

Conclusive evidence that Britons have not become 'European'

But an opinion poll in the Guardian also points to a failure of political leadership that explains public ignorance about the Lisbon Treaty

Under the Labour Government Britain has become progressively more like Europe, less like the United States. Largely as the result of the ever-mounting tide of EU regulation, Britain's economic and political profile has come to resemble that of other EU member states. However, a recent opinion poll on attitudes towards the EU provides evidence that the British people have not themselves become more European, their outlook on the world remaining unchanged by Britain's EU membership over more than three decades. Asked to pick Britain's best friend in the world voters remain strongly pro-American, despite the Iraq war and despite the fact that President Bush is almost universally held in low esteem. Only 29 per cent think that Britain's warmest relations are with the European Union, against 64 per cent who think that they are with America. This is an extraordinary finding given the efforts made by successive governments and by this country's political elites to sell "Europe" to the British.

Anti-Democratic

The survey, carried out by ICM and published in the *Guardian* on 26th January, also provides welcome evidence that the British remain democratic at heart and that a majority recognise the EU's anti-democratic tendencies. Doubts about the EU also show through in opinion about the Lisbon treaty: a derisory 10 per cent of voters think it will make it better for

Britain. In other respects, however, the survey findings are depressing. Fifty per cent of those polled think that the treaty will make no difference, and 58 per cent think that membership is a good thing, as against the 35 per cent who say it is a bad thing.

To those who do have some grasp of what the Lisbon treaty portends it will seem remarkable that half the population think that it will have no impact. That the British should remain so obtuse about the treaty's implications points to a persistent failure of political leadership. Instead of concentrating on the way in which the Treaty will impact on our political and economic lives the Conservative Party has largely focussed on the Labour Party's betrayal of its commitment to hold a referendum on this issue. This, of course, is a legitimate ground for concern, but hardly obviates the need to analyse the treaty text and to move every sinew to resist its ratification.

Imaginative Ways

A single think-tank, *Open Europe* and its campaigning off-shoot, *I want a Referendum*, has done more to draw attention to the contents and implications of the Treaty than the Conservative Party and UKIP put together. Through a constant stream of on-line publications, meetings and events it has found imaginative ways to draw attention to the ways in which the Treaty will make a difference to our lives and to explain why the

Government's claims about the matter are either fraudulent or misleading. The Conservative Party has not come close to achieving either of these things; nor has it come up with bright ideas about how opposition to the treaty could be maximised; indeed, there are times when the grins on Tory faces suggest that the Conservative High Command is entirely happy with the present situation and is content that its cursory examination of the issues should take place exclusively through the prism of party advantage.

Brilliant Bloggers

As well as *Open Europe*, *Global Britain*, *Global Vision* and the brilliant blogging team of Helen Szamuely and Richard North have been doing sterling work. In contrast, *Policy Exchange* the think-tank closest to the Cameron coterie does not even include the EU in its "list of issues" despite the fact that it has a eurosceptic chairman, Charles Moore, and a eurosceptic director, Anthony Browne.

If behind the scenes the Conservative Party is engaged in serious work about what it should do if it finds itself in office following ratification of the Treaty, about how a genuine renegotiation of Britain's terms of membership might be achieved and what steps might be taken in the event of failure, this is a rare example of a well-kept political secret. This situation does not augur well: the Thatcher revolution was the result of a

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: Huge gaps in Treaty text still to be completed p.2 - EU to fund pan-European radio stations p.3 - Energy deal will change the face of Britain p.4 - Half a million may vote on Constitution p.4 - Why Britain will break with the EU p.4 - Why MPs must reject Declaration 17 p.5

Huge gaps in Treaty text still to be completed

As Donald Rumsfeld, the former US Defence Secretary famously remarked, there are known unknowns, that is to say we know there are some things we do not know, but there are also unknown unknowns, the ones we don't know we don't know. For almost the entire body of MPs the Lisbon Treaty falls into the first category. MPs know that they are largely ignorant about the treaty text which consists of amendments to existing treaties and which is consequently very difficult to understand without the advantage of a consolidated text (the EU Commission has helpfully decided not to produce such a version until *after* the treaty has been ratified). As a result there has been something surreal about the spectacle of MPs pretending to scrutinise a treaty which remains largely unfamiliar to them and which they are in any case powerless to change. Extraordinarily, it is now clear that there are aspects of the Treaty which fall into Rumsfeld's category of unknown unknowns - things about which we all remain ignorant because despite the document's length and complexity there are huge gaps that remain to be filled in. This situation has arisen because some decisions have evidently been delayed until after ratification in order to limit opposition in "difficult countries" like Britain. In this respect the Treaty resembles a partly-finished painting whose completion awaits the artist's pleasure.

A confidential strategy paper prepared by the Slovenian EU presidency for heads of government

Continued from p.1

hugely intellectually and politically exacting process of policy reappraisal involving leading figures inside and outside the party inspired by a politician - Keith Joseph - with sufficient candour and courage to admit to past error. A similar admission now - "*We thought Europe could be reformed, but we were terribly mistaken, and we must now seek other ways of promoting the national interest*" would transform the political

landscape, but it is quite unlikely. identifies no fewer than 31 areas where decisions remain to be taken and where "preparatory work" needs to be carried out quietly behind the scenes during the present year. The document, which was leaked to *Open Europe*, says that decisions will need to be taken "as soon as possible after ratification".

The issues which remain to be resolved are not merely minor matters but include such weighty issues as the role and powers of the EU President and High Representative (foreign minister).

We are indebted to *Open Europe* for the following account of areas which remain to be worked out:

Institutions

■ The role of the EU President. The exact role of the President remains to be defined. For example, will he represent the EU abroad, and, if so, what will be the role of the Foreign Minister? How will the President interact with the rotating presidencies of the Council? Will he have the entire body of civil servants at the Council Secretariat (6,000 in total) at his disposal?

■ The EU President and Foreign Minister's "conditions of employment" - this includes pay, benefits, pensions etc. To put this into context, the EU President is likely to be better paid than the Commission President, who is paid £180,000 a year, on which he pays a special EU rate of tax of just 15 per cent. He can also

claim accommodation expenses of £27,000, £7,000 for entertaining, and an official car worth up to £75,000. His pension, which also attracts the low Brussels tax rate, is £120,000 a year.

Home Affairs

■ The structure, operation and field of action of Europol. The Treaty gives new tasks and powers to Europol in general terms - giving it a role in operational action on the ground (e.g. dawn raids etc) - but how this will work will need to be defined by specific legislation.

■ The new powers and operation of Eurojust. The Lisbon Treaty gives the European prosecutors' group new powers including the "initiation of investigations". However, exactly how this will work is yet to be decided.

■ The rules governing the European Public Prosecutor and its functions. The Lisbon Treaty allows for a regulation to be agreed which would establish the EPP and lay down its "general rules". Despite opposing the idea for years, under the Lisbon Treaty the UK would no longer have the right to stop the prosecutor from going ahead.

■ The powers of the new "Operational Committee on Internal Security". There is an on-going debate over whether the Committee will be able to propose legislation; whether

Continued on p.3

Britons still not 'European'

prepared the Party somehow displays the courage and strength of conviction on this issue that it has lacked hitherto, or voting UKIP - a party which is unambiguously committed to withdrawal from the EU but which has failed so far to rise to the challenge of events and whose greatest achievement to date has been to win seats in a parliament from which it believes Britain should withdraw. It is an unenviable choice.

As Frederick Forsyth writes in this issue (*Letters*, page 6) a Labour victory at the next general election will guarantee that there is no referendum; it will also guarantee the continuation of the present integrationist trends. Voters who believe that 'Europe' is the most important issue of the age will consequently have the choice of holding their noses and voting Tory while hoping that although badly-

prepared the Party somehow displays the courage and strength of conviction on this issue that it has lacked hitherto, or voting UKIP - a party which is unambiguously committed to withdrawal from the EU but which has failed so far to rise to the challenge of events and whose greatest achievement to date has been to win seats in a parliament from which it believes Britain should withdraw. It is an unenviable choice.

EU to fund pan-European radio station

Radio listeners will soon have the dubious pleasure of being able to tune into a new pan-European radio station providing items about EU affairs which will be funded by the EU Commission.

The 'European Radio project' (ERP) - a consortium of 16 radio stations from 13 member states - will broadcast programmes "from a European point of view" with the declared aim of trying to develop "a European public area".

Under the project the group will produce daily half-an-hour news shows, weekly magazines as well as coverage of European cultural events.

The programmes will be broadcast on the usual frequencies of the participating radio stations, as well as through a new ERP internet site which will be operating from June this year.

Participants include internationally recognised public broadcasters such as Germany's *Deutsche-Welle*, *Radio France Internationale* and *Radio Netherlands Worldwide* as well as *Polskie Radio* of Poland and *Radio Punto* of Spain.

Belgian, Czech, Bulgarian, Greek,

Hungarian, Portuguese, Romanian and Slovenian stations are also taking part in the scheme which will be open to further participants in the future.

Original content of the radio stations will be produced in five "core" languages - English, French, German, Spanish and Polish - and will be translated into Bulgarian, Greek, Hungarian, Portuguese and Romanian.

The project's plans anticipate that by 2012 all 23 EU languages will be covered.

The project will be mostly financed by the EU Commission which last year asked broadcasters to submit tenders for "informative programmes on EU affairs". The ERP consortium submitted a successful bid and will receive 5.8 million euros, while the participating stations will provide frequencies, studio space and staff.

ERP programmes are likely to include "Europe in brief" (European news), "Europe in Perspective" (background to the news), "Europe in depth" (interviews, analysis and debates) and "Europe live" (cultural events).

The audience is estimated at 12 to 19

million daily listeners in the EU-27 plus around 30 million in the rest of the world.

Deutsche-Welle will have responsibility for editorial coordination, *Radio France* will be responsible for financial affairs and *Radio Netherlands* will run the radio station's web portal.

A Commission spokesman said that despite EU-funding there would be no attempt to influence the editorial content of the programme - but since broadcasters will know on which side their bread is buttered that is unlikely to be necessary.

The Commission already subsidises the European TV news channel *EuroNews* to the tune of 10 million euros a year.

Meanwhile, the *Daily Mail* has reported that BBC has taken out £141 million in loans from the European Union. The money came from the EU-backed European Investment Bank, which describes itself as "promoting European objectives" and offers lower than normal interest rates.

Continued from p.2

Huge gaps in Treaty still to be completed

there will be any parliamentary oversight of its work; and what the goal of "internal security" includes.

Foreign Policy

■ The "organisation and functioning" of the EU External Action Service (diplomatic service). What the EU diplomatic service will look like and do, its size and composition, are some of the biggest remaining question marks hanging over the Lisbon Treaty. Estimates of the size of the diplomatic service vary between 7,000 and 20,000. A report by the European Parliament already warned that it could "take on an uncontrollable life of its own" and become "an independent super administration".

■ The role and powers of the EU Foreign Minister. Despite the UK's

objections, the EU Foreign Minister (now known as the "high representative") will have the automatic right to speak on behalf of member states on issues where the EU has a position. However, other aspects of the role remain to be decided.

Defence

■ The size and arrangements of the new foreign policy fund. The Lisbon Treaty allows for the creation of a "start-up fund" for foreign policy operations. Everything about the fund remains to be decided - including its size and how much member states will pay into it - and the decision will be taken by QMV.

■ Structured cooperation in defence. Following ratification of the Treaty, member states that are interested in

establishing permanent, structured cooperation in the field of defence may set up a group to do so. A briefing paper by the European Federalists argues that the group is a "significant step towards a single European Army". But how it will work is still very unclear.

■ Arrangements for the implementation of the Defence "Solidarity Clause". The Lisbon Treaty states that "Should a Member State be the object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster, the other Member States shall assist it at the request of its political authorities". The exact meaning of this is still to be decided, and the decision will be taken by qualified majority vote.

Energy deal will change the face of Britain

Economic and environmental ramifications of the EU agreement on greenhouse gases are so far-reaching they are difficult to estimate

It seems likely that EU membership will change the visible face of Britain as profoundly as its politics. The decision to impose legally-binding targets, enforceable in European Courts, in order to cut Europe's greenhouse gases by 20 per cent by 2020 will mean that Britain will have to build 50 times the number of existing wind turbines at sea and six times as many on land.

Britain currently generates just two per cent from renewable wind, wave or solar technology. Under the agreement reached on 23rd January Britain will be expected to increase this to 15 per cent.

Approximately five per cent could come from tidal power if the Government is allowed to build the Severn Barrage, the hydroelectric generator planned to cross the Severn Estuary. Experts say that a few per cent could come from burning biomass - such as wood or crops - in power stations. But given the highly ambitious timescale most will have to come from wind turbines. It is estimated that 7,000 on land will be needed. Today there are 1,910.

The deal will initiate one of the

greatest engineering projects in modern times - and will dramatically alter the skylines and coastal waters. As a result of new technology wind-turbines can now be built in valleys as well as on hill-tops.

Failure to meet targets - which the Government has described as "difficult" - means that Britain will face daily fines.

Under the deal, which was reached by the EU Council on 23rd January, targets for carbon emissions will be set for commerce, households and transport-sectors not covered by the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS). Britain's national target is to reduce emissions by 16 per cent.

The economic costs of the deal will be huge. Jose Manuel Barroso, the EU Commission President said that the new package would cost each individual £2.24 a week or £116 a year equivalent to £465 for a family of four.

Overall Brussels estimates the cost around £45 billion a year, reducing the value of the EU's economy by 0.5 per cent.

Households will be hit by a 10-15 per cent increase in electricity charges,

although some companies have already factored the expected increases into their prices. And there is the prospect of still higher petrol and diesel prices as the result of the obligation for 10 per cent of all road fuels to come from plant-based fuels such as ethanol.

Open Europe estimates that the 10 per cent EU target would lead to total annual transfers to the wider biofuels industry of 11-23bn euros by 2020.

The shift to biofuels will contribute to higher world food prices - this is already happening as a result of US demand, with 2007 seeing dramatic rises in food bills. *Open Europe* estimates that EU targets for biofuels would be responsible for pushing 60 million people around the world into food insecurity. The EU targets would also be responsible for £50 - £65 cost increases on family food bills in the UK.

Business and industry groups have widely criticised the deal on the grounds of its cost - but its ramifications are sufficiently wide-reaching that it will be years before an accurate picture of these can be estimated.

Half a million may vote on Constitution

Half a million people will have the opportunity to vote on the revived EU constitution as part of the *I Want a Referendum* campaign. The ballot will constitute the biggest consultation on Europe since 1975.

In the first wave the campaign organisers will stage referendums in ten marginal constituencies later this month. The first will be held in the Scots seat of East Renfrewshire - where the incumbent is the Europe

Minister Jim Murphy.

The IWR campaign has commissioned Electoral Reform Services, a leading independent ballot administrator and scrutineer, to organise the poll. Later this month voters in the ten constituencies will receive a pack containing an information leaflet with contributions from both sides of the debate, a ballot paper and a freepost envelope.

The IWR is a cross-party campaign

whose advisory committee includes Derek Scott, Graham Stringer MP, Gisela Stuart MP, Mike Hancock MP, Frank Field MP, Kate Hoey MP, David Heathcoat Amory MP, Greg Hands MP and Nick Herbert MP.

Readers who wish to assist in the organisation of the campaign in their area should contact IWR at (campaigns@iwantareferendum.com).

Why Britain will break with the EU

The EU is now reaching a point where its centralising, sovereignty-stealing obsessions will cause day-to-day outrage to the public. It may take this, or one more federalising pile of dishonesty after it, to push us to breaking point: but we will break

because we are in our hearts democratic people. We resent the spectacle of our politicians - low as so many of them are - being humiliated by having to kow-tow to their and our masters in Brussels. We are revolted by the sight of our parliament being

rendered impotent. We feel special disgust - and here the Conservative Party should take note - at not being offered an adequate choice at elections on the future of Europe.

Simon Heffer, *Daily Telegraph* 23rd January 2008.

Why MPs must reject Declaration 17

Denis Cooper argues that MPs have an historic opportunity to protect the legislative supremacy of the British Parliament

According to the website of the UK Parliament:

“Parliamentary sovereignty is a principle of the UK constitution. It makes Parliament the supreme legal authority in the UK, which can create or end any law. Generally, the courts cannot overrule its legislation and no Parliament can pass laws that future Parliaments cannot change. Parliamentary sovereignty is the most important part of the UK constitution”.

Given this statement, and especially the last sentence, one might expect that MPs would be up in arms at any attempt to deny the sovereignty of Parliament.

Yet that is exactly the intention of Declaration 17 annexed to the Final Act to the Lisbon Treaty:

“The Conference recalls that, in accordance with well-settled case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union, the Treaties and the law adopted by the Union on the basis of the Treaties have primacy over the law of Member States, under the conditions laid down by the said case-law”.

No doubt many MPs assume that EU laws already have primacy over British laws, and so they do, in a way - but certainly not in the way intended by Declaration 17.

It must never be forgotten that there is only one reason why EU laws have any effect in this country - because Parliament has decided that they shall have effect, through its European Communities Act 1972.

Irrespective of how many laws come from Brussels, none of them has any authority in the UK except the authority directly or indirectly lent to it by Parliament - which remains “the supreme legal authority in the UK”.

Similarly, there is only one reason why British judges give precedence to EU laws - because Parliament has told them to do so.

Moreover, as “no Parliament can pass laws that future Parliaments cannot change”, Parliament can change its mind about the blanket authorisation it

has given to EU laws.

Not only by repealing the European Communities Act 1972 in its entirety, but also by legislating contrary to specific EU laws - and provided its intentions are clear, British courts will follow its new directions.

It hardly needs saying that if the British government has agreed to be bound by a treaty, with the approval of Parliament, then Parliament should not be cavalier about passing a law which puts the government in breach of its international obligations.

But it retains the right to do so, and as a last resort it may choose to exercise that right.

Which is particularly important with regard to the EU treaties, because the future obligations which may stem from those treaties are unpredictable but potentially unlimited, are now largely beyond the control of the British government, and are almost entirely beyond the control of Parliament itself.

So while EU membership has come close to destroying our parliamentary democracy, in theory at least it has not yet touched parliamentary sovereignty. The legal doctrine embodied in Declaration 17 aims to change that.

Legal Doctrine

As acknowledged in the legal opinion annexed to the Declaration, this doctrine has no basis in either the founding Treaty of Rome, or any subsequent treaty which has been ratified by all the member states.

“It results from the case-law of the Court of Justice that primacy of EC law is a cornerstone principle of Community law. According to the Court, this principle is inherent to the specific nature of the European Community. At the time of the first judgment of this established case law (Costa/ENEL, 15 July 1964, Case 6/641 (1)) there was no mention of primacy in the treaty. It is still the case today.”

Put bluntly, this novel legal doctrine was nothing more than the invention of

lawyers at the Court of Justice, who took it upon themselves to decide that the treaty had created “an independent source of law”, inherently superior to the national laws of the states which had made that treaty, and who persisted with that view despite protests from the governments of several of those countries.

Even a Jacques Delors Professor of EC Law conceded in a 2003 memorandum to the House of Lords:

“...primacy is currently a creation of the Court’s case law, inspired by what the Court regards as the Treaty’s intent...” adding that *...this (purported) primacy extends to the constitutional rules of a member state.*

It is a matter of concern that an argument based on this doctrine was advanced during the 2002 “Metric Martyrs” case. Fortunately, it was dismissed by Lord Justice Laws.

In 2004 the Danish MEP Jens-Peter Bonde warned:

“In the understanding of the Court, the EU is already a federation with a unitary legal system interpreted by the Court in Luxembourg for all authorities in the whole of the EU”.

It is plain that some British MPs share that understanding, even though it amounts to an attempt to usurp the sovereign rights of the member states and their parliaments.

It therefore falls to those MPs who are still loyal to this country, and who still believe in the sovereignty of Parliament, to insist that it must repudiate Declaration 17.

I have written to my MP, Theresa May, urging her party to table an amendment to the Bill to ratify the Lisbon Treaty, explicitly rejecting Declaration 17 and affirming that Parliament remains “the supreme legal authority in the UK”.

I would also urge others to write to their MPs, of whichever party, in a similar vein.

After all, what legitimate reason could there be for any MP to ignore this opportunity to assert and protect the legislative supremacy of the British Parliament?

LETTERS

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

Time to Unite

Dear Sir,
EU-fanatic Nick Clegg has predictably played the Quisling card and joined Gordon Brown in forcing through to our statute book the Giscardian Constitution posing as the Lisbon Treaty. The consequence is crystal clear.

Try as they might, the Tories cannot block ratification nor, against a guillotine and three-line whip, even secure a national referendum as a condition. They simply will not have the numbers.

The question will then arise: between Royal Assent and a General Election, will David Cameron insist the Conservative pledge will not be betrayed even though it would mean a post factum plebiscite, like that of 1975? If he selects the option of integrity, UKIP voters are going to have to think very carefully.

For three elections UKIP has had great fun venting its spleen on Tory candidates for the treacheries of the Heseltine/Clark years. But it was cost-free fun; the Conservatives were not going to win anyway, even though UKIP intervention provably cost the Tories 25 seats in 2005. But if UKIP continues this shaft-the-Tory campaign in 2009 it could cost us our country.

Only a numpty really thinks what we all desire will happen in one fell swoop. It will happen if at all step by step and the first step will almost certainly be a convincing result to that referendum. If we miss that, we may never have one again. If the Tories lose in 2009 it is a guarantee we will never have one again. UKIP voters should think really carefully: which is more important? Revenge for Maastricht or our country back?

If David Cameron re-iterates the Tory manifesto pledge Conservative and UKIP voters should cease internecine feuding over the past and unite for that plebiscite, jointly targeting the servants of Brussels in every constituency.

(For those with a taste for irony: those 25 seats lost in 2005 thanks to UKIP intervention would have meant a swing of 50 seats from the Lib-Lab pro-EU

alliance against the Tories. That means they will probably cost us the vote on the referendum in the Commons this spring. Ever heard of a Pyrrhic victory?)

FREDERICK FORSYTH
Hertfordshire

Importance of Power

Dear Sir,
I can't speak for Dr Cooper, but I certainly made no suggestion of prohibiting anybody from voting for whoever they choose (nor as far as I can see did Dr Cooper - Letters 14th December). I cannot imagine where Bryan Smalley got that idea from. If people are so foolish as to vote for a party which will win no Westminster seats at all and merely help to perpetuate the incompetent and disastrous government of Gordon Brown, they are certainly entitled to do so.

If they were so foolish, however, they would ensure the final ratification and enforcement of the Lisbon Treaty/Constitution and our fate would be permanently sealed as a mere provincial government in the European Union. This strikes me as a suicidal attitude.

There is a faint hope that the return of a Conservative government might keep enough options open to enable us to continue the fight and therefore I continue to remind readers that there is only one way of realising this faint hope and that is by electing a Conservative government, however much this would distress the purists in UKIP.

Tom Collins is clearly dedicated to the UKIP route, however. I would remind him that determination to leave the EU is of little use unless by some unlikely miracle UKIP got the power to do so.

CHRISTINA SPEIGHT
London

Working for Change

Dear Sir,
Prima facie, Bryan Smalley makes a good justification for UKIP's fielding Parliamentary candidates against the

Conservatives (Letters, 8th January). But he leaves us wondering what practical result he hopes such demonstrations will achieve.

Doubtless he would answer "a UKIP government". But we have had enough experience by now to realise that hopes of electing even a UKIP MP - let alone a government - in this epoch are a bit premature.

Wouldn't it be quicker and easier to work for changes in the muster-roll of the established Parliamentary parties, leading them to adopt more-EU realist candidates and politics, simply by threatening to deploy UKIP's well-organised and not-inconsiderable vote tactically? It might even win more members for UKIP candidates; but (to adapt a phrase from Lord Tebbit) "Is having candidates what UKIP is for?"

ANTHONY HOYLE
Buckinghamshire

Historic Reversal

Dear Sir,
With the whole-hearted backing of Nicolas Sarkozy behind him Mr Blair could soon be President of the European Union (*eurofacts* 25th January).

This possibility is bound to raise some interesting issues for the protocol department of the Foreign Office. For example, when Mr Blair leaves his presidential palace in Brussels to come to this country on official business should his trip be accorded the status of a state visit with all the trappings and ceremony that this entails? Should he be feted in the City? Should he be invited to address a joint session of the Parliament whose powers he has done so much to reduce? Should the Queen entertain him at Buck House?

Cherie has often given the impression that she dislikes bowing to the Queen. But in the past she has met Her Majesty as the spouse of a mere prime minister; when she does so next time it may be as the wife of a head of state. Should the process be reversed? Cherie would obviously enjoy this and nothing would better symbolise Britain's subordinate status.

HECTOR BOFFEY
London

MEETINGS

The Freedom Association

0845 833 9626

Tuesday **12th February**, 1.00 pm

“Freedom in the City”

Jeffrey Titford MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Function Suite, The Counting House, 50 Cornhill, London EC3V

Admission Free

The Democracy Movement

(Surrey North and Spelthorne Branch)

01372 465379

Friday **15th February**, 8.00 pm

“EU - Give us a Referendum”

Marc Glendening, *Campaign Director, Democracy Movement*

Daniel Hannan MEP, *Columnist, Daily Telegraph*

PUBLIC MEETING

Claygate Village Hall, Claygate, Surrey

Admission Free

Democracy Movement, ‘I Want a Referendum’ group and Trade Unionists

Against the EU Constitution

020 7603 7796

Wednesday **27th February**,

starts 11.00 am ends in the evening

Mass Lobby of Parliament

Plus speakers in Westminster Central Hall

Marlborough Group

01672 515275

Sunday **2nd March**, 2.00 pm

“Is our UK membership of the EU legitimate?”

Lindsay Jenkins, *Author*

Michael Shrimpton, *Constitutional expert*

PUBLIC MEETING

Court Room of the Marlborough Town Hall, Marlborough, Wiltshire

Admission Free

UK Independence Party

01626 831340

Saturday **8th March**, 10.00 am

“Let the People Speak”

Speakers will include;

Nigel Farage MEP, Christopher Gill RD, Marc Glendening, Lord Pearson of Rannoch

SOUTHWEST RALLY

The Great Hall, Exeter University, Exeter, Devon

Admission Free

Hurlingham Club

0207 736 8411

Tuesday **11th March**, 7.30 pm

“Is it in Britain’s best interest to be a member of the European Union?”

For the motion;

Peter Luff, *Chairman of the European Movement*

Denis MacShane MP, *Former Minister for Europe*

Against the motion;

Christopher Booker, *Journalist and author*

Daniel Hannan MEP, *Columnist, Daily Telegraph*

PUBLIC DEBATE

The Hurlingham Club, Putney, London (100yds from Putney Bridge)

Admission £30 (Includes Supper)

{**Tickets from the Hurlingham Club**}

Gresham College

020 7831 0575

Wednesday **16th April**, 6.00 pm

“The British and American Constitutions”

Vernon Bogdanor CBE FBA, *Gresham Professor of Law*

Professor Cristina Rodrigues, *New York University*

PUBLIC MEETING

Royal College of Surgeons of England, 35-43 Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London

Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Monday **18th February**, 4.00 pm

Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into how contemporary issues of international policy are addressed through UK membership of international organisations (excluding the EU)*, including the impact and effectiveness and value for money from London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, and from Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine.

Thursday **21st February**, 10.10 am

Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into the EU Commission’s Communication on organ donation and transplantation* from Dr Anthony Warrens, Reader and Honorary Consultant Physician and Dr Keith Rigg, Vice-President, British Transplantation Society.

Thursday **28th February**, 10.10 am

Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into the EU Commission’s Communication on organ donation and transplantation* from Dr Paul Murphy, Intensive Therapy Unit Consultant, Leeds General Infirmary; and Jayne Fisher, Chair, UK Transplant Coordinators’ Association (UKTCA).

Note:

Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning

DIARY OF EVENTS

2008

UK Government Budget **12th March**

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

European Reform Treaty to be Ratified **December**

2009

Czech Republic takes over EU presidency **1st January**

European Parliamentary Elections **11th June**

Thinker Tailor Soldier Spy

by Harry Beckhough. **£18.99**
A remarkable book about a soldier, code-breaker, intelligence officer, teacher and political activist.

A Democratic Europe: An Alternative to the EU

by Richard Body. **£10.00**
Sir Richard lays out the case for a truly democratic European Union as opposed to an undemocratic super power.

Scared To Death

by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **Hdbk £16.95**
This latest book by the famous duo explores the tricks used to extend EU power and control.

Gordon Is A Moron

by Vernon Coleman. **£9.99**
Analysis of Brown's Chancellorship.

The Problems for Post-Communist Countries in the Context of the EU

by CRCE. **£11.95**
Papers from the 2006 colloquium in Bled.

The Bumper Book of Government Waste

by Matthew Elliott and Lee Rotherham. **£9.99**
An exposé of the huge levels of waste in Britain and the EU.

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by Peter Gardner. **£9.99**
An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

A Life of Mayhem, Money and Unintentional Treason

by J Brian Heywood. **£9.99**
This novel clearly shows how easy it is for good intentions to be used by anyone with ambitions for a world government.

The General Rule

A Guide to Customary Weights and Measures
by Vivian Linacre. **£12.99**
The author reflects the needs for imperial units in every day usage.

Lost Illusions: British Foreign Policy

by Ian Milne. **£4.00**
Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.

Warning:

Immigration Can Seriously Damage Your Wealth

by Anthony Scholefield. **£6.00**
Scholefield argues that while immigration increases a nation's GDP it must inevitably reduce per capita income.

Corruption - The World's Big C Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures

by Ian Senior. **£12.50**
Senior shows how corruption in the EU is becoming worse and why the UK should not sign up to the proposed European Constitution.

Allegations

Selected works by Alexander Litvinenko
Edited by Pavel Stroilov. **£12.95**
Translated from Russian with an introduction by Vladimir Bukovsky.

Video

Britain On The Brink

by Sanity. **DVD or VHS Video £5.00**
Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

Send payment to THE JUNE PRESS LTD PO BOX 119 TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA

Tel: 08456 120 175
Email: info@junepress.com

WEB SALES 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)	£16
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 Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
CIB	020 8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
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	
Global Vision	www.global-vision.net
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Nick Clegg MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006