

EU membership 'costs Britain £100 bn every year'

*An independent cost-benefit analysis shows that membership of the
European Union may cost more than the NHS*

How much does it cost the UK to belong to the EU? The Government says membership results in a net economic benefit, not a cost, but it has resisted demands for a rigorous cost/benefit analysis. Since the Prime Minister maintains that the forthcoming referendum on the constitution is, in effect, a vote on membership there can be no grounds for withholding the single most important economic fact about membership that the public would need to make up its mind. Even if, as we believe, Blair's claim about the referendum's purpose is merely a scare tactic, an objective assessment of present and future costs and benefits is a necessary condition of an informed public debate on the issues.

Government reluctance

However, the Government's reluctance to order an inquiry into the costs of membership - and its decision to block such an attempt by members of the House of Lords earlier this year - have become more explicable in the light of a study of the economic implications of Britain's membership of the European Union by Ian Milne, the founder editor of *eurofacts* and a frequent contributor to its columns.

The results of the study, *A Cost Too Far?* published by Civitas, the London-based think-tank, suggests that the costs are huge - and are likely to grow. Using government statistics the study suggests that the current

recurring annual direct net cost to the UK of EU membership is likely to range between three and five per cent of GDP with a "most likely" figure of four per cent, equivalent to £40 billion a year - i.e £13 billion more than is spent on national defence, and roughly equal to the combined excise duties on drink, fuel and tobacco. Of this £40 billion an estimated £20 billion is the direct net annual cost of EU regulation. A further £15 billion is the direct net cost to the UK of the Common Agricultural Policy, while another £5 billion is Britain's net contribution to the EU budget.

According to the study, the heavy burden of direct net economic cost will not get lighter; at best it will not get worse. The more likely scenario is that the net cost of being a member of the European Union will grow - perhaps dramatically so. This gloomy prognosis is due partly to measures already in the EU pipeline as a result of the EU Constitution and Enlargement and partly because Britain is locked into a regional bloc in unmistakable long term economic decline.

Missed opportunities

Milne's "most likely" estimate does not include "opportunity cost" - the cost of missed opportunities arising from the fact that the Continental Europe with which Britain has been forced to converge is seriously under-performing. He poses the question - which our political and academic elites

ought to have asked, but haven't - Could the UK have done better had it been free of the constraints imposed by EU membership, and if so, how much better?

This question inevitably leads to others: "What if the formidable energies and resources that the British government devotes to integration with 'Europe' had been diverted to standing free in the rest of the world? What if HM Government had not spent much of the last ten years fending off the effects of the Working Time Directive, the Withholding Tax and much else and spent the time and money negotiating FTAs [Free Trade Agreements] with the fastest growing economies of the world, and with further liberalising the domestic economy itself?"

Cultural affinities

In order to answer these questions the British economy is compared with peer group economies with which it shares political, legal and cultural affinities - those of the so-called Anglo-sphere countries: the US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand. During the decade 1993-2003 these economies grew by an average 3.47 per cent a year - compared to the average UK growth rate of 2.86 per cent a year.

It follows that if the UK economy had grown at the same average rate as its peer group economies between 1993 and 2003 its real GDP in 2003 would have been 6 per cent higher than its

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: 'EU transformation' the way forward p.2 - Number Ten shoots itself in the foot p.4 - How the EP votes are really counted p.4 - Three quarters of City regulations comes from the EU p.5 - The sour taste of sugar subsidy reform p.5

'EU transformation' is the right way forward, not 'out now' - and here's how to do it

*Dominic Cummings and James Frayne of the New Frontiers Foundation
devise a strategy for eurosceptics*

"If revolution there is to be, then let us rather undertake it than undergo it." Bismarck.

As Lenin said, "everything is connected to everything else", and we face a series of objectives: (a) stopping Blair winning a referendum on the euro or Constitution; (b) taking back powers from the EU; (c) the renaissance of confidence in markets and independent government, which, in the current culture, requires a Conservative Party revival. They require sequencing in terms of emphasis but must run in parallel.

The public divides roughly as follows: (a) about 20 per cent that would vote for the euro and Constitution tomorrow; (b) about 35 per cent that would vote never to the euro and out of the EU tomorrow; (c) about thirty percent that thinks, "I don't like the euro or Constitution and would vote "no" tomorrow, but I know little about the issues, they bore me, and although I don't like the EU much I would worry about leaving".

Those in this latter group say they want "more information" while admitting that they would ignore it if provided because it is a boring non-

crucial issue. Certain things have got through: "we have done better than them outside the euro"; there is a growing awareness of European economic problems; "it's not inevitable - they said that about the euro". The basic argument that "we all gain from sharing power with Europe and influencing the outcome" is not generally believed outside intellectual circles. Instead, the EU is seen as a vehicle whereby "foreigners always shaft us". The EU's reputation is now tied to the general contempt for our political process, but there is a residual thought that "the EU is necessary for trade", and that we may "lose out" if we leave.

Business, so crucial in 1975, has become much more hostile to the euro and the EU. About 70 per cent of small and over half of large businesses oppose the euro and support taking power back over crucial areas of the economy. Increasingly, it is recognised that EU integration is the fast track to the dustbin of history.

However, though the arc of public opinion is favourable, we should remember how little people know and are interested, and how hard it is to get

an agreed message that penetrates the public psyche. Cultural elites cling to the view that being pro-EU is "modern" and that there is something reactionary about viewing the EU as a disaster. Though this feeling is crumbling slowly, it is still pervasive in the media world.

Practically, we are hampered by vastly inferior political warfare networks compared with America, viz people, ideas, money, and management (Heritage, a single American think tank, has a budget of over \$50 million dollars and a staff of over 200 people - Conservative Central Office's communications machine has an annual budget of less than £2 million and one researcher for the whole of foreign affairs); a state broadcaster that is culturally hostile to markets and sympathetic to the EU; TV advertising is illegal and there is no TV station fulfilling the same function as Fox News; Parliament has decayed and is not attractive to those who could revitalise it. The Conservative Party has not had a convincing vision of Britain for over a decade.

Consequently, though opinion is

Continued on P.3

Continued from P.1

EU membership 'costs more than the NHS'

actual real GDP in 2003.

In other words, when one adds on the costs described earlier to the opportunity costs, the current recurring annual net cost to the UK of EU membership is ten per cent of GDP, or approximately £100 billion per year at present levels of UK GDP. This is about one-and-a-quarter the sum spent each year on the British National Health Service.

Moreover, in the absence of fundamental reform in continental Europe the opportunity costs are likely to grow still further. If the calculation made in respect of the previous decade

were extended to the next ten years the difference in the size of the UK economy at the end of the period would be 12.5 per cent, resulting in an opportunity cost in 2013 of £125 bn annually at today's values.

Professional economists tend to be extremely reluctant to estimate opportunity costs since these depend on assumptions which may well turn out to be wrong. However, it is quite clear that membership of the EU has denied Britain important economic opportunities whose cumulative impact has been very great indeed. Those who take the trouble to read Ian

Milne's study - and all those in public life from the Prime Minister down should do so as a priority - will be struck by the fact that while his estimates of such costs turn out to be huge the assumptions on which his calculation is based are actually cautious and conservative.

A Cost Too Far? by Ian Milne, Civitas, Downloadable free from www.civitas.org.uk

Printed copies £8.50 each, available from The June Press; please see back page.

'EU transformation' the way forward

moving our way, as with the winter of discontent and union reform, it may take a large and damaging crisis in the EU to move elite and public opinion away from the conventional wisdom of supporting the status quo. This should not affect our goal but should affect how we define priorities and effective action. How should we proceed?

First, there needs to be an organisation dedicated purely to winning the referendum if it is held. Vote No has been created by many of the same people who ran the successful anti-euro campaign (particularly Alex Hickman, who was the central figure in that organisation). This will merge with others, including Left groups, after the election if the referendum is really on. It must focus only on marketing (a) EU failure, and (b) why the Constitution is bad for living standards and democracy. It would be a mistake to claim that "a 'no' vote means we will have to leave the EU". This would needlessly maximise the odds of losing the referendum and is anyway factually incorrect.

Disastrous Divisions

Second, we need to drag elite opinion towards a policy that involves taking back power over far more than fish and aid policy. However, given the constraints above, nobody should delude themselves about the chances of successfully marketing an "out now" campaign in the immediate future. Business will not support it and even those who want to leave will not support or fund it in significant numbers. It would precipitate disastrous divisions in the Conservative Party and allow the media to damage the anti-Constitution campaign. An "out now" campaign gets the sequencing wrong and ignores the fact that we have not done the hard work necessary on constructing a route map to a different relationship, with all the practical consequences of Britain throwing the European jigsaw in the air, and the requirements of actually persuading the public to support such

an act.

The correct sequencing is to articulate a new position - "EU transformation". The principle behind this is equally to "throw the pieces in the air" but to do it in a politically achievable manner. This would articulate (a) the global challenges we face (new science, terror, and powers); (b) how the EU is an impediment rather than asset; (c) how the answer for Britain is a mix of economic liberalisation, educational renaissance, and constitutional reform - with EU transformation as an integral part of national reform. Transformation would involve taking back powers over employment, trade, everything from health and safety to product regulation, CAP, etc. It means openly saying to the non-euro members - do not join, and instead join us in demanding transformation such that the EU combines those who wish to pursue the euro and "political union" with those who wish little more than cooperating on the environment and terrorism. It requires coming up with a convincing answer to the question of the single market, trade, and competition etc. Should we become a normal member of the WTO and negotiate a free trade deal with the EU, or think more radically about the politico-moral possibilities of advocating the unilateral abolition of all British trade barriers ("which damage living standards and kill poor people in the third world")?

Cultural Elites

This should be done in tandem with (a) an intellectual campaign to engage cultural elites with the arguments that they are now almost entirely unfamiliar with concerning the nature of markets as information processors and thus their inherent capacity for superior adaptation to uncertainty; (b) selling the moral case for more liberal markets, connecting public contempt for the political classes with the moral consequences of political failure - "when we politicians run things, we screw them up and the worst-off suffer most - which is why they should be

taken out of our hands"; (c) the task of building support for moving Britain in the direction of a more "executive government", with the Conservative Party sending a multi-million volt surge through the political wiring by bringing in people from outside the Parliamentary Party ("we want to bring in the best people for the job, regardless of Party"). No genuine Conservative or national revival can occur without facing the general problem of the decaying political culture. There is a whole new territory for the Right to seize here and the general revival of the Right will necessarily strengthen the case for EU transformation.

Selling Transformation

Transformation will be attacked as not on offer. Leave aside what we could actually persuade others to do. The politics is simple: if we spend time before the next Conservative Government marketing EU failure and transformation, then it will enable a potential or actual government to move very substantially over time, and have the support necessary in power to negotiate a new relationship. For those who think that in the end we will have to leave - selling transformation will make leaving all the more possible, and is a necessary transitional phase. Limited resources surely should be spent on the intellectual planning for a different architecture based on EU transformation, and the marketing campaign hammering how the EU is failing, why it will get worse, and why the Constitution would be bad. This will create the climate in which a new Government could be extremely radical, in circumstances which we cannot yet know. "Out now" could be sellable now by a politician of immense personal prestige with a cast-iron exit strategy but there is no such figure.

Number Ten shoots itself in the foot

Downing Street's favourite newspaper enlists the trade statistics to refute the eurosceptic case - but succeeds only in achieving the opposite

By Ian Milne

The campaign to get us to vote in favour of the draft Constitution has begun. Downing Street, in cahoots with Neil Kinnock (still, one assumes, Vice-President of the depleted and lame-duck Commission) has chosen *The Independent* as its mouthpiece. That newspaper has fallen for the bait. Rather foolishly, it hasn't bothered to check the "feed" from Downing Street before printing it: much of it is drivel.

On the evidence so far the Blair campaign to bounce us in will rival Edward Heath's for sheer duplicity, disinformation and barefaced lies. This time round, with 30 years' actual experience of the Common Market/EC/EU behind us, the public is unlikely to be taken in. Neither is (most of) the British media.

One example of a spectacular Downing Street own goal appeared on the front page of *The Independent* on 16th June, which (confirming that it's the eurosceptics who set the agenda nowadays) was devoted to rubbishing the eurosceptic case. For two years now, europhiles have been working out

how to counter the indisputable and for them highly inconvenient fact (which I first brought to light in Global Britain Briefing Note No 22, *Nine-tenths of the British Economy is NOT Involved in Exporting to the EU*), (see www.globalbritain.org) that less than ten per cent of the UK economy is actually involved in exporting to the EU. (Another eleven per cent is involved in exporting to the world outside the EU; the remaining eighty per cent of the UK economy is purely domestic.) Finally, it dawned on the europhiles that if only ten per cent of the UK economy is involved in exporting to EU-14 (i.e. EU-15 less the UK), which they accept, then in the other direction, exports of EU-14 to the UK must only represent a teeny-weeny proportion of the EU-14 economy - just 2.4 per cent as it happens. Aha, they cried, that "proves" that the UK "needs" the EU more than the EU "needs" the UK! Hence the assertion on *The Independent's* 16th June front page: *We need the EU more than it needs us: 9.5 per cent of the UK*

economy is trade with the EU; the reverse figure is 2.4 per cent.

Neither the *Independent* nor Downing Street realised the real significance of those figures. After 30 years of intense "integration" of the British and EU economies, with UK government policy focussed on little else, hundreds of thousands of EU Directives and Regulations transposed into British law, and all that propaganda about the wonders of the "Single Market", it turns out that UK-EU trade integration is a pathetic two per cent on the EU side and under ten per cent on the UK side. Turning those figures round, 98 per cent of the EU-14 economy is NOT involved in exporting to the UK, and 90 per cent of the UK economy is NOT involved in exporting to the EU-14.

All of which shows that a) all those EU regulations have been pointless, trade-wise, and b) that, if the UK withdrew, the impact on both the UK and EU-14 economies would be marginal.

What are we waiting for?

How the EP votes are really counted

Having reported in our 28th May issue that ignorance extended to every aspect of the 10th June elections to the European Parliament, including the way in which seats were allocated, we set out to dispel that ignorance. Unfortunately, this was even more pervasive than we realised - extending not only to the editorial office of *euofacts* but to the headquarters of an organisation with responsibility for explaining the procedure to the public!

Our description of the d'Hondt system of PR which governs the way in which the votes are counted in EP elections was written following telephone calls to the Electoral Commission which referred the *euofacts* editor to the website maintained by the Greater London Authority (www.londonelects.co.uk)

as an authoritative guide to election procedure.

Having based our article on the information contained on the website and replicated in its printed Fact Sheet 5, we then read our account to a senior member of staff at the Electoral Commission who (wrongly) confirmed its accuracy.

Fortunately, one of our readers, Mr Bryan Smalley of Much Hadham, Herts, was quick to spot that our account was inaccurate.

The means by which our parliamentary representatives are chosen is quite obviously an important matter and may even influence voting behaviour. For this reason we set out below the simplest and clearest description of how the d'Hondt system

works - provided by Mr Smalley.

In simple terms the system can be explained by saying that when a Party gets one MEP its total number of votes is divided by 2. When it gets two MEPs the total number is divided by 3. When it gets three MEPs the total number is divided by 4, and so on. This process is continued until all the seats have been allocated.

euofacts apologises to its readers for having unwittingly misled them, thanks Mr Smalley for having pointed out our error and expresses the hope that none of the returning officers on 10th June sought guidance on counting procedure from the Greater London Authority's website.

Shoppers resist 'Europeanisation'

There may be a standard European cucumber and there are EU regulations relating to almost every item you can find on a shop counter - but there is no such thing as a European shopper. Extensive research shows that leading European retailers are failing in their attempts to create pan-European retail groups because of that familiar EU problem: there is no one size that fits all.

The study by the consultant Bain and Co shows that four out of five retail giants are failing to return value to shareholders after investing heavily in expansions outside their own borders and have been struggling to achieve growth of more than 1.1 per cent in

recent years.

Based on data from retailers in Belgium, France, Holland, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the UK, the study draws contrasts with EU integration and the shortcomings in the ways shopkeepers and grocers have tried to create a seamless market. Its conclusions are that European markets remain fragmented with shoppers resisting "Europeanisation" and sticking to local shopping habits and customs.

In France, the hypermarket continues to dominate, accounting for almost 50 per cent of sales, compared with 25 per cent in Germany where discount groups hold sway.

Competition is fierce - and loyalty

said to be lowest - in the UK.

Italians like to shop more frequently than others, but spend less - they make more than 250 visits to food stores per year but spend 17 on each trip. Surprisingly, the French make the fewest visits (what about those daily trips to the boulangerie for freshly baked bread and croissants?) but spend much more, averaging 35 a time.

A spokesman for Bain's Paris office said: "These findings dispel the notion that retailers can simply set up a shop in any European market and be profitable."

Source: *Business and Jobs supplement*, The Daily Telegraph, 17th June, 2004

Three quarters of City regulation comes from EU

In attempting to show the City that he had slain a hundred regulatory dragons in negotiations with his EU colleagues the Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown has revealed a statistic that will no doubt prove useful in future debate. Speaking at the Mansion House on 16th June, Mr Brown said: "I have announced measures - both for the City and

beyond - to tackle unnecessary and wasteful bureaucracy...and because 40 per cent of regulation - **and as much as three quarters of new financial sector regulation** - comes from Europe I can tell this gathering that having won the battle for a Savings Directive against tax harmonisation, Britain has...already insisted on improvements to the

Prospectus Directive, the Transparency Directive, the Market Abuse Directive, the Occupational Pensions Directive and the Investment Services Directive..." Those City types don't realise just how lucky they are to have a Chancellor like Gordon to amend the ceaseless flow of restrictions on their affairs that pours from Brussels.

The sour taste of sugar subsidy reform

Here is the good news for Third World sugar producers: the EU is going to 'reform' its much criticised sugar subsidy regime. Here is the bad: the chances are that they still won't be able to increase exports to the world's biggest market.

EU sugar prices are three times world market prices which means that consumers pay more than necessary for their sugar, while EU export subsidies - one of the most morally reprehensible aspects of the CAP - depress world sugar prices.

According to a document released by the EU on 23rd June Franz Fischler, the EU agricultural commissioner is shortly to announce reforms to the

subsidy regime which has remained largely unchanged for 40 years. These will include a cut of nearly 15 per cent in quotas combined with cuts in prices of up to a third by 2007.

However, as Oxfam pointed out the changes would not end the practice of dumping which destroys the livelihood of Third World farmers who will actually receive less for sugar exports (*The Guardian*, 25th June). Big business seems to agree. Mogens Granborg, executive vice-president of Danisco, a leading producer of food ingredients said that the reduction in prices would make it impossible for the poorest farmers to export to the EU because of high production costs and

that some way should be found to increase their access to the huge EU market (*euobserver*, 25th June).

However, no one should be surprised that the 'reforms' won't help the poor, or bring down the price of sugar to the consumer: that is not their purpose. The proposals are a way of heading off pressure for fundamental reform at the WTO to which a number of countries including Brazil, Thailand and Australia have filed a complaint. EU Commissioners may come and go, but given a fresh layer of cosmetic from time to time, the CAP shows truly astonishing powers of survival.

LETTERS

Tel: 01548 821402 Fax: 01548 821574 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

What the Treaty Text Actually Says

Dear Sir,

My copy of the DTECE (Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe) has 335 pages and weighs almost 1lb. according to our kitchen scales. It is so turgid that seemingly very few experts ever get to the end to read the final Declaration, in which the authors allow themselves to proceed if only four fifths of the Member States ratify it. Ashley Mote, MEP(UKIP), Torquil Dick-Erikson and I worked out months ago that the EU could proceed unless SIX countries failed to ratify. Messrs. Chirac and Schröder have confirmed it, yet no less a luminary than Adam Boulton of *Sky News* was still announcing at the very moment when Prime Minister Blair was signing the Treaty that it would be dead unless all twenty five countries ratified - and so said *The Times* the following morning! The document is best read backwards. The Contents is at the end, and to give one example, the procedures of Article IV-8 can be amended under Article IV-7! Part III has 340-odd articles. There have been many attempts to summarise them by picking out about twenty of the most important. Needless to say, each summary is totally different from any of the others. Has Mr. Blair read what he has signed or has he just seen a summary?

Of all the lies that have been put about regarding the new Constitution the most blatant is the claim that it does not define a Superstate, yet unlike our own constitution (now sadly vandalised) it describes every jot and tittle of the behaviour demanded of its subjects, and of the rights which their unelected rulers claim to have bestowed on us. This Superstate will be composed of around 130 Regions

covering about 1.7 million square miles. It will have a Napoleonic legal system replacing Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights. It will have an army, police forces indemnified for life, a vast charter of self-contradictory 'rights', a common currency, a Court of Justice with a remit to favour centralisation, ambassadors the world over, and even an anthem to replace God Save the Queen.

Of special interest is the statement, Art. IV-2, that all the existing treaties will be 'repealed' (they mean 'terminated') when the new Treaty comes into force. (Even though this is illegal under the Vienna Convention unless all twenty five States agree). If after a referendum the UK fails to ratify, it will have no treaty to belong to - it will be free, and the Westminster parliament will regain its power.

Unless the EU change the rules, of course.

MAURICE MITFORD
BLACKBURN
Surrey

Déjà vu

Dear Sir,

Consider the following: The purpose of the treaty is to make the EU work after enlargement. It will amend power-sharing and make the 'union' work more effectively. The Commission is to be reduced in size and more than 40 national vetoes will be lost. Key vetoes will remain though in areas such as taxation. The 2004 constitution perhaps? Try the Nice Treaty in 2000. Four years ago we were told that the UK only held onto its tax veto by surrendering 43 others, (the EU sets minimum energy tax and VAT levels, but they don't count apparently). This week we're informed that our courageous PM has held onto it again,

but that the cost for doing so is another 40 vetoes. Is being charged twice for the same safeguard extortion on the EU's part, duplicity on the government's, or both? Just how stupid does Tony Blair think we are?

MATTHEW R. ILLSEY
Nottinghamshire

Whither UKIP?

Dear Sir,

Anthony Scholefield asks: "So, what does UKIP do now?" (*eurofacts*, June 25th, page 2).

In principle, the answer is perfectly simple, not only for UKIP but for all of us who share the aim of reclaiming our natural right to govern our own country.

Within the next two years, there will be a referendum on the EU Constitution.

We must win that referendum. If we lose, our opponents will claim that we asked for the people to be allowed to speak; and they have now spoken; and it turns out that they are quite content to be absorbed into a politically integrated "Europe".

That would spell the end of the UK, and of course of UKIP as well.

It would be "game over", at least for a generation, and probably for ever.

Winning the referendum on the Constitution is not just the most important thing - it is now the only thing that matters.

So whether or not we are in UKIP, everything that we plan should be subjected to this acid test: "*Will it help us to win the referendum on the Constitution?*"

Dr D R COOPER
Berkshire

*The summer double issue of eurofacts (Vol 9 No 20/21)
will appear on 30th July 2004*

MEETINGS

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

Tuesday **13th July 2004**, 7.00 pm

Sir Andrew Green KCMG, *Chairman of Migration Watch UK*

PUBLIC MEETING

The British Academy, 10 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1

Admission £10 on the door - or in advance (Refreshments included)

The Anti-Common Market League
01787-376374

Friday **30th July 2004**, 7.15 pm

“The EU Constitution - An infamous document?”

Ashley Mote MEP, *Author*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Lecture Room, Rudolf Steiner House, 35 Park Road, London NW1

Admission Free

CONSERVATIVE PARTY FRINGE MEETINGS

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

Monday **4th October 2004**
12 noon - 1.30 pm

Rt. Hon Lord Lamont of Lerwick, *Chancellor of the Exchequer 1990 - 1993*

John O'Sullivan, *Associate Editor of The Times and Assistant Editor of The Daily Telegraph. He is Founder and Co-Chairman of the New Atlantic Initiative.*

The Terrace Ballroom, The Marsham Court Hotel, Russell-Cotes Road, East Cliff, Bournemouth

Admission Free

Save Britain's Fish
01224-313473

Tuesday **5th October 2004** 11.00 am

John Ashworth, *Save Britain's Fish*
Owen Patterson MP

The Cliffside Hotel, East Overcliffe Drive, Bournemouth

Admission Free (Fish and chip lunch)

The Freedom Association
01746-861267

Tuesday **5th October 2004** 12 noon

“Education, Education, Education - for the business of life or the life of business?”

Ruth Lea, *Centre for Policy Studies*
Rt. Hon Dame Angela Rumbold CBE

The Royal Suite, Bournemouth Hilton, Westover Road, Bournemouth (opposite side of the Lower Central Gardens to Conference Centre)

Admission Free

The Freedom Association
01746-861267

Wednesday **6th October 2004** 12 noon

“Political Correctness”

John Midgley, *Co-Founder of the Campaign Against Political Correctness*

The Royal Suite, Bournemouth Hilton, Westover Road, Bournemouth

Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

2004

UK **27th July - 7th Sept.**
Parliamentary Recess

Lib-Democrats **19-23rd September**
Party Conference
Bournemouth

Labour Party **26-30th September**
Conference
Brighton

UK Independence Party **2-3rd October**
Conference
Colston Hall, Bristol

Conservative Party **4-7th October**
Conference
Bournemouth

2005

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

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Monday **12th July 2004**, 4.30 pm
Evidence may be heard on *Commission White Paper on Services of General Interest* from a DTI Minister.

Wednesday **14th July 2004**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Parliament and the Legislative Process* from the Lord Grenfell, Chairman, the European Union Committee.

Tuesday **20th July 2004**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Forthcoming Dutch Presidency of the European Union* from H.E. Count Jan d'Ansembourg, Dutch Ambassador.

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

MEDIA COMPLAINTS

The Advertising Standards Authority
2 Torrington Place, London WC1E 7HW. Tel: 020-7580 5555

Fax: 020-7631 3051

complaints page: www.asa.org.uk

BBC www.bbc.co.uk/info/bbc/complaints.shtml

Broadcasting Standards Commission
7 The Sanctuary, London SW1P 3JS
Tel: 020-7233-0544 Fax: 020-7233 0397 E-mail: bsc@bsc.org.uk
www.bsc.org.uk

Independent Television Commission
33 Foley Street, London W1P 7LB
Tel: 020-7255 3000
E-mail: programme@itc.org.uk or advertising@itc.org.uk
www.itc.org.uk

Press Complaints Commission
1 Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JB
Tel: 020-7353 1248
Fax: 020-7353 8355
How to complain page:
www.pcc.org.uk

Radio Authority, Holbrook House, 14 Great Queen Street, London WC2B 5DG, Tel: 020-7430 2724
Fax: 020-7405 7064
www.radioauthority.org.uk

Germany's Fourth Reichs

by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Idiosyncratic history of Germany by Englishman, El Alamein, Burma, Bletchley (codebreaker), knew Adenauer well. Is Germany's 4th Reich the European Union?

What if we say No to the EU Constitution?

by Lord Blackwell. **£5.00**

Britain can and should settle an arrangement with the EU that preserves its political, economic and constitutional independence.

The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union

by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£20.00**

A comprehensive history of the European Union project.

Saving England

by Vernon Coleman. **£8.99**

Coleman, who wrote *England Our England*, now exposes the way EU rules are affecting every walk of life.

An Analysis of the Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe

by Anthony & Andrew Cowgill. **£15.00**
The definitive guide. to the draft Treaty.

Whip's Nightmare

Diary of a Maastricht Rebel

by Christopher Gill. **£17.50**

Former rebel MP gives an insight into the way politics works and why Britain's freedom is being surrendered.

The Essential Guide to the European Union

by Ruth Lea. **£12.50**

(Special launch price 10.00)

A detailed yet accessible picture, right up to date, of how the European Union works now and in the future.

Britain and the European Project

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

Reflections on sovereignty, history, politics, psychology and economics. How they point to the UK regaining her independence.

A Cost Too Far?

by Ian Milne. **£8.50**

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

The Fate of

Britain's National Interest

by Professor Kenneth Minogue. **£4.00**

The author argues that the national interest is being undermined by legal activists and international bureaucrats.

OverCrowded Britain

by Ashley Mote. **£8.95**

A look at the facts and consequences of large-scale immigration.

The Making of Europe's Constitution

by Gisela Stuart MP. **£6.95**

An insider's insight into the proposed EU Constitution and a call for greater democratic scrutiny.

VIDEO

Shockwaves

by Sanity

Video £5.00

A clear thirty minute presentation of the EU threat to the United Kingdom.

Send Payment to

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO BOX 119**

TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA

Tel: 01548-821402

Fax: 01548-821574

Email: info@junepress.com

www.junepress.com

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P

(UK ONLY) Ring for foreign rates

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"

Britain in Europe	020-7233 0123
European Movement	020-7881 8989
Federal Trust	020-7799 2818

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@ukonline.co.uk
New Frontiers 020-7494 3000

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative 020-7222 9000
Rt Hon Michael Howard MP

Democratic Party 01684-891700
Mr Geoff Southall

Labour 020-7802 1000
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP

Liberal 01562-68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft

Liberal Democrats 020-7222 7999
Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP

New Britain Party 020-7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield

UK Independence Party 0121 333 7737
Roger Knapman MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006