

Could the EU act to avert a financial crisis?

A decision-making process that requires months of inter-governmental horse-trading is not one which is ideally suited to dealing with any urgent major problem

It can now be taken for granted that any crisis worthy of the name (as well as some which are plainly not) will be used to justify new measures of European political integration. We waited patiently to see who would be the first to exploit the storms which have recently swept through global financial markets. The prize would appear to belong to Mr Brian Cowen, the Irish Prime Minister who at the outset of the crisis said that European governments would have been far better placed to deal with the situation if only the Lisbon treaty had been in place. Alas, the poor Irish people didn't understand the treaty and consequently failed to see how it could protect them in times of crisis, or so he implied.

No Evidence

Mr Cowen's motives, unlike some of his political tactics, are transparent: he is trying to terrify the Irish people into accepting the treaty at a second referendum to be held in late 2009 or early 2010; happily there is no evidence to date that he is succeeding.

Nevertheless, the extent of public fears of a deep and lasting recession make it necessary for eurosceptics to have clear answers to those who say that greater economic integration can afford a higher degree of protection against the problems which presently beset all of the world's economies.

It is true that decisions taken in this country have made matters worse than

they otherwise would have been. We would include among these the Government's decisions in relation to public spending, the failure of the Bank of England to warn sufficiently strongly that increasing money supply was feeding into asset prices and fuelling an unsustainable housing bubble, Gordon Brown's cynical manipulation of economic data to justify his profligacy as well as his absurd claim to have abolished the business cycle.

It does not, of course, follow from this that Britain would be better placed to deal with the present problems if it were in the eurozone or, more generally, that the zone's existing members would be better protected if economic integration had been carried on to a further stage.

Whatever the long-term costs and consequences of the steps taken by the US Treasurer Hank Paulson to deal with the crippling burden of toxic debt no one could deny that America has reacted to the crisis boldly and decisively.

Storm Clouds

Could Europe act with equal resolve in the way that is implied? This is not entirely an academic question since the economic storm clouds over Europe are still darkening.

Any answer must begin by recognising the obvious fact that there is no European Treasury and no individuals with the influence and

range of powers enjoyed by Mr Paulson. Although constrained by EU regulations and by the spending limits imposed by the Maastricht Treaty member states are still largely on their own when financial storm clouds gather.

This state of affairs can, of course, be used to argue for further measures of economic integration. But the extent of divergence between the economies of EU members makes the kind of sweeping measures announced by Paulson a virtual impossibility. Such powers would necessarily pre-suppose the existence of a European public opinion which could be mobilised in support of drastic remedies; no such thing exists and there is no reason to think that it is likely to come into being. In the absence of these conditions the European reaction to a major financial crisis is likely to be characterised by indecision or paralysis; for rather similar reasons the European Union has proved itself indecisive when it comes to issues of war and peace.

Explosive Risks

The truth is that decision-making processes that require months of inter-governmental horse-trading and which are subject to lengthy appeals to the European Court by interested parties are not ones which are ideally suited to dealing with any urgent major problem. The federalist remedy - more

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: No Lisbon Treaty until 2010, says Juncker p.2 - Is this where democracy leads? p.2 - No European demos , says Economist p.2 - Giscard's speech highlights weakness in position of Tory eurosceptics p.3 - A special EU status for Britain? p.4 - A tale of everyday life in Brussels p.5 - EU fails to sign off accounts for 14th year p.5 - Chance would be a fine thing p.6

No Lisbon Treaty until 2010, says Juncker

The European Union's Lisbon Treaty will not enter into force before the European Parliament elections in June 2009, as was initially hoped, and is unlikely to do so before 1st January 2010 either, Luxembourg's Prime Minister, Jean-Claude Juncker said in Brussels on 17th September.

"If I was the Irish Prime Minister, I wouldn't go for a second referendum in the next few months."

"I don't think that the treaty will be in place in June [2009], when the next European elections will take place," Mr Juncker, who is also the president of the eurogroup - comprising the finance ministers of the eurozone - said at a conference organised by the Brussels-based European Policy Centre (EPC).

In order for the document to be in place by June 2009, it would have to be ratified by all 27 EU member states by February - something which according to Luxembourg's premier is *"not realistic"*.

"It's not possible to have this treaty

enter into force before the year 2010," he stressed.

Mr Juncker is the first high-level politician to publicly state that the Lisbon treaty may be impossible to adopt next year.

Originally, the document - aimed to replace the failed European Constitution and to provide for a better and more efficient functioning of the EU - was planned to enter into force in January 2009.

But Irish citizens voted No in a referendum on the treaty in June, casting doubt over the possibility to reach the goal.

EU leaders will be expecting to hear from Irish Prime Minister, Brian Cowen, on the issue at a summit meeting in October, with the EU insisting ratification of the document should continue in other member states, and a second referendum in Ireland seen by some as a possibility to by-pass the June No vote.

Mr Juncker, however, said that a possible re-vote in Ireland should not

take place in the immediate future.

"Given the economic crisis we're living in, given the confidence that's lacking, given that governments are increasingly unpopular all over Europe, organising a referendum around a European treaty is a dangerous road to take", he said.

If the Lisbon treaty does not come into force in 2009, that will affect the composition of both the European Parliament and the European Commission next year.

Both would have to be conducted under the EU's current set of rules, the Nice treaty, which would mean that there would be 785 instead of 751 seats, as foreseen in the Lisbon treaty, in the parliament.

But it would also reduce the number of commissioners in the next commission - to be nominated by November 2009 - as under Nice, the number should be *"less than the number of member states"*.

Is this where democracy leads?

What would be the implications of a decision by an incoming Tory Government to hold a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty?

According to Denis MacShane, the former Minister for Europe, it would mean

"...a feast for all the xenophobic and

isolationist forces in British politics and be a major boost for the BNP, UKIP and those 'better off out' Tories who want Britain to quit Europe."

"David Cameron... would plunge Britain into the maelstrom of a feast of anti-Europeanism by campaigning to repudiate the decision of the Commons

and Lords this year to ratify the Lisbon Treaty."

"The BNP, UKIP and all other anti-European forces would join in to indulge in months of xenophobic and isolationist hysteria."

Open Europe blog, posted on 19th September 2008.

No European demos, says *Economist*

"There is no European demos and, across 27 member-states, there will never be... Ireland shows that most voters do not understand the EU, and do not really want to. What they do understand is national politics, and care about who wins national

elections. So the only coherent answer to disenchantment with the EU lies in preserving a leading role for national governments and parliaments. The EU's best hope of enjoying democratic support for its extravagantly complex workings is a devolved form of

consent, channelled through national representatives.

Anything else is neither sane, nor sensible."

Charlemagne column, *The Economist*, 19th September 2008.

Continued from page 1

Is the EU capable of averting a financial crisis?

integration - can only be adopted by accepting the kind of explosive political risk entailed by ignoring the wishes and interests of millions of ordinary people; these are likely to be unwilling to put notions of the

European common good before the national interest at moments of crisis or danger. If their wishes are ignored they will take direct action. Successive British governments may have got into a mess over Europe by pursuing

incompatible goals (see Giscard's speech on page 3); ultimately European governments are likely to get into a bigger mess through the pursuit of a political project which treats ordinary voters with contempt.

Giscard's speech highlights weaknesses in position of Tory eurosceptics

Fear of losing a place at the EU top table prevents straight thinking on Europe, argues Anthony Scholefield

Former French President Giscard D'Estaing's address to the *Global Vision/Daily Telegraph* Westminster Conference on 8th September highlights problems a Tory government will face in dealing with the EU.

Most EU-realists left the conference with some respect for Giscard's readiness to listen to and respond to questions thoughtfully. He was courteous and frank, candidly admitting that the Lisbon Treaty was "simply a legal re-packaging of the Constitution, albeit unreadable".

Giscard's main and incontrovertible point was that it was the British who decided to join the EU and to sign up to the various integration treaties. No-one forced the British government or Parliament to join, or applied great pressure to make it do so. "Let us note first of all that the UK negotiated and ratified all the EU treaties adopted during the period", he said.

Giscard's thesis was that the other EU countries want more economic and political integration while Britain believes that there is enough already or even too much.

Accordingly, he believes that Britain should be allowed a 'special status' within the European Union. But a close reading of his text reveals that this status would apply only in relation to future integration. He was not proposing a 'special status' for Britain in respect of treaties already signed or in respect of the Lisbon Treaty but for measures he anticipates will take place in future years.

"For a majority of member-states, representing a clear majority of the population, the position is that integration must be continued as set out in the Union Treaty and that the EU is not yet 'complete'. At a time when new powers are emerging ... the unification of Europe must be made more effective and understandable ... The building and development of the

Common Foreign and Security Policy must be reinforced, gradually being detached from exclusively national impetuses. And the Parliament must conquer the democratic legitimacy which the election of its members confers on it."

However, as the EU contemplates further integration measures Giscard recognises this will not be popular with Britain and some others and that new negotiations would be exhausting for participants.

'Valuable Club'

He therefore favours a 'special status' for Britain which would enable it to state at the beginning of a round of negotiations whether or not it would participate.

While this idea might meet some concerns, it elicited somewhat contradictory reactions from a number of panel members. Lord Howell, Deputy Leader of the Conservatives in the Lords, was robustly critical of the "bloc-ism" of Giscard's vision of Europe but nevertheless described the EU as "an immensely valuable club" - if too ambitious. Iain Martin, Head of Comment at the *Daily Telegraph* said he did not wish to leave the EU, but wanted "a different relationship".

Lord Trimble did say that he feared inertia (in the EU or the UK?) would keep the project going and, in any case, even the present status lacked political legitimacy.

A reasoned response to Giscard might be to graciously accept the 'special status' in relation to future negotiations while making it clear that the Lisbon treaty must be aborted, the financial costs of EU membership to Britain reduced and the *acquis communautaire* hacked back. The acceptance of these conditions would be made a pre-condition of future negotiations.

UKIP and the Better Off Out MPs

have a clear-cut policy position on Europe but the Tory position reflects a jumble of emotions in which distaste for EU integration competes with a fear of being "left out" and "left behind". Irrespective of whether this accurately reflects public attitudes this is not conducive to coherent policy-making or even to straight thinking.

Another worrying reaction of some of the Tory panellists was that when pressed by Stuart Wheeler, they displayed an indifference to the economics of British membership.

The EU was designed from the start to form an economic union of German industry and French agriculture. As a result of its world-wide trading Britain was always going to have difficulty in adjusting to this situation. A country which belongs to a customs union but which consistently runs a deficit with the other members inevitably ends up subsidising them.

Additionally there are the increased gross and net budgetary costs. Stuart Wheeler suggested that these amounted to some 15 per cent of the post-tax income of a British family which is in line with estimates made by Ian Milne in 2004. (Publication, "A Cost Too Far?").

These are colossal deductions from the average UK's family income and draw many into poverty.

A bit of joined-up thinking by the social justice wing of the Conservatives might pay dividends here, but there is little ground for optimism when even the self-styled eurosceptics within the party talk about the EU as "an immensely valuable club" appear to want to cling to the top table and to be in on all the decisions and agreements. It came as no surprise therefore when Iain Martin reported Cameron recently as saying about the EU,

"It sounds to me like one for the second term".

A special EU status for Britain?

The following is an extract of a speech by former French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing at a conference staged by Global Vision and the Daily Telegraph on 8th September, 2008

I was myself at 10 Downing Street the week that Tony Blair announced his referendum. I asked him what the chances of success were. He told me that he was optimistic, and described his three-part strategy: parliamentary debate, general election then referendum, all of which he thought he could win.

That referendum never took place. It was replaced in the UK by a parliamentary debate which allowed the ratification of the Treaty of Lisbon, which is simply a legal re-packaging of the Constitution, all be it unreadable and which scrupulously reproduces the innovations set out in the Constitution. As far as the UK is concerned, it adds a "clause of exception" affecting the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

During this period, the UK has maintained its refusal to adopt the (inter-governmental) Schengen Agreement, which aims to remove police controls at the internal borders of member-states and replace them at the periphery of the area.

Thus, the present position of the UK is that of a State which has participated in all the negotiations and adopted the texts aimed at improving the functioning of the EU, while insisting on opt-outs allowing it not to apply certain provisions of the treaties.

The importance of these opt-outs - from the single currency, from the Charter of Fundamental Rights, from Schengen - constitutes a kind of "special status" for the UK vis-a-vis the EU.

The use of this "special status" - already present in the Churchillian vision - deserves to be examined at a time when there is a risk that different views concerning the continuation and deepening of European integration divide the member-states.

Two different approaches to European integration can be seen.

For a majority of member-states,

the population, the position is that integration must be continued as set out in the Union Treaty, and that the EU is not yet "complete". At a time when new powers are emerging - as the Olympic Games in Beijing have shown - the unification of Europe must be made more effective and understandable. In those areas over which the Union has competence, decisions should be able to be taken by qualified double majority, thus avoiding the delays and uncertainty of the vetos of twenty-seven member-states. The building and development of the Common Foreign and Security Policy must be reinforced, gradually being detached from exclusively national impetuses. And the Parliament must conquer the democratic legitimacy which the election of its members confers on it.

For these States, the EU is on the right path, but its integration needs to be improved, and fresh efforts devoted to accomplishing this task.

For other States, including the UK, as far as can be judged from its political parties and public opinion, the degree of European integration achieved today is enough, and should not be deepened. The dominant feeling is "too much" rather than "not enough". The excessive interventionism of Brussels damages the efficient functioning of the market. And other vital relationships, especially that with the USA, ought to be given more weight, as well as the new factors resulting from economic globalisation. These States do not want more "initiatives" and would prefer a more modest conception of European union.

Let us be realistic: these two approaches, these two stances, are incompatible, yet, at the moment, they co-exist within the EU. To avoid the possibility that these tensions grow and end up in a crisis, we need to ask ourselves what is the best way to go

forward. The thinking behind today's event is a good example.

It seems to me that the solution needs to be sought on the basis of the application of a democratic principle, at the EU level. If a majority of EU citizens judge that the level of integration - that is to say the degree of union reached today - is sufficient, there is no need to bring forward new initiatives, and tensions will lessen.

If, on the other hand, a majority of EU citizens, of which I am one, believe that our degree of union, of conscience and action, is not yet adequate to meet the challenges of today's world, then we will need to envisage new advances, remove vetos and reinforce a strictly European Common Foreign and Security Policy.

This difference of views may be handled with permanent antagonism, some seeking to deepen integration through new initiatives, others to apply the brake by complicating negotiations, flattering nationalisms or devising subtle manoeuvres to encourage further enlargement, all matters in which British diplomacy has incomparable expertise. This approach is exhausting for the participants, and disappointing for public opinion, which is forever presented with negative results.

The other method would consist of learning the lessons of recent decades: European integration can be continued, and remain compatible with the participation of the UK, on condition that the latter be allowed to opt-out of initiatives it judges to be incompatible with its national prerogatives. Such opt-outs could be claimed by other member-states, as is the case with monetary union. The recognition of the entirety of these exceptions would equate to the granting to the UK of a "special status", the operation of which would have to be meticulously worked out.

A tale of everyday life in Brussels

Barroso's plans for cutting EU red tape have come to absolutely nothing - and here is why

Here is a story that illustrates much about life in Brussels and the dynamic which determines what happens there - and what doesn't.

In September 2007 the former Bavarian Prime Minister, Edward Stoiber, was appointed head of a high-level group charged with slashing red tape. The EU President Manuel Barroso described the group as a "flagship project for the Commission". Enterprise and Industry Commissioner, Guenter Verheugen, declared that "...the group will play a crucial role in identifying the unnecessary burdens we need to improve".

The gullible could be excused for thinking that when it came to hacking back the jungle of regulation at last, the EU meant business.

The first results of the group were promising: it reported the EU could save up to €7.3 billion a year merely by reducing the amount of information that companies were obliged to send to Brussels.

Currently, there are no less than 344 different reporting obligations. The total cost of providing this information totals €20 billion. In order to surpass the EU's target figure of 25 per cent reduction in the cost of red tape, Mr

Stoiber's group came up with proposals which would save €7.3 billion. These were presented to Charlie McCreevy, Commissioner in May. Mr McCreevy promised action "very soon".

What happened then? Absolutely nothing.

"Actually we haven't heard from him since", said Mr Stoiber during a meeting of the European Parliament's legal affairs committee on 22nd September, when he urged MEPs to press for the introduction of his proposals.

"I hope the European Commission, especially Commissioner Charlie McCreevy will say yes or no to these proposals, which are not only consultative documents, but proposals to be taken seriously", he said.

"It would be awful if you set up a high-level group with all the pipes and drums in the attempt to move the Commission, and this high-level group makes proposals, but then nothing happens", said Mr Stoiber who suggested that while his plans had the backing of Mr Barroso they were opposed by other Commissioners and their staffs.

The story provides perfect validation of the Public Choice theory which

interprets political behaviour in terms of the self-interest of politicians and civil servants. More regulation means enhanced career prospects for the eurocrats as well as additional powers for the EU; a reduction in the volume of regulation would mean the reverse.

It is hardly surprising therefore that Mr Stoiber's group should consist of 14 "honorific members" but meets only twice a year and has a support staff of "three or four" - compared to the many hundreds involved in the work of creating new regulations.

The fate of Mr Stoiber's plans is clear. Because he has made a bit of a public fuss and in order to demonstrate that contrary to appearance he is not a total patsy a few regulations will be repealed or watered down - while the total number of regulations continues to grow rapidly.

As it does so readers may wish to take part in a competition announced by Mr Stoiber to assist him in his hopeless task. This is entitled "Best Idea for Red Tape Reduction". We suspect that readers may converge on a single compelling idea for relieving Britain from the burden of EU red tape - but it is not one that is likely to put them among the prizewinners.

EU fails to sign off accounts for 14th year running

According to the online news publication *European Voice*, Siim Kallas, the EU Commissioner for audit, has announced that the European Court of Auditors will not sign off the EU's 2007 accounts - marking the 14th consecutive year in which the EU has failed to have its accounts approved. Auditors will say they found only a slight improvement in the legality and regularity of payments between the financial years 2006 and 2007. The Court is to publish its annual report on the EU's accounts on 10th November, but Kallas has told his fellow Commissioners that another negative verdict is imminent.

Speaking to MEPs, Kallas admitted that there were "real and

unquestioned" weaknesses in 17 areas including research policy, the European refugee fund, structural funds, external actions and rural development.

For the Common Agricultural Policy - which amounted to 12.4 billion euros in 2007 - the auditors found that rural development expenditure was "particularly prone to errors" because of the complexity of rules for complying with the programme. For the Structural and Cohesion Funds, worth 45.5 billion euros in 2007, the auditors found that there had been an improvement, with 46 per cent of projects free from error, compared to 31 per cent in 2006. But in terms of financial impact the situation is almost

unchanged. The Court estimated that 11 per cent of the total amount reimbursed to member states should not have been reimbursed, compared to 12 per cent (or 4 billion euros) in 2006.

With the Court's verdict, MEPs have concluded that the European Commission will miss one of the declared objectives of José Manuel Barroso - to have its accounts signed off. Jan Mulder, a Dutch Liberal MEP and a member of the Budgetary Control Committee has described the improvements made under the Barroso Commission as "extremely slow". "At this rate we'll achieve a positive DAS in 20 years' time", he said.

LETTERS

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

Privatising Profits, Socialising Costs

Dear Sir,

Your article on Spain's economic problems (19th September) does not surprise. Britain, the USA and Spain have all been testing to destruction the idea that mass immigration is a net benefit. Their policies on immigration have reinforced the slack money policies pursued since 2001. This has led in all three instances to an unsustainable boom and ensured that it will be these three countries that will suffer most in the present crisis.

The USA and Spain have gone much further in pursuing a pro-immigration policy than the UK. Spain has consistently regularized the position of illegal immigrants, allowing them, therefore, to move throughout the EU. The latest amnesty in 2005 regularized nearly one million illegal immigrants but, three years later, there are a further one million illegal immigrants. Sarkozy, quite correctly, rebuked the Spanish in 2005 for their amnesty saying, "*We see the damage created by the phenomenon of massive regularization. Every country which has conducted an operation of massive regularization finds itself the next month [in a position that] does not allow it to master the situation any more*".

According to the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE), Spain has 5.2 million immigrants and the largest number of immigrants in the world, after the USA, and, as you point out, unemployment is already at 11 per cent.

There is an open dispute in the Spanish government, with some ministers wanting to shut the door, but

the ultra-feminist deputy Prime Minister, Maria Teresa Fernandez de la Vega, has stated, "*There will be recruitment of foreign workers in their country of origin because we need them*".

It has always been obvious that mass immigration of even those with average skills but without capital must impoverish the receiving country, while benefiting the corporate and private employers of cheap labour. In effect the latter privatize the benefits of immigration and socialise the costs. This applies to an even greater extent to those with below average skills who also represent a fiscal drain.

The reason for this is that the receiving country has to provide an appropriate share of capital and wealth for new residents. This capital is, in the case of the UK, some 65 times the annual contribution of the average worker in capital additions - an enormous sum. In rough figures, each immigrant to the UK with one dependant, requires £150,000 of instant funding but his contribution to the GDP of residents, according to Mr. Byrne, Minister of Immigration, is about £6 per year.

At least the UK government and the Opposition have refused to go down the route of regularizing illegals, despite the urgings of Boris Johnson and numerous ecclesiastics. There have been some under-the-counter regularizations due to breakdown in the immigration control process. In the USA, however, both Obama and McCain strongly advocate the regularization of illegal immigrants and both propose to introduce proposals in Congress to achieve this.

While massive immigration is far from being the only reason why the USA, the UK and Spain find

themselves the countries most buffeted by the present crisis their economies have all been characterised by slack money, a construction bubble and massive immigration. By privatizing the benefits of cheap labour and cheap money this has blinded the political class to the costs of the binge. These have been met by the public taxpayer and by low-income workers who have to compete for reduced pay with the immigrants no longer needed by a bubble economy.

ANTHONY SCHOLEFIELD
London

Disunited Kingdom

Dear Sir,

R.A. Hopkins contends that if Scotland got its independence, all members of the UK would need to re-apply for membership of the EU as the UK would no longer exist. In this, he is plain wrong. The UK did not cease to exist when the 26 counties of what is now the Republic of Ireland left. Pakistan did not cease to exist when it lost Bangladesh.

And even if Wales and Northern Ireland joined Scotland in the rush for the exit, and the UK truly did cease to exist, under international law, England, as by far the largest component of the former UK, would be regarded as the UK's successor state.

Whether or not an independent Scotland would be granted automatic membership of the EU is another question, but we must be certain that the Scots, by leaving the UK, will not take the rest of us out of the EU. That is a job for us to do.

JOSEPH B FOX
Surrey

Chance would be a fine thing

"The Polish president may not sign the law ratifying the treaty. The Czechs could decide not to submit ratification of the treaty to their newly re-elected senate, and in the meanwhile the British Prime Minister, Gordon Brown,

who is worn out, may call an early election. If he is replaced by David Cameron, the latter might review the ratification of the treaty...if Irish ratification is not legally completed by June, there will be no more Lisbon

Treaty. And in the European elections, the Eurosceptics will triumph."

Alan Lamassoure, aide to President Sarkozy of France, quoted in *The Irish Times*, 18th September 2008.

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **16th October**, 6.00 pm

“Hitler’s Victories 1939-41.”

Richard J Evans FBA, *Visiting Gresham Professor of History*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Hall Inn, Holborn, London
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Monday **20th October**, 7.00 pm

“The Creation of Anglo-American Grand Strategy 1941-45: Anglosphere Planning for the Liberation of Europe”

Andrew Roberts, *Author and historian*

plus

“The United States, a United Europe and the United Kingdom”

Dr Irwin Stelzer, *Economic and political commentator for the Daily Telegraph*

PUBLIC MEETING

Foreign Press Association, 11 Carlton Terrace, London SW1Y 5AT

Admission £10

(Includes wine, juice, mineral water and nibbles)

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **21st October**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidential Elections”

and

Tuesday **28th October**, 6.00 pm

“The American President: Gerald Ford”

Vernon Bogdanor CBE, FBA,
Emeritus Gresham Professor of Law

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard’s Hall Inn, Holborn, London
Admission Free

United Kingdom Independence Party
East Devon Branch
01395 276130

Friday **24th October**, 7.30 pm

Earl of Dartmouth
Nigel Farage MEP, *UKIP, Leader*
Laura Moralee, *UKIP Youth*

EUP Launch and

PUBLIC MEETING

West Hill Village Hall, near Ottery St Mary, Devon

Admission Free

Marlborough Group
01672 515275

Sunday **9th November**, 2.00 pm

Michael Ancram MP

PUBLIC MEETING

Assembly Room of the Marlborough Town Hall, Marlborough, Wiltshire

Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Annual Conference

Saturday **22nd November**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

The Great Hall, King’s College, London
Admission (details to follow)
(Includes drinks and lunch)

FREE

Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

Contact Details

eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65

or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Wednesday **8th October**, 10.30 am
Evidence will be heard on *Government Communications* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **8th October**, 11.30 am
Evidence will be heard on *Government Communications* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **15th October**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on *Genomic Medicine* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **16th October**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Western Balkans* from Jim Murphy MP, Minister for Europe, Foreign & Commonwealth Office.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Parliamentary Recess Ends **6th October**

EU Summit **15-16th October**

EU Summit **11-12th December**

European Reform Treaty to be Ratified? **December**

2009

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

Slovakia to adopt euro **1st January**

European Parliamentary Elections **11th June**

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

2010

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

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

Germany's Fourth Reich

by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Beckhough a former code-breaker and intelligence officer, shows how the EU is being formed by the needs of Germany.

The Treaty of Lisbon in Perspective

by BMDF. **£27.50**

Detailed analysis and review together with the full text of the Treaty as signed in Lisbon in December 2007.

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.

The End Of The English

The European Superstate

by David Brown. **£6.99**

As an apology to all grandchildren, it analysis how the EU plans for control of the UK have destroyed democracy. Required reading for all those worried in any way about the EU's power over us.

The O.F.P.I.S. File

The Organisation for the Preservation of Individuality and Sovereignty

by Vernon Coleman. **£15.95**

Why citizens all across Europe are fed up with the EU.

A Tribute to Ralph Harris

1924-2006

by CRCE. **£9.95**

Lord Harris of High Cross was one of the leading figures in the fight against the EU and injustice everywhere.

Squandered

How Gordon Brown is wasting over one trillion pounds of our money

by David Craig. **£8.99**

An exposé of the huge levels of financial waste by government on Quangos and Advisers, which are self serving at the tax-payers expense.

The Costs Of Regulation

And How the EU Makes them worse

by William Mason. **£4.00**

How by imposing EU regulations power is taken from national Governments.

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.

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.

The Principles of

British Foreign Policy

by Philip Vander Elst. **£4.00**

Should BFP reflect political principles or should it merely be shaped by current conceptions of national self-interest?

Dead In The Water

by Tom Wise MEP. **£3.00**

How the Common Fisheries Policy destroys lives, economies and environments.

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

FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£17
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	0116 2874 622
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	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006