

Europe: it's the modern version of the white man's burden

Beware the new europhile rhetoric which admits that Europe is an economic disaster area - but says that it's our job to sort it out

Even before the historic - but predictable - French 'non' and the even more emphatic Dutch 'nee' it was evident that the europhile argument in this country was undergoing a remarkable change. This was apparent not only from the speeches of the Chancellor, who has recently put the emphasis on EU economic failures rather than upon the supposed benefits of membership, but also from the remarks of many of his colleagues.

According to the *Daily Telegraph's* political columnist Rachel Sylvester when the Cabinet met on 26th May even the most ardently pro-European agreed that the EU was rapidly approaching a moment of truth. "If the French vote 'No', it's comeuppance day for the Europhile federalists who live in this little bubble of Brussels," one minister apparently told Ms Sylvester, "Their solution is to shower a directive at anything that moves and they're completely out of tune with popular opinion".

It seems curious that ministers have only just noticed the whirring of the regulatory machine in Brussels. Regulation - the so-called 'Monnet method' - is the means by which an artificial European state has been bound together and by which its unelected executive has amassed its power. In 2001, the most recent year for which we have figures, the number of regulations enacted as a result of EU membership was 2,611, but this was fewer regulations than passed into law in 1997 when Labour was elected to office and this number compares to a

massive 4,283 regulations in the record breaking year of 1988.

The reason for the Government's change of rhetoric of course has nothing to do with its remarkable discovery that Brussels is engaged in the business of regulation; it has everything to do with its desire to avoid a British referendum on the Constitution and Chancellor's wish to find something credible to say about Europe that might resonate with the public and therefore assist a fourth Labour victory.

Voice of the People

Having so recently said that there would be a British referendum irrespective of what happened elsewhere, the Prime Minister, for his part, cannot immediately declare the treaty to be dead in the water, so his emissaries (Kinnock, Byers *et al*) have been saying this for him. He wishes to create the impression that his present disagreement with other EU Prime Ministers is a difference between those who wish to disregard the voice of the people and those, like himself, who wish to reflect on the democratic will in an attitude of deep humility. The reality is that he is desperately trying to find a way to avoid the British people expressing their will, and to avoid a hugely embarrassing exit from Downing Street and a most ignominious end to his political career.

Meanwhile, the Chancellor, wrapping himself in the Union Jack, says that the EU must conform to anglo-saxon

ways. He laments the flood of EU regulation, the low growth, the failure to meet the Lisbon goals, the unfunded pensions, the rigid labour markets and the consequent high levels of unemployment. But just a minute, Chancellor it seems only yesterday - indeed it *was* only yesterday - that you were claiming that we were winning the argument. If things are going so well, how come they are going so badly?

The Chancellor informs us that Britain's future lies in reforming the EU and leading it to the sunny uplands of economic renewal; there are echoes here of John Major but it is also possible to detect signs of a curious neo-colonialism: it is our task, it seems, to educate the European natives and to convert them to higher things.

Having once been told that EU membership was the key to high rates growth and full employment, the British people are now told, in effect, that that we must remain within the EU despite its low growth and rising unemployment because it is our responsibility to do something about these problems. It is not.

Regrettably, in its present mood of political introspection the Conservative Party seems incapable of exploiting the contradictions and absurdities of Labour's European policy, still less of charting a course that would define a new relationship with Europe. There are political opportunities that go begging, but sadly there are no serious takers.

INSIDE: Eurozone could face economic nightmare p.2 - The end of the beginning p.3 - Review of "The Case for Commonwealth Trade" p.4 - You couldn't make it up - No 57 p.4 - Heeding the voice of French democracy p.4 - Why it's a plea - sure to be thrown out of the EPP! p.5

Eurozone could face economic nightmare as result of massive health and pensions costs

Is the Eurozone's future an economic nightmare world in which house prices and equities fall, pensions are reduced and taxes and public spending soar to unprecedented levels? This, we should explain, is not the forecast of some eurosceptic economist but the clear implication of an article in the 2004 Annual Report* of the European Central Bank.

Entitled "Potential Effects of Demographic Change in the Euro Area", the article dismisses the idea that immigration is a solution to declining and ageing populations, noting, ever so diplomatically, that: "Most studies suggest that the role of migration in addressing Europe's demographic challenge is likely to be small and temporary, being limited by the number of potential migrants relative to the size of the problem and by practical and political restraints".

It also notes the potentially massive additional cost by 2050 (compared

with now) of providing pensions, healthcare and long-term care for rising numbers of pensioners: "Estimates by the European Commission's Economic Policy Committee's Working Group on Ageing Population suggest additional pension expenditure of between 3 and 6 per cent of GDP ...in most Euro countries. A further increase in expenditure of 2 to 4 per cent of GDP could result from rising health and long-term care costs".

Thus, the total additional cost attributable to rising numbers of pensioners amounts to between 5 and 10 per cent of GDP. Assuming that current government spending in a typical Euro-using country is 40 per cent of GDP, the implication (though this is not spelt out by the ECB) is that by 2050 government spending - and taxation - will have to increase by between twelve-and-a-half and twenty-five per cent. The ECB says - again,

very diplomatically - that governments will have to "adjust" - which means reduce - pensions paid out by the pay-as-you-go systems used in most Eurozone countries. They will also have to run such systems down and replace them with funded systems such as those used in the UK and the Netherlands.

The ECB also discusses the impact of ageing populations on asset prices. It notes that ".....simulations carried out using models based on the 'life-cycle' theory generally find that an ageing population implies a decrease in financial asset prices (both equities and bonds)....." and that "demographic changes may also affect real estate prices". In other words, share, bond and property prices are going to fall as taxes and public spending sharply increase.

*Source: ECB Annual Report 2004 www.ecb.int

EU-25 growth rates in 2004

Real GDP Growth 2005/2004 Per Cent

UK	3.1
Sweden	3.5
Denmark	2.0
Ten Accession States	4.8
EU-13 total (non-euro)	3.3
Eurozone	2.0

Source: ECB Annual Report 2004 www.ecb.int

Youth unemployment rises again in Eurozone

Almost one in five Eurozone under-25s were out of work in 2004, according to the ECB's 2004 Annual Report (www.ecb.int):-

	Eurozone Unemployment: Per Cent		
	2002	2003	2004
Under-25s	16.8	17.6	17.8
Over-25s	7.0	7.4	7.6
Total	8.2	8.7	8.8

European Central Bank makes thumping loss

The ECB, the Eurozone's central bank, made an even bigger loss in 2004 than in 2003:

	2004	2003
Loss bn	1.64	0.48

Part of this was due to sharply rising Staff Costs (up by 24 per cent) and Admin Expense (up by 15 per cent). The ECB has bought a central Frankfurt site from the Frankfurt City Council and will soon start building a mega-skyscraper on it to be its new headquarters. If the ECB were a quoted company (now there's a thought!) it would be time for investors to bale out. The long-suffering taxpayers of the Eurozone don't have that option.

Source: ECB's 2004 Annual Report (www.ecb.int)

The end of the beginning

Reflections on the implications and consequences of the French 'non'

By Ian Milne

Europe did for Margaret Thatcher; "Europe" did for John Major; "Europe" did for Alain Juppé. On 29th May 2005 "Europe" finished Chirac's long and undistinguished career; "Europe" brought Giscard d'Estaing's to a humiliating close; "Europe" did for Raffarin; and "Europe" did for the French Socialist Party's pro-oui leader, Hollande. Chirac remains President of France, but is the lamest of lame ducks.

The French 'Non' also finished off Turkey's prospects of joining the EU. Earlier this year, hoping to neutralise the Turkish question ahead of the French referendum, Chirac inserted a clause in the French Constitution (which was being revised to make it compatible with the draft EU Constitution) subjecting every future potential admission of a country to the EU to the agreement of the French electorate by referendum. The French Constitution, unlike that of the EU, is now in place. So the French electorate, if it so chooses, has the unilateral and unconditional right to reject any enlargement beyond a 27-member EU (EU-25 plus Bulgaria and Romania). The prospect of any future French Head of State and his or her government risking a referendum on Turkish entry is minimal. So, after Bulgaria and Romania join the EU (scheduled for 2007) enlargement is effectively stopped dead.

Turkish Entry

The collapse of the process of Turkish entry to the EU presents the Americans with a major geo-political headache. US policy *vis-à-vis* Turkey and Ukraine is explicitly to favour their joining the EU. US policy is also, less stridently, to favour accession to the EU of other Eastern European and central Asian countries, including former provinces of the USSR. Turkey, and to a lesser extent the Ukraine, had been gearing up to eventually join the EU-as-is: *acquis communautaire*, abandonment of sovereignty, single currency, the EU Army: the lot. That

particular EU is, for them, no longer an option, partly because of the threat of the French electorate's veto enshrined in the French Constitution, partly because, politically, the EU is going to be in a state of suspended animation for years, if not decades. Turkey in particular is big and strong enough to simply walk away from the EU option, and will probably do so.

Political Headache

Another potential geo-political headache, for the Europeans themselves, and for the Americans, is the centuries-old conundrum of Russia. The EU - with, one must assume, tacit or explicit American approval - has long been making eyes at Russia, suggesting, or giving the impression, that it was Russia's "destiny" to join the EU. French "thinkers" often look on Russia as the key to building a "Europe Puissance" (a Great-Power Europe) in which Russia's nuclear and space weaponry and natural resources, combined with Europe's technology, would enable the EU to "stand up" to the USA. Given Russia's appalling demographics and its seeming backward leap into authoritarianism, such a scenario always looked problematic; now, it seems far-distant. But the problem of what to do about Russia will not go away.

Inside the current EU itself another potentially huge schism could be opening up. With the French 'Non', for the first time in forty or fifty years, Germany and France find themselves on divergent paths. Germany completed its ratification of the EU Constitution two days before the French referendum; Schröder looks to be a lame duck; another German government could be in place before autumn. Germany, as ever, has legitimate geo-political interests in the regions and territories to her east. She "might be tempted" (to quote the famous and controversial paper by Wolfgang Schäuble in 1994) to achieve

her objectives - by peaceful means this time - outside the current EU framework, if French and EU paralysis in the aftermath of the referendum did not suit German requirements. If Germany were indeed to be so tempted, neither the Americans, nor the Russians, nor the other Europeans, could remain indifferent.

So far, there is no sign whatsoever that the Blair government has any idea how to respond constructively to the French 'Non', except somehow to get through the next few weeks with minimal British electoral damage. The Blair/Brown line appears to be that the EU is reformable from within the existing structures - just as Gorbachev thought he could reform the Soviet system from within - and that (as British politicians have been wrongly asserting since the 1950s) - "Britain's winning the arguments in Europe". Blair still wants to join the euro, and still - one assumes - wants Britain to ratify the EU Constitution or something very like it. The reality is that EU "reform" within the existing structure is pie in the sky. Until the present government, and the Conservative Party, understand that, the UK, and Europe, will drift, treading water. It is quite possible that another decade or two will be wasted.

Unreformable EU

To paraphrase Churchill after El Alamein, this (the French 'Non') is not the end; it is not even the beginning of the end; but it is the end of the beginning. Neither the EU, nor the UK, nor the world economy, can afford to put up with an unreformed Europe. Since the EU is unreformable, the quickest and cleanest way out of the mess is for a big English-speaking member to leave, provoke the collapse of the whole structure, then assemble a slim-line body from the debris. A good name for it would be the "Common Market" - what the British thought they were voting for in 1975.

The Commonwealth: a sleeping economic colossus

By Ian Milne

The author and publisher are Canadian. Cameron argues that the shared histories and present-day interests of Commonwealth members are strong enough for the 54 nations and 1.8 billion people involved to come together on issues of trade, development and prosperity.

The members of the Commonwealth, says Cameron, account for 20 per cent of global trade (about the same proportion as either the USA or the EU); they also account for 40 per cent of the membership of the World Trade Organisation. The Commonwealth is thus, in theory, “a sleeping economic colossus - the last manifestation of the only truly global empire the world has known.....”

The author proposes the creation of the “Commonwealth Free Trade Area”, the CFTA. He explores at length the pros and cons and practicalities of so doing and concludes that the CFTA “rather than represent a return to the

The Case for Commonwealth Free Trade

By Brent Cameron

Trafford March 2005

Paperback 238 pp

Available from *The June Press*

Price £11.26 + p&p

(see back cover)

ISBN 1-41204277-1

days of Empire, (would) provide the best possible opportunity to preserve the independence and integrity of nation-states”. He understands that Britain could not join a CFTA and remain a member of the EU.

This is a fascinating Canadian viewpoint on the huge potential of the Commonwealth. Implicitly, it recognises that the current EU model is

simply incapable of getting to grips with how the world will evolve in the next half-century. When the UK leaves the EU, the scenario of the UK’s pursuing its national interests through and with the Commonwealth could well be one of its most attractive options.

This reviewer has often tried to think of an occasion in the last fifty years - any occasion, however insignificant - when the UK found itself in a fix and got a spontaneous, generous and altruistic helping hand from any of its EU “partners”. He can’t think of any (perhaps though readers can?). In contrast, there have been many occasions over the same period when Commonwealth countries have done just that: come to the aid of the UK without being asked first. That itself is a powerful argument for swapping our disastrous experiment with “Europe” for a re-engagement with our kith and kin in the rest of the world.

You couldn’t make it up - No 57

The Foreign Secretary, arriving in Brussels for a meeting of EU foreign ministers to discuss the British rebate on 22nd May 2005, said (according to the *Daily Telegraph*):

“It is only the fact that we have a veto which gives a proper bargaining power to the United Kingdom”.

Odd, that. In Mr Straw’s

“*Explanatory Memorandum on the EU Constitutional Treaty, Presented to Parliament*”, dated December 2004, he writes, at paragraph 28, “QMV”:-

“*The EU Constitution will move 15 Articles...from ...unanimous...to QMV and introduces 24 new Articles...at QMV...QMV was extended to 16 [new and existing areas] by*

Amsterdam...and to 31 by Nice”.

According to Mr Straw, assuming the Constitution goes through, since 1997 that will make no fewer than 86 vetoes given up by the government of which he is a member.

You couldn’t make it up.

Heeding the voice of French democracy

“If it’s a Yes, we will say ‘on we go’, and if it’s a No we will say ‘we continue’.” Jean Claude Juncker, Prime Minister of Luxembourg (*Daily*

Telegraph, 26th May).

“Your prime minister signed it, you can’t just say it’s not valid,” EU official commenting on the

implications of the French ‘Non’ for the British government (*Daily Telegraph*, 28th May).

Why it's a pleasure to be thrown out of the EPP!

Roger Helmer explains the background to the decision to expel him from the European People's Party

You may have seen in the press that the Conservative delegation in the European parliament has decided to suspend my Conservative whip. I remain, of course, a member of the European parliament and of the Conservative Party.

The facts are below. But first, a word about the EPP political group in the parliament, of which the British Conservative MEPs are members. It is the largest group, and is dominated by the German Christian Democrats. Its leader Hans-Gert Poettering (HGP) is a German Christian Democrat. It is often to the left of New Labour, and is passionately federalist. Last week, HGP declared that he would expel me from his group, and added: *"No one, but no one, must be allowed to shake our resolve as we continue to build European integration"*.

So, to the story.

Last July, José Manuel Barroso, a Portuguese, was nominated as President of the EU Commission. In August, he and his family enjoyed a six-day holiday on a luxury yacht owned by multi-billionaire Greek shipowner Spiros Latsis. In September, the Commission nodded through (under EU state-aid rules) a 10 million grant to a company largely owned by Latsis. During parliamentary debates we heard of further business relations between the Commission and companies in which Latsis has an interest.

Barroso says that Latsis is an old family friend, and that the holiday took place before he was confirmed as Commission President. This may be so, but it still leaves a bad smell. The Commission President, like Caesar's wife, should be above suspicion. It certainly amounts to cronyism, if not worse.

Some MEPs called on Barroso to come to the parliament and explain himself. He showed great reluctance, so the MEPs adopted the tactic of a Motion of Censure. This was a moderate motion: it did not accuse

Barroso of wrong-doing, but merely asked him to explain himself. The motion required 74 signatures (10 per cent of the members), and some 77 signed. I want to stress that these MEPs came from many parties and many countries, and not all were euro-sceptics. It was not, as some reported, "a UKIP motion", although Nigel Farage was the first signatory.

The larger political groups in the parliament closed ranks to oppose the motion, fearful of negative publicity ahead of the French referendum. Their first tactic was to try to pressure MEPs into withdrawing their names from the motion, and I am sorry to report that the five Conservative signatories (myself, Chris Heaton-Harris, Dan Hannan, Martin Callanan and David Sumberg) received letters threatening "very serious consequences" unless we removed our names. But we stuck to our guns.

Procedural Device

Their next tactic, after the first failed, was to use a procedural device to prevent any of the dissidents from speaking. They agreed in the "Conference of Presidents" (the committee of heads of political groups) that there would be only one speaker per group. So again, HGP spoke for the Conservatives and no dissidents were on the list. It was in this debate that he made the infamous comment noted above.

However I managed to find a little-known parliamentary rule (No. 141) that allows any member to put a question to a listed speaker. So I managed to speak in the censure debate, in front of the parliament, the whole EU Commission, and the world's press. Needless to say, I made a robust attack on the political leadership in the parliament and their desperate attempts to silence dissent.

This infuriated both HGP and, I am afraid, Conservative MEPs' leader Timothy Kirkhope. The other four

Conservative signatories have received "Final Warning Letters". I have had the whip suspended, and I expect to be ejected from the EPP.

I was elected on a Manifesto commitment to oppose fraud and corruption in the EU institutions. I believe therefore that I had a duty to honour that commitment and to hold the Commission to account in a case that certainly involved cronyism, and potentially involved corruption. If there is any case for disciplinary action, it should surely be directed at Kirkhope for seeking to frustrate a clear manifesto commitment.

I am expecting that a motion to expel me from the EPP-ED will be passed at a group meeting in Strasbourg during the week commencing June 6th. I have spent the last six years campaigning unsuccessfully against the British Tory delegation's membership of the EPP group. I have not resigned from the EPP, simply out of respect for Party policy on the matter, even though I disagree with the policy. But I shall greet my expulsion not only with equanimity, but with a great measure of satisfaction.

This creates an interesting situation. The British Conservative delegation has already made a first approach to see how I can normalise my relationship with them, and I am keen to cooperate. But of course I cannot decide to re-admit myself to the EPP-ED. This opens the possibility of a Conservative MEP receiving the Conservative whip whilst not being a member of the EPP-ED group. If we can create this precedent, there will be others keen to take advantage of it.

Roger Helmer is MEP for the East Midlands

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

The National Interest and PR

Dear Sir,

Gerald Frost's analysis of the election was incorrect in respect of its references to UKIP. The idea that UKIP cost the Tories 27 seats is based on the totally false assumption that UKIP voters would have voted Tory had there been no UKIP candidate: there is absolutely no reason for believing this would have happened.

Gerald also states that "UKIP offered to stand down in seats where there was a strong 'euro-sceptic' candidate" (whatever that is); that is also wrong. This 'offer' was a totally unauthorised statement on national television made by my fellow UKIP MEP Nigel Farage. Nigel had no authority to make this statement and there was widespread anger in the party that he did. When he put this proposition to the UKIP Party Conference last October it was defeated by 1,000 votes to 10.

Gerald's idea that UKIP candidates should practice 'self-immolation' on behalf of Tory candidates is a preposterous one to say the least. The 'national interest' is best served by UKIP giving the electorate the opportunity to vote for candidates who stand for unconditional withdrawal from the EU. Regarding UKIP's future, I hope that we will now get behind a national campaign to introduce proportional representation so that in the next Parliament the electorate can have a real and meaningful choice when they vote. MPs in Parliament who really believe in British independence, and who are prepared to say it, is the best way of eventually bringing it about.

GERARD BATTEN MEP
UK Independence Party
London

[Gerald Frost writes: *I did not for a moment mean to suggest that UKIP candidates should practice self-immolation for the sake of the Tory*

party. My point was that they should have been prepared to sacrifice themselves in the interests of creating a wedge of robust eurosceptic MPs at Westminster (which is the only place where change can be effected but in which UKIP signally failed to achieve the foothold it sought). Secondly, that this might have given 'Europe' greater salience in an election campaign in which the issue simply didn't feature.

Message from one of the '27'

Dear Sir,

I am afraid that I can't help smiling whenever I hear that I 'cost the Conservatives a seat' (I was the UKIP candidate for Romsey and one of those famous 27 who are said to have prevented Conservative candidates from claiming victory).

I stood against the daughter of Roy Perry ex-MEP, a lady with the same europhile views as her father. I really can't see that her presence as a Conservative MP would have helped the Eurosceptic cause whatsoever.

But the solution for the Conservatives is simple. It is as follows:

Get off the fence, stop pretending to be another party of social democrats, get back to your free-market, anti-big government (and anti-big business these days) roots and campaign against our membership of the EU. The French 'no' vote has now cleared the decks. Admitting that you are against the EU dream is now politically totally acceptable. Your treatment of Roger Helmer will be a litmus test in this. This principled individual has frequently been pilloried for sharing a platform with UKIP speakers (even though his speeches usually result in UKIP voters returning to the Conservatives - I know, first hand, of this happening after his appearance in Winchester recently). If you hang him out to dry after he 'did the right thing' in the EU parliament in an effort to censure the

EU Commission then we know you are a hopeless cause. Rehabilitate Helmer and censure your Quisling MEP leader Kirkhope and you may have started on the road to recovery.

MICHAEL WIGLEY
Southampton

UKIP's Role

Dear Sir,

I often wonder which UKIP most wants to destroy: the EU, or the Conservative Party?

Derek Norman's 'UKIP star' (letter 27th May) *had* risen in the EU elections; only to collapse again on 5th May (as I forecast in *eurofacts*). With sympathisers naturally unwilling to split the EU-realist vote, most UKIP candidates won even fewer votes than did the British National Party or the Greens.

Although it was obvious that the effect of UKIP's hubristic intervention might well be to return an EU-fanatical government instead of a moderately EU-realist one, few foresaw that it might even lead to a keen EU-fanatic becoming Conservative leader.

UKIP will probably never attract enough voters to win itself Parliamentary seats until the BBC - and some other media - stop ignoring the facts about the EU (and when pigs fly). Instead of the electoral equivalent of suicide bombing, why doesn't UKIP use its votes intelligently in tactical support of EU-realist candidates of the other parties. Nigel Farage's offer, though much too late, was predictably unsuccessful. But influencing the composition of the Conservative - and even Labour - Parliamentary parties could still be within UKIP's reach.

ANTHONY HOYLE
Buckinghamshire

MEETINGS

Young Britons' Foundation
020 7470 7237

Thursday **23rd June 2005**, 7.00 pm

Rt Hon William Hague MP, *Guest of Honour*

THE TRAFALGAR BALL

The Royal Naval College, Greenwich, London

Admission by ticket £80 each

(Black Tie - Live entertainment and a late license until 1.00 am)

The Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Tuesday **28th June 2005**, 7.00 pm

“Where does Europe go now?”

Derek Scott, *Former Economics Advisor to the Prime Minister, 1997-2003. Campaigner against the EU Constitution and Chief Economic Consultant to KPMG*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Abbey Centre, 34 Great Smith Street, Westminster, London

Admission £10

(Includes wine and refreshments)

Public Meeting
01223 363545

Wednesday **29th June 2005**, 7.30 pm

Joan Veon, *Author of “United Nations Global Straitjacket”*

PUBLIC MEETING

St Matthews Parish Church Hall, Cambridge

Admission Free

The Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Thursday **21st July 2005**, 7.00 pm

Simon Wolfson, *CEO of Next*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Abbey Centre, 34 Great Smith Street, Westminster, London

Admission £10

(Includes wine and refreshments)

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Monday **13th June 2005**, 4.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Law and Institutions* from the Legal Affairs Committee of the European Parliament.

Tuesday **14th June 2005** 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *2006 EC Budget* from Mr Ivan Lewis MP, Economics Secretary to the Treasury.

Tuesday **14th June 2005**, 3.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *European Union/United Nations* from Mr Sam Daws, Executive Director, United Nations Association.

Tuesday **14th June 2005**, 4.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Better Regulation Inquiry* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **15th June 2005**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *Economic Migration to the EU* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **15th June 2005**, 3.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on *EU Proposal on Consumer Credit Harmonisation* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **15th June 2005**, 4.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *European Union/United Nations* from Sir Jeremy Greenstock, former British Ambassador to the United Nations.

Wednesday **22nd June 2005**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *Economic Migration to the EU* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **22nd June 2005**, 3.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on *EU Proposal on Consumer Credit Harmonisation* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **23rd June 2005**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *European Union/United Nations* from a Minister, Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005

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

Luxembourg referendum on European Constitution **10th July**

ECOFIN meeting **12-13th July**

GAERC meeting (General Affairs and External Relations Council) **18-19th July**

German Parliamentary Elections (to be confirmed) **Mid-September**

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

ECOFIN meeting **11th October**

GAERC meeting **14-15th October**

European Constitution (Final date for ratification) **31st October**

ECOFIN meeting **8th November**

GAERC meeting **21-22nd November**

ECOFIN meeting **24th November**

ECOFIN meeting **6th December**

GAERC meeting **12-13th December**

Portugal referendum on the European Constitution (to be confirmed) **December**

2006

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

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

2007

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

Accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union **1st January**

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

2008

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

**Britain and the European Union:
Alternative Futures**

by Mark Baimbridge, Brian Burkitt and Philip Whyman. **£7.50**

A critical analysis of UK membership, with credible alternative options.

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

by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£12.99**

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'.

**The Case for
Commonwealth Free Trade**

by Brent Cameron. **£11.26**

The Canadian author explores at length the pros, cons and practicalities of a Commonwealth Free Trade Area.

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 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.

Roger Liddle was the Prime Minister's policy adviser on Europe 1997-2004.

A Cost Too Far?

by Ian Milne. **£8.50**

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

Alarming Drum

Britain's European Dilemma

by Peter Morgan. **Hdbk £19.95**

An analysis of Britain's relationship with the EU.

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

by Stuart Sexton. **£5.00**

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

CD

EEC Entry Campaign 1970-72

by Independent compiler **£2.00**

Free Educational CD (charge is for handling). Uses startling new source material showing how Parliament and the people were deceived into supporting entry. You will need a pdf reader such as adobe acrobat.

**Send Payment to
THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO BOX 119**

TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA

Tel: 08456 120 175

Fax: 08456 120 176

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"

European Commission	020-7973 1992
European Movement	020-7940 5252
Federal Trust	020-7735 4000

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403-741736
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020-8922 0089
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071-663876

Campaign for an Independent Britain

	020-8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020-7491 3072
Freedom Association	01746-861267
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020-7691 3800
New Alliance	020-7386 1837
Save Britain's Fish	01224-313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy	01372-453678
-------------------------------	---------------------

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020-7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org	
New Frontiers	020-7808 7772

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative Rt Hon Michael Howard MP	020-7222 9000
Democratic Party Mr Geoff Southall	01684-891700
Labour Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	020-7802 1000
Liberal Mr Michael Meadowcroft	01562-68361
Liberal Democrats Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP	020-7222 7999
New Britain Party Mr Dennis Delderfield	020-7247 2524
UK Independence Party Roger Knapman MEP	0121 333 7737
Veritas Robert Kilroy-Silk MEP	020-7631 3757

ISSN 1361-4134

