation of the social model."*Jean-Louis Borloo, French Minister for Employment interviewed by *Le Figaro*, 31st March.

*"Social Europe comes through a 'yes',"* Socialist campaign slogan.

*"In terms of economic government and management of the Stability Pact, the treaty offers no response to the situation of indecisiveness, weak consensus and the complexity which characterises the way Europe works. I am intellectually and economically very anglophile"*, Philippe Marini,

reporter-general of the French Senate's finance committee explaining why he intends to vote 'no'. *Le Monde*, 31st March.

*"...the treaty gives arms to those who want to reduce savage liberalism."* Former French Socialist Minister Jack Lang (*AFP*, 31st March).

*"At last we have obtained this 'Europe à la Française' that we have for so long awaited. This constitutional treaty...is an enlarged France."* Dominique Perben, French Justice Minister speaking in Lyon (quoted in *The Sunday Telegraph* 3rd April).

# Well, why don't the europhiles let the issue be put, the battle joined?

By Daniel Hannan

"Let the issue be put. Let the battle be joined". With these resounding words to the House of Commons, Tony Blair launched the Yes campaign in April 2004. A year on, we're still waiting.

It is not that supporters of the EU constitution have stayed quiet, exactly. It's just that, when they do break radio silence, it is to enjoin each other to come out and make the case, rather than actually to make it. Barely a week passes without some self-important Labour politician lamenting in the pages of *The Independent* that "the argument is going by default", that "Tony Blair must take a lead", that "the momentum is with the Europhobes" and so forth.

It was, then, with some appetite that I picked up *The New Case for Europe* by Roger Liddle, a respected former adviser to the Prime Minister now on Peter Mandelson's staff. At last, I thought, someone is going to come out and make a case from first principles as to why the United Kingdom will be better off with the constitution than without it. At last we shall have a solid opponent to grapple with, rather than one who pops up, shouts "You're all a bunch of Europhobes!" and then scarpers.

## Bold Argument

"Social democrats", says Mr Liddle in his introduction, "should make a bold progressive argument for Europe - something which Labour has never been prepared to do". Great, I thought, turning the page eagerly. Let's hear it then. Let's hear why Britain will be richer if Brussels sets our tax rates, or freer if European judges protect our liberties, or safer if we are defended by EU troops. Let's finally hear this argument that you've been promising us since Tony Blair took office eight years ago.

Eighty two pages later, I'm afraid I am no wiser. Mr Liddle deals adroitly with the weaknesses of the traditional

---

### **The New Case for Europe: The Crisis in British pro- Europeanism and How to Overcome it** By Roger Liddle

Fabian Society,  
2005 Paperback 81 pp  
Available from *The June Press*  
Price £6.95 + p&p  
(see back cover)

ISBN 0-7163061-5-8

---

pro-EU case. He explains why it is no longer enough to rely on the idea that the Continent is doing better than the UK. That argument may have been all very well in the 1970s, when we were beset by strikes and inflation, and when Rhineland capitalism, like Monty Python, seemed cutting edge. But it no longer has any traction in a world where Britain is outperforming most of its Continental competitors, and where the EU is associated with high taxes, over-regulation and what Roy Jenkins used to call "Euwo-swerwosis".

Any remaining sense that Europe was vital to Britain's prosperity was blown away on 16th September 1992, when sterling left the ERM - an event Mr Liddle describes as a "seismic calamity for the pro-European cause" (although he then hilariously tries to argue that the ensuing period of growth was really thanks to our membership of the ERM rather than our having left it).

The necessary sense of national pessimism being lacking, he concludes, the Euro-zealots need to try a new argument. (We are by now half way through the book, and still no closer to hearing it.) Mr Liddle then goes on to castigate those who have tried to sell the constitution by emphasising what it doesn't do. His implied target here is Gordon Brown,

but the criticism could equally apply to Tony Blair, whose statement to Parliament following the summit was taken up mainly with his swanking about having seen off attempts to harmonise taxation and foreign policy (highly questionable claims, by the way, but that is another story). No, says Mr Liddle, what we need are concrete, positive reasons to love the constitution. But still we don't hear what these may be.

It is hard to quell the suspicion that the reason the author is flannelling is that he really can't think of anything positive to say. To the extent that Mr Liddle sketches out his "progressive" case for the EU, it consists of three assertions. First, that we need a more integrated EU because, these days, countries are inter-dependent. Second, that the constitution locks in a number of social democratic policies, particularly in the fields of immigration, the environment, human rights and employment law. Third, that the alternative is too horrible to contemplate: a No vote would "push us down a slippery slope to 'associate membership'".

## Logical Flaw

On his first point, Mr Liddle misses a glaring logical flaw. The alternative to supra-nationalism is not some kind of atomised, Hobbesian world, in which no government talks to any other. It is intergovernmentalism: wholehearted collaboration among states. The fact that fish do not recognise international boundaries does not mean that you need the CFP: you can have bilateral deals, as the rest of the world does and, indeed, as the EU's Baltic and Mediterranean members did while the CFP was obliterating North Sea stocks. The fact that crime can be cross-border does not mean that you need a European Public Prosecutor or an EU police force. Sovereign democracies have been extremely adept at evolving

**Continued on P.5**

# UK taxpayer pays to educate children of the EU elite

In our issue of 14th January we listed the remarkable array of perks, privileges and legal immunities enjoyed by senior EU officials, and we quoted the Liberal Democratic peer William Wallace, a noted europhile, warning that there would bound to be a public backlash against the emergence of this new elite which could colour attitudes towards the European project. It seems, however, that our list was incomplete. What was missing were the free places available to the children of EU bureaucrats at a network of elite schools.

Britain spends proportionately more than any other nation on funding the 13 schools whose overall budget this year amounts to £160 million. In 2004-5 the British government spent just under £9 million on direct subsidies to the

schools and a further £5 million via its contribution to the EU budget.

A government briefing note leaked to the *Daily Telegraph* on 1st April points out that Britain is required to make “a disproportionately large contribution” to the cost of the schools, but points out that several countries - notably Greece, Italy, Spain and France - do well out of it and would be “difficult to persuade”.

According to Chris Heaton-Harris the Conservative MEP who has campaigned against the perks and privileges of EU officials, the European schools spend £8,000 a head, almost twice the sum spent by British state schools.

Most of the schools are sited near major EU institutions in Brussels, Luxemburg and Frankfurt but they also

include the European School at Culham, near Oxford which was created to serve the children of scientists working at the Joint European Taurus, a nuclear fusion centre.

According to the *Daily Telegraph* the EU has thrown its weight behind reforming the present funding arrangements but has defended the existence of the schools arguing that the availability of high quality multi-lingual free schooling “has made it easier for [EU] institutions to recruit experienced, highly qualified staff”.

In other words the schools enable the EU elite (which enjoys special low tax rates) to perpetuate itself at the expense of the taxpayer, especially the British taxpayer.

Continued from P.4

## Well, why don't they allow the issue to be put?

common mechanisms to fight crime: extradition treaties, Interpol, the Hague Convention, recognition of time spent in someone else's prison and so on. What makes the EU - and the constitution, specifically - different from all this, is that it can oblige countries to pursue policies which are patently not in their interests.

Which brings us neatly to the second contention: that the EU is good for the Left. Here, Mr Liddle is on stronger ground. There is no doubting that the constitution enshrines the values prevalent in Europe at the time of its framing. Just as the US constitution was drawn up at a time when the ideals of personal liberty and limited government dominated Western thought, so too is the EU constitution a child of its time. Where the former is concerned with the rights of the individual, the latter is concerned with the power of the state. Where the Declaration of Independence promises life, liberty and the pursuit of

happiness, the Charter of Fundamental Rights guarantees affordable housing, free healthcare and non-discrimination. Doubtless, had it been drawn up thirty years ago, it would also have provided for a pan-European incomes policy. That is the trouble with constitutions: they take the ideas that happen to be modish, and lay them down for all time, proof against future elections. Thus, for example, we recently learned that an incoming Tory government would not be allowed to implement its declared policy of setting an upper limit to the number of immigrants into Britain because this would contravene EU law. Mr Liddle is correct that the constitution would be a prophylactic against Right-wing government. That is another way of saying that it is anti-democratic.

But what is the alternative? Is Mr Liddle right that opponents of the constitution really want to trigger a wider renegotiation with Brussels, aimed at staying in a free trade area but

repatriating many other powers? Yup. I'd say he's got our number. Commerce, military alliance and close collaboration with our neighbours, but domestic self-government. It's what other countries in the world take for granted. Mr Liddle pours scorn on Norway, which, he says, gets a very bad deal out of Brussels. But Norway, according to the OECD, has the richest people in Europe. Of course Norwegians must meet EU standards when selling to the single market - just as they must meet Japanese standards when selling to Japan. But Norway is outside the CAP and CFP, controls its own energy reserves, runs its own immigration policy, settles its own human rights issues, is free to sign trade deals with third countries - oh yes, and is also a sovereign democracy.

*Daniel Hannan is MEP for the South East Region*

# LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## UK Voting Weight

Dear Sir,

In the latest *eurofacts* Data Sheet (No. 4) you state that the UK Voting Weight in the European Commission is 4.0 per cent. Not so. It is precisely zero. Commissioners are explicitly forbidden to seek or take instructions from any government or other body (Draft Constitution, Art. 25.4). Mr Mandelson, therefore, in no way represents our Government - much less the people of the UK. As a European Commissioner, he has effectively transferred his allegiance from the UK to the European Union.

In fairness to the other side, a europhile might reasonably argue that the UK Voting Weight in The European "Parliament" should be based on all UK MEPs, not just the Labour ones. Should you not have said that the Voting Weight of the UK party in Government is 2.6 per cent?

Notwithstanding the above cavils, the *eurofacts* Data Sheets are much

appreciated. Keep up the good work.  
MALCOLM McCAUSLAND  
Cheshire

## Stop the Squabbling!

Dear Sir,

The greatest gift that so many eurosceptics give to the EU is their readiness to squabble with one another and their willingness to stand in a general election against other eurosceptics.

GEORGE WEST  
Leicestershire

## Campaign Tool

Dear Sir,

During the forthcoming debate on the EU European Constitution, many euro-enthusiasts will ask if we have actually read the thing in order to ridicule our objections.

From what I understand, most of this huge tome will be virtually unintelligible to average voters like

me. Maybe that is why it runs to over 300 pages of pure EU legalese!

Could I suggest that organisations leading the fight against this further dangerous erosion of our civil liberties and freedoms could render a simple service to eurorealists like me, which would greatly enhance our ability to debate all the really important issues.

A simple system of markers along with a clear explanation, and page number, of each salient point, will greatly assist those of us who will regularly be insulted by the feeble arguments put forward by its supporters.

When attending meetings nothing will put Europhiles off more than seeing someone armed with a copy of the draft treaty with key sections clearly ear-marked for easy reference.

Tony Blair uses a similar system every week during PM's questions in the House of Commons, and if it works for him, it could also work for us.

WILLIAM HALL  
Hertfordshire

## All talk and no delivery

Other EU governments have made it easy for members of the public to obtain copies of the Constitutional treaty so that they make an informed decision on the matter. The Spanish government distributed copies at a football match, the French government is mailing copies to all 42 million voters and has produced pages of explanatory literature as well as setting up a telephone help-line. The strong impression that the British government wishes the public to remain entirely ignorant about the treaty contents has been strengthened by the behaviour of Denis MacShane, the Minister for Europe. On Channel 4 News on 8th June last year and on a December

broadcast of *Any Questions* Mr MacShane grandly offered to send anyone a copy of the treaty who wrote to him requesting this. More recently, in a letter to *The Spectator* Mr MacShane urged that publication to produce "a 28-page tabloid style summary of the main parts of the Treaty".

Mr MacShane's letter elicited a response from a *Spectator* reader, Mr Eric Brown of Bromley who pointed out that he had written to MacShane requesting a copy of the treaty on two occasions but his requests had been ignored.

"It is ironic that with all the billions at the disposal of the EU, the minister's

office cannot deliver on this promise and that he should now request that you do his work for him", said Mr Brown.

Why is it that the job of Minister of Europe is occupied by individuals who constantly slip on banana skins? It was difficult to believe that a more foolish figure than Keith Vaz (who memorably claimed that the Charter of Human Rights would have no more legal significance than the *Beano*) could be found to occupy the position. But Denis MacShane is rising magnificently to the challenge!

## Correction

In the front-page article in the 1st April issue, "Refuting the biggest myth about leaving the EU", a euro symbol was inadvertently dropped from line 8 of Table 1 & line 8 of Table 2. This should have read "Total in bn". Please accept our apologies.

# MEETINGS

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
01503-230055

Saturday **16th April 2005**

11.00 am until 5.00 pm

**David Lucas, UKIP, Parliamentary Candidate for South East Cornwall**

(Questions and Answers)

GRAND AUCTION and  
PUBLIC MEETING  
Callington Town Hall, Callington,  
Cornwall

**Admission Free**

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
01243-604186

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

“We Want Our Country Back”

**Douglas Denny, UKIP, Parliamentary Candidate for Chichester**

**Idris Francis, Businessman**

(Questions and Answers)

PUBLIC MEETING  
Liberty Hall, The Grange, Midhurst,  
West Sussex

**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, Labour**

**Nigel Farage MEP, UK Independence Party**

**Daniel Hannan MEP, Conservative**

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

**Admission Free**

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
01243-604186

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

“We Want Our Country Back”

**Douglas Denny, UKIP, Parliamentary Candidate for Chichester**

**Idris Francis, Businessman**

(Questions and Answers)

PUBLIC MEETING  
Liberty Hall, The Grange, Midhurst,  
West Sussex

**Admission Free**

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
01503-230055

Tuesday **19th April 2005** 7.30 pm

**David Lucas, UKIP, Parliamentary Candidate for South East Cornwall**

**Further speaker to be announced**

(Questions and Answers)

PUBLIC MEETING  
St. Neot Village Hall, St. Neot,  
Cornwall

**Admission Free**

**Gresham College**

020-7831 0575

Wednesday **25th May 2005** 6.00 pm

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

[During the immediate post-war period, the United states used the promise of Marshall aid to force the countries of Western Europe to take the first steps towards integration. Britain opted out, then spent the subsequent twenty years trying to get in. Once in, she toyed with various plans and made various attempts to be both in and out. This may be a play with a long run.]

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

PUBLIC MEETING  
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

**Admission Free**

## SELECT COMMITTEES

**House of Lords**

020-7219 3000

Wednesday **20th April 2005**, 4.15 pm  
Evidence will be heard by the  
*Constitution Committee* from witnesses to  
be confirmed.

Wednesday **4th May 2005**, 4.15 pm  
Evidence will be heard by the  
*Constitution Committee* from witnesses to  
be confirmed.

Wednesday **18th May 2005**, 4.15 pm  
Evidence will be heard by the  
*Constitution Committee* from witnesses to  
be confirmed.

*Note:*

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

## DIARY OF EVENTS

**2005**

UK General Election **5th May**

French referendum **29th May**  
on European Constitution

Dutch referendum **1st June**  
on European Constitution

UK takes over **1st July**  
EU presidency

ECOFIN meeting **12-13th July**

GAERC meeting **18-19th July**

Danish referendum **27th September**  
on European Constitution

ECOFIN meeting **11th October**

GAERC meeting **14-15th October**

**2006**

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

Finland takes over **1st July**  
EU presidency

**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 Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union**

by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£11.99**

A comprehensive history of the European Union project. In paperback.

**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.

**The Freedom Audit**

by The Freedom Association. **£3.00**  
Details the extent of the Government's assault on fundamental freedoms and the democratic system.

**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.

**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.

**The New Case for Europe:**

The Crisis in British pro-Europeanism and How to Overcome it  
by Roger Liddle. **£6.95**  
The strap line tells it all.

**A Cost Too Far?**

by Ian Milne. **£8.50**

A fully worked out cost/benefit analysis of Britain's EU membership.

**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: 08456-120175  
Fax: 08456-120176  
Email: info@junepress.com  
**www.junepress.com**

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)**  
**20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

## 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-1@globalbritain.org	
<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	
<b>Veritas</b>	<b>020-7631 3757</b>
Robert Kilroy-Silk MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771 361 413006