

# Gerard Batten

Member of the European Parliament for London  
UK Independence Party

## Speeches in the European Parliament 2004 – 2009



# Gerard Batten

Member of the European Parliament for London  
UK Independence Party

## Speeches in the European Parliament 2004 – 2009

*“Hence there is no gainsaying nor legitimate doubt but that the  
customs of the English are not only good but the best.”*

Sir John Fortesque  
*In praise of the laws of England*  
1471

For Franceslina, Richard & Paul,  
UKIP activists, members and voters

*Special thanks to my researchers  
Lynda Robson, Fiona Wise, Kamila Zarychta*

First published in Great Britain  
June 2009 by Gerard Batten MEP.  
Copyright © Gerard Batten 2009  
All rights reserved  
Printed and bound by MCNG Ltd.

## Foreword

The European Parliament is not a real parliament, such as we understand our Parliament at Westminster to be. The function of the European Parliament is to present a veneer of democracy on the undemocratic European Union. The European Parliament cannot make law nor repeal law. It can only vote 'Yes' or 'No' to legislation presented by the European Commission, and suggest amendments to that legislation, which the Commission may adopt or ignore as it wishes. The European Parliament can never develop into a genuinely democratic institution because it can never achieve the most basic characteristic of a real parliament - to represent a common political identity shared by a people who feel themselves to be a nation – what the Greeks called a 'demos'. A 'European demos' does not exist and never will.

Debates in the European Parliament are not worthy of the name. Most MEPs speeches are usually restricted to 60 or 90 seconds, and sometimes two or three minutes if they are lucky. Few listen to what anyone else says but concentrate on getting their comments across in the allotted time. Speeches are usually constructed with an eye firmly on how they will look as a press release or when published on the member's website.

The Chamber, which is usually nearly empty during debates, suddenly fills with Members when voting time comes. This is because unless MEPs vote at least fifty per cent of the time for recorded votes on a particular day they stand to lose half of their daily expense allowance (about £130); or if they fail to vote fifty per cent of the time on recorded votes during the whole year they will stand liable to pay back half of the General Expenditure Allowance (about £21,000) given to them to finance an office in their constituencies. No wonder that MEPs flock to vote when summoned by the voting bell.

Voting is mostly by show of hands, which can be conducted at a furious pace, especially when a French MEP takes a turn to fulfil the role of Vice President of the Parliament. It can sometimes be impossible to get one's hand up or down in the right place in order to vote

correctly. Presidents often get the vote wrong by a spectacular margin; but this only shows on those occasions when enough MEPs shout for an electronic push-button vote to check the outcome. On one memorable occasion a Spanish Vice President was in the Chair and an electronic check revealed that he had wrongly called a vote by a margin of hundreds, he explained by saying that ‘with such a large number of votes being cast it was statistically inevitable that some would be wrong’. Such is the attitude to ‘European democracy’.

Recorded, or ‘Roll Call’ electronic votes are used when Political Groups in the Parliament specifically request them, usually in the hope of showing up their opponents for having voted the wrong way – in their opinion. UKIP MEPs requested of the Parliamentary authorities that all votes be taken electronically but our request was refused on the grounds that it would ‘take too long’.

Why then would anyone want to be an MEP? The pay, perks and pensions are very good, and it offers a safe haven for the politically semi-retired, such as ex prime ministers, of which there are a few, and fourth and fifth rate politicians who could never make it into their national parliaments but are useful stooges for their political parties. There is the occasional MEP with the ability to make it into their own national Parliament, and I have been cordially informed by both Labour and Conservative MEPs in Brussels bars late at night that they hate the whole charade and cannot wait to find a safe seat in Westminster and escape.

Why then did I become an MEP for the UK Independence Party? It was simply so that I could use that position to promote on every possible occasion the idea of unconditional British withdrawal from the European Union. I hope my speeches in the European Parliament leave no doubt of my position.

## **Explanations of how MEPs may speak in the Parliament.**

Speeches in the Parliament fall into different categories as designated in the 'Rules of Procedure' and are entitled as follows.

### **Matters of Political Importance**

At the beginning of each plenary (voting) session half an hour is allotted when MEPs may request to speak for 60 seconds on any subject of their choosing. Usually they are of no political importance whatsoever, unless of course I am speaking, in which case they are.

### **Speeches in debates**

Speaking time is allocated to the political groups depending on their size. This time is then shared out within the group. Unimportant MEPs like me will occasionally get 60 or 90 seconds. On one occasion I did get a whole four minutes, but that was because it was late at night and no one else wanted to do it.

### **Catch the eye**

In 2008 a new practice was introduced that allocated five minutes at the end of each debate when up to five MEPs could 'catch the eye' of the President and request 60 seconds to speak. This was to cater for those MEPs who had not been able to secure speaking time but felt the urgent need to say something.

### **Interventions**

If an MEP intervenes during a debate or during a voting session on a point of order this is recorded. However while Europhiles can stand up and will be allowed to waffle pretty much as they like, Europhobes are expected to cite the particular rule of procedure that wish to speak under and if they cannot recite it they may have their microphone cut off as happened to me more than once.

**Written statements**

For those MEPs who were unable to speak at all in a debate they can make a written statement of up to 200 words on one debate on one occasion per plenary session.

**Explanations of votes**

If an MEP feels the need to explain why they voted in a particular way they can stand up and do so at the end of each voting session to which the vote appertains and will be called by the President to do so. If they prefer the comfort of their office they can make the same statement on-line.

I have not included my explanations of vote here, (except with a very few exceptions) as they all amount to the same thing: I do not want any legislation from the EU on any subject, good, bad or indifferent, as this should be the sole prerogative of our own Parliament. To list them all would just be tedious for the reader.

## Contents

1. Robert Kilroy-Silk and slander
2. EC-San Marino and EC-Monaco agreements
3. Assaults on UKIP staff
4. Assaults on UKIP staff continued
5. Situation in Middle East
6. The EU agrees with UKIP
7. Commission legislative and work programme
8. George Bush, the EU Constitution and NATO
9. Common organisation of the markets in sugar
10. Foreign policy/Security
11. The UK General Election and proportional representation
12. INSPIRE
13. The European Constitution is dead – but so was Dracula!
14. Controls on cash movements
15. Legal and illegal migration and the integration of migrants
16. Tony Blair and the unreformable EU
17. EU and Iraq
18. Community railways
19. Prisoners' voting rights
20. Iran
21. Leave the EU and trade with Europe and the world
22. Arms exports
23. Statements by the President of Iran
24. Imposition of criminal penalties and infringement of Community law
25. Tony Blair will surrender the British rebate
26. Data retention and ECHELON
27. Bulgaria and Romania
28. The EU Budget – how much will Britain pay?
29. Standards of conduct of Members
30. Implementation of the European Charter for small enterprises
31. European Neighbourhood Policy
32. The future of the Lisbon strategy from a gender perspective
33. Mozart was an Englishman!
34. Common foreign policy perspectives



## Contents – continued

35. The UK police and a United States of Europe
36. Human Rights and Democracy Clause
37. Confrontation between Iran and the international community
38. Community action programme in the field of consumer protection
39. Community action programme in the field of health
40. Red diesel and boating
41. Security of energy supply in the European Union
42. Mr President, do you have an appointment somewhere else?
43. Alexander Litvinenko and Romano Prodi
44. Situation in the Middle East following elections in Israel
45. Work of the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly 2005
46. Alexander Litvinenko and Romano Prodi continued
47. Suspension of aid to the Palestinian Authority
48. Suspension of aid to the Palestinian Authority
49. Malcolm Cubin and the European Arrest Warrant
50. Nuclear research and training activities
51. Period of reflection on European Constitution
52. The Austrian Presidency – Who do you think you are kidding Mr Schussel?
53. Extraordinary rendition
54. Results of the WTO meetings in Geneva
55. EU-China relations
56. Situation in the Middle East
57. Use of passenger name data agreement with USA
58. Switzerland and its EU cost benefit analysis
59. Taking into account previous convictions in another Member State
60. Turkey's progress towards accession
61. Israeli passport stamps and Algeria
62. The Bowbelle and Marchioness disaster
63. EC-Syria Euro-Mediterranean Association Agreement
64. Implementation of the European Security Strategy
65. Biological and toxin weapons
66. The murder of Alexander Litvinenko
67. Alexander Litvinenko and Russia's international murder squads

## Contents – continued

68. EU enlargement strategy and capacity to integrate
69. Annual reports on arms exports
70. Voluntary modulation of direct payments under the CAP
71. External dimension of the fight against terrorism
72. Transportation and illegal detention of prisoners
73. Incandescent light bulbs
74. Negotiation of EU Central, and Andean, Community Association Agreements
75. Prospects for the EU's Common Foreign Policy in 2007
76. Galileo satellite system
77. Human rights – Mario Scaramella is a European political prisoner!
78. A posthumous pardon for Steve Thoburn, Metric Martyr
79. EU-Russia summit
80. Weekly bin collections
81. Excise duty on alcohol
82. Common Foreign and Security Policy 2005
83. The situation concerning the President of the World Bank
84. Michael Davidson and the illegal seizure of his goods
85. The Prüm Treaty
86. Enrico Mariotti and the European Arrest Warrant
87. How much does the EU cost Britain?
88. The murder of Rizwan Darbar and the return of the death penalty
89. Britannia Rule the Waves!
90. Explanation of vote – number of MEPs representing the UK
91. The 'Reform Treaty' is treason!
92. Intervention – Mr President slow down!
93. EU Serbia relations
94. EU Turkey relations
95. Intervention – on behalf of Mr Martin
96. Another nail in the coffin of British liberties
97. Euromed
98. Strengthening the European Neighbourhood Policy – situation in Georgia
99. First anniversary of the murder of Alexander Litvinenko

## Contents – continued

100. Second EU/Africa Summit
101. Mario Scaramella – still a political prisoner
102. Accomplishment of internal market in Community postal services – closure of British post offices
103. Situation in Iran
104. An EU strategy for Central Asia
105. The demographic future of Europe
106. The first ten years of the Euro
107. EU Budget estimates for 2009
108. Trials in absentia
109. Situation of the Roma in Italy
110. Alexander Litvinenko – killed by state sponsored terrorism
111. Rachel Margolis & Lithuanian Jewish partisans in World War II
112. Annual report on the Common Foreign and Security Policy and implementation of the European Security Strategy
113. The body of the European Constitution is beginning to stink!
114. Common standards and procedures for returning illegally staying third-country nationals
115. Preparations for EU/Russia summit (June 2008) – justice for Alexander Litvinenko
116. Formation of Political Groups
117. Amendments to the Rules of Procedure
118. Stabilization of Afghanistan
119. Space and security
120. The Commission's 2007 enlargement strategy paper
121. Andrew Symeou and the European Arrest Warrant
122. Immunity of Europol officials
123. Immunity of Europol officials – explanation of vote
124. A European Police State
125. Combating terrorism – intervention on Point of Order
126. Dr Frederick Toben and the European Arrest Warrant
127. Applicable law in matrimonial matters
128. EU/Russia Relations
129. Airport charges

## Contents – continued

130. Congo – Human Rights Debate
131. Burma – Human Rights Debate
132. Venezuela – Human Rights Debate
133. First ten years of the Euro – the UK needs the Euro like a drowning man needs a straightjacket
134. Support schemes for farmers under the CAP
135. Conditions of entry and residence for third-country nationals
136. Presentation of the Court of Auditors Report 2007
137. The Greek riots and the Euro
138. Sustainable use of pesticides - Placing of plant protection products on the market
139. The British want a referendum on EU membership
140. Security features and biometrics in passports and travel documents
141. Gas supplies by Russia to Ukraine and the EU
142. The Czech Presidency's programme
143. Dutch MP Geert Wilders denied entry to Britain
144. Annual Report (2007) The EU's Common Foreign & Security Policy, European Security & Defence Policy, and NATO
145. Future of the European Common Asylum System
146. Progress reports: Croatia, Turkey, & Macedonia, 2008
147. Recommendation to the Council on the new EU-Russia agreement – justice for Alexander Litvinenko
148. What has the EU ever done for Britain?
149. I will vote against my own interests and in favour of the tax payers interests



## 1. Robert Kilroy-Silk and slander

DATE: 17 November 2004 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 seconds - cut short

Mr President, Mr Kilroy-Silk's remarks on the Commission were correct, especially so in the case of Mr Mandelson, whose name is a by-word for sleaze in the United Kingdom. Your remarks accusing Mr Kilroy-Silk of slander demonstrate the anti-democratic nature of this Parliament and of all EU institutions if such a further example ...

*At this point the President of the Parliament cut off the speaker's microphone.*

### COMMENT

*My remarks followed those of my erstwhile colleague Robert Kilroy-Silk who had made a statement concerning the newly appointed commission in which he had referred to them as, "...a gaggle of rejects, failures, has-beens, no-marks, liars, dodgy characters and communists, epitomised by the British Commissioner, Mr Mandelson..." The President of the Parliament, quite unreasonably in my view, then accused Mr Kilroy-Silk of 'slander' and I felt the need to respond in his defence.*

## 2. EC-San Marino and EC-Monaco agreements

DATE: 1 December 2004 - Brussels

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, the UK Independence Party objects to this directive in the strongest possible terms. This directive admits the principle that the European Union has the right to interfere in Member States' taxation policies, something that the British Government has always told the British people it will never allow to happen. Indeed, it interferes with the taxation policies of non-member states too, and this has been achieved by threats, coercion and bullying. Taxation policy should be the reserve of independent, sovereign states; any desirable end contained in this directive should be achieved by international agreements freely entered into by sovereign states.

Tonight we are discussing Monaco and San Marino, but this directive will also affect some British overseas territories, namely the Cayman Islands, some other Caribbean islands and Gibraltar, territories that depend heavily on banking and financial services for their economic existence. In the great tradition of European legislation, this directive extends the power of the European Union whilst damaging the economic performance and viability of the victims of that legislation.

In relation to the European Union, the British Government has acted true to form in its usual cowardly and treacherous manner. Just as it betrays its own people, it has betrayed its dependent peoples in order to fulfil its higher loyalty to the European Union.

Looking on the bright side – who knows? – Perhaps this directive may help in time to turn up some of the countless millions that have been embezzled from the European Union. Unfortunately, it is far more likely that those millions along with other perfectly legitimate millions will be subject to capital flight and will be reinvested outside the reach of the European Union.

I would ask any MEP who values national sovereignty to vote against this directive

### 3. Assaults on UKIP staff (*Intervention*)

DATE: 1 December 2004 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, I have a serious complaint: about 15 minutes ago a peaceful protest was about to take place against the Constitution – a banner was to be unfurled. Two researchers belonging to the Independence and Democracy Group were physically assaulted – one was kicked and punched. The security staff who I believe were involved include Mr Zylka and Mr Dekhudt. I ask you to conduct a serious and immediate investigation into what happened.

We have had a one-sided debate here about the Constitution. An enormous amount of money has been spent; banners are being unfurled for the ‘yes’ side, but the ‘no’ side is not allowed a say; and when a peaceful process takes place, people are physically assaulted. This is totally contrary to the purportedly democratic principles of this institution.

I ask you to undertake an immediate investigation. You will receive a complaint in writing.

COMMENT

*I broke into the explanation of votes to make this point. See the next speech below for an explanation of what this was about.*



#### 4. Assaults on UKIP staff - continued (*Intervention*)

DATE: 12 January 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, I should like to know who is responsible for security staff outside the Chamber. I cannot find anything about this in the Rules. Who authorised the security staff to interfere with free and peaceful expressions of political opinion outside this House, and on what authority was this done, having regard to the Rules of Procedure or any other relevant authority?

Secondly, why was violence used against women, and thirdly, what steps will the President take to bring to account those responsible? This follows on from my previous complaint to the President, Mr Borrell Fontelles, asking for this matter to be investigated...

*At this point the President cut off the speaker's microphone.*

#### COMMENT

*The EU had spent thousands of euros on a celebration to mark the Parliament's anticipated 'Yes' vote on the European Constitution, but when a number of UKIP members held a peaceful counter demonstration for a 'No' vote outside the chamber they were set upon by security staff and their banners confiscated. Needless to say, no action was ever taken against those responsible.*

## 5. Situation in the Middle East

Date: 26 January 2005 - Brussels

Time: 120 Seconds

Mr President, the European Parliament seems to be an enthusiastic supporter of the presidential elections in Palestine and of democracy in the Middle East. Does this mean that it will also be equally enthusiastic towards the coming elections in Iraq? The Iraqis are surely just as deserving of democracy as the Palestinians.

It will be interesting to see if President Abbas has the will or the ability to curtail the murderous activities of the various terrorist organisations in his domain. Since the European Parliament had 28 observers present at the elections, perhaps they will report what role, if any, was played by Hamas, Fatah and the other terrorist groups in the election.

Parliament has, I believe, spent €17 million of taxpayers' money on assistance to the Palestinian elections. What proof do we have that this money was properly spent and accounted for? What proof do we have that none of this money found its way into the pockets of terrorist organisations? The European Union has no legitimacy to play a part in the Palestinian – or any other state's – elections, but if it is going to pour millions of euros into them, then we should at least know where they have gone.

It is remarkable, is it not, that the late President Arafat – who was purportedly a lifelong and selfless champion of an impoverished people – seems nevertheless to have possessed enough part-time entrepreneurial skills to accumulate a multi-million dollar fortune. If only he had thought to remember the Palestinian people in his will to a sufficient extent, then the recent elections could have been staged by his generosity, rather than as a further burden on the European taxpayer.

If the European Union insists on providing funding in the field of Middle Eastern politics, given its legendary levels of corruption we can at least ask that it receive and keep the receipts for its expenditure, contrary to practice to date!

## 6. The EU agrees with UKIP

Date: 27 January 2005 - Brussels

Time: 60 Seconds

Mr President, this week has seen a very remarkable occurrence: the European Union, on one issue at least, finds itself in complete agreement with the UK Independence Party. How did this come about?

Earlier this week, Mr Michael Howard, Leader of the Conservative Party, announced policies supposed to halt the flow of uncontrolled asylum seekers into Britain. However, EU officials quickly informed him and the British public that this is an area of policy, like so many others, that is now under the control of the European Union and not the British Government. Not that Mr Howard was being honest anyway: Conservative MEPs in this place voted in favour of Turkish entry and are also in favour of Bulgarian and Romanian entry. The Tories pretend to be against unlimited immigration at home, but here they support giving the right of entry into Britain to an additional 94 million people.

The only way for Britain to regain control of its immigration and asylum policy is through the UK Independence Party's policy of Britain's unconditional withdrawal from the European Union.

## 7. Commission legislative and work programme

DATE: 21 February 2005 - Strasbourg

Time: 120 Seconds

Madam President, I should like to bid Mr Barroso good evening, but oh dear, oh dear! Here we go again! This legislative programme has been shaped largely by the annual policy strategy, which was published by the last Commission in February 2004. The European Commission is the unelected government of the EU, but what other government anywhere in the world would have its legislative programme set out by its predecessor? The UK Independence Party has complained before that the Commission is unaccountable, but this demonstrates just how undemocratic things are. We will be lumbered with policies framed by people who are not even in office any more!

On 26 January Mr Barroso spoke to Parliament in Brussels about this programme, but Mr Prodi and his team put it together. The new Commission's central policy objective is economic growth. This was also the central objective of the old Commission's document, drawn up last February. Indeed, Mr Prodi made it one of his key objectives when he first came to office in 1999. A fat lot of good it did, as EU growth is lower now than it was then. Fortunately for Mr Prodi, he is safely back in Rome and is no longer answerable for his failures.

The document states that, due to the institutional changeover in 2004, a lighter procedure than usual was adopted for the European Parliament to consider the policy strategy. That procedure was concluded last April – in other words, even before the election of the present European Parliament. We all know this is a phoney parliament, but this demonstrates just how pointless it is.

Europhiles have been complaining that the British people will not be properly informed about the EU Constitution. The Spaniards have just voted on the Constitution, but the fact is that 90% of Spaniards – whom the Europhiles think were well informed about the Constitution – told Spain's state polling organisation that they had little or no knowledge of it, and less than half of them bothered to vote.

What the citizens of Europe should be informed about is not the impenetrable Constitution, but the mountain of EU legislation which

will pass through the EU's institutions this year – legislation dreamt up by a defunct Commission and approved by an expired Parliament, both of whom are no longer accountable to the people this programme will affect. However, the citizens of Europe – especially those in Britain – are waking up to what is going on. Soon, not only will the last Commission and the last Parliament be defunct and expired, but so will the whole EU project – and the sooner the better!

## 8. George Bush, the EU Constitution and NATO

DATE: 21 February 2005 - Strasbourg

Time: 60 Seconds

Mr President, referring to the proposed European Constitution President Bush has said that he is fascinated to see how the sovereignty of nations can be integrated into a larger whole. He can afford to be fascinated: it is not his country's freedoms, liberty and democracy that are being dismantled and abolished in that process of integration.

What he does take seriously, however, is Article 16 of the Constitution that commits Member States to a common foreign and security policy. He has rightly warned that this undermines NATO – and it is NATO that has kept the peace in Europe since 1949, not the European Union.

The British people need to know that the proposed common foreign and security policy will prevent Britain from ever again being able to act independently, militarily or politically, whether in alliance with the USA or not. That is one more good reason for the British people to reject the European Constitution when they have the opportunity to do so.

## 9. Common organisation of the markets in sugar

DATE: 10 March 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, over-production of sugar is another manifestation of the obscene common agricultural policy that protects certain producers for political reasons and penalises consumers for the same political reasons. The French produce 160% of their domestic requirements in sugar, and dump the rest on the Third World. The British produce 50% of their requirements, and import the remainder from African, Caribbean and Pacific countries.

British sugar producers act responsibly and are not the cause of the problem. They will suffer through ill-considered so-called reforms. Real reform for Britain will only be accomplished when we withdraw from the common agricultural policy, and indeed from the European Union itself.

This resolution has left a sour taste with British sugar producers, many of whom have written to me and my British colleagues. The UK Independence Party will vote against the resolution and its amendments, which will damage the interests of British sugar producers.

## 10. Foreign policy/Security

DATE: 13 April 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, this report clearly shows where the European Union is heading. It calls for the common foreign security and defence policies contained in the European Constitution to be initiated without waiting for the inconvenient and unpredictable matter of its ratification by the Member States.

The report contains the telling line that the fight against terrorism blurs the traditional distinction between foreign and domestic policy. This is another example of how any argument will be used in order to promote European integration in any and all spheres of policy.

The threat from terrorism makes national borders and national interests all the more vital, not less so. This report is another step in the process of the European Union attempting to further its foreign policy and military ambitions in order eventually to rival the United States of America on the world stage. Meanwhile, all talk of an ethical foreign policy is put into perspective by the European Council's intention to lift the embargo on arms sales to China, which Mr Brok rightly criticises and which is driven by the requirements of the French arms industry.

Parliament's opposition to the lifting of the arms embargo on China will, of course, be ignored by the Council, demonstrating once again the irrelevance of this Parliament.

Britain should regain control of its own foreign, security and defence policies. The only way to do that is through the UK Independence Party's policy of unconditional withdrawal from the European Union.



## 11. The UK General Election & proportional representation

DATE: 9 May 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, I am sure everyone here today will be aware that last Thursday there was a general election in Britain. It was conducted under the first-past-the-post voting system, which is inherently unfair and is no longer defensible in the 21st century. It produced some strange results: the Labour Party that now forms the government won 55% of the seats based on only 35% of the vote. Thirty-nine per cent of the electorate could not be bothered to vote. Britain now has a government put in place by only 21% of the electorate.

In 1999 the European Union forced Britain to adopt a form of proportional representation for the European parliamentary elections. Since the European Commission is now the real government of Britain, perhaps it could do us a favour and force Britain to adopt a form of proportional representation for parliamentary elections. Under a fair voting system, the UK Independence Party could gain representation in the British Parliament and use it eventually to bring about our desired goal: Britain's unconditional withdrawal from the European Union.

COMMENT

*This should read '21% of the 'eligible' electorate'. Please also note that my call on the EU to legislate is meant to be ironic.*

## 12. Infrastructure for spatial information in the Community (INSPIRE)

DATE: 6 June 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, this directive should be named Expire rather than Inspire, considering the detrimental effect it will have on the Ordnance Survey mapping agency of Great Britain.

Ordnance Survey has been in existence for 215 years and has a long and distinguished record. Over the last 20 years or so, it has built itself up from a government-funded organisation into a successful commercial enterprise. Under its current arrangements, it has responsibility for its own finances and freedom to develop new customer-related initiatives. Inspire puts all that at risk and will undermine its successful commercial operation.

Why is this being done? Once more we see the dead hand of EU harmonisation and the EU's need to control every aspect of its Member States' lives. Also evident in this directive is the sinister presence of Galileo, the EU's 'big brother' spy satellite, its eye in the sky. How much more effective that will be when the EU has control of national mapping services. According to the Commission's own report, those involved in the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies, particularly the Commission itself, will be the main beneficiaries of this proposal. The British Government should have told the EU to get lost. However, we can always rely on its cowardice and craven surrender to the EU.

I would ask you to vote against this directive, but knowing your insatiable appetite for more and more legislation, I know I am wasting my breath. Perhaps the growing torrent of damaging legislation imposed on the United Kingdom might help to bring the British Government and its people to their senses and bring forward the day of Britain's unconditional withdrawal from the European Union.

### 13. The Constitution is dead – but so was Dracula!

DATE: 6 June 2005 - Strasbourg

Time : 60 Seconds

Mr President, the European Constitution is dead. The French killed it, the Dutch put it in the coffin and now the lid is on. But, like Count Dracula, EU treaties have a nasty habit of coming back to life. The Constitution needs a stake through its heart. That stake could be administered by means of a British referendum, which would deliver a resounding 'no'. It now seems, however, that the British Government will deny the British people that opportunity. Instead of a stake there might be an even more deadly termination, in the form of a silver bullet. That silver bullet will take the form of the disintegration of the European single currency.

The eurozone is already starting to show signs of fraying at the edges. The break-up of the European single currency, which is only a matter of time, will kill political and economic integration stone dead once and for all.

## 14. Controls on cash movements

DATE: 7 June 2005 - Strasbourg

Time : 60 Seconds

Mr President, this report calls for tight controls on the reporting of cash entering or leaving the European Union Member States. It is introduced under the convenient guise of the prevention of organised crime, terrorism and money laundering, but what is its real motivation?

An obligation to declare or disclose cash movements could easily be changed to impose an actual limit on the movement of money out of the European Union. Yesterday in this Chamber I spoke of the certainty of the eventual failure of the European single currency. It is obvious that the proposals in this report anticipate a future crisis of confidence in the euro. When that happens the European Commission and European Central Bank will want to prevent the movement of money out of the eurozone. To include Britain in these restrictive measures is to couple insult with injury. It is yet another reason, if one were needed, for Britain's unconditional withdrawal from the European Union.

## 15. Legal and illegal migration and the integration of migrants

DATE: 7 June 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME : 60 Seconds

Mr President, I have heard a number of references this evening to a common European immigration policy. I can assure you all that the British people do not want a common European immigration policy.

In the recent British general election, all the large pro-EU parties made impossible promises about containing immigration. Their pledges were incompatible with EU membership. The Commission itself said so with regard to the Conservative Party's asylum proposals. But it is internal EU immigration that really demonstrates the futility of their promises. Over 130,000 people from Eastern European countries entered the UK between May and December 2004: ten times the maximum official predictions. We bear no ill-will to the people of the new Member States. But go to London and observe its creaking housing, transport and health systems: it cannot cope with such a large and sudden increase in population.

Now Spain intends to grant legal status to up to 700,000 illegal immigrants. These people will then be free to move to Britain if they wish. Spain's selfish and irresponsible act demonstrates how Britain can have no independent immigration policy inside the European Union.

## 16. Tony Blair and the unreformable EU

DATE: 4 July 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME : 60 Seconds

Mr President, the week before last we were addressed by the British Prime Minister, Tony Blair. Mr Blair knows that the European project is in crisis. He knows that further political integration cannot be sold to the peoples of Europe, still less the British, unless there are at least some cosmetic changes to the worst excesses of the budget. We in Britain have endured New Labour for the last eight years. Now it is your turn to endure New Europe at least for the next six months.

Mr Blair hopes that he can reform the European Union in order to make it more palatable to the people. He will learn the same lesson as Mrs Thatcher did, namely that the European Union is unreformable. It is likely that it will be even more apparent to the British people at the end of the British Presidency that the British Government should adopt UKIP's policy of unconditional withdrawal.

## 17. EU/Iraq - A framework for engagement

DATE: 6 July 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME : 60 Seconds

Mr President, reports before this Parliament seldom contain jokes, but there is some humour, if unintentional, in this one. Paragraph 43 suggests that the European Union ‘offers its expertise and assistance with a view to the drafting of the Iraqi Constitution’. Iraqis might think that the European Union’s expertise and experience in this field leaves something to be desired. Its last attempt produced a Constitution that was opaque and confused and ran to almost 500 pages. On the other hand, the United States of America has a clear and concise Constitution that runs to just a few pages of paper, with only about 27 amendments needed over the past 200 years. If the Iraqis need some help, they might prefer to ask the Americans to lend a hand. If the EU becomes involved it might even offer to organise the constitutional referendum for the Iraqis, and that could lead to all kinds of unwanted problems.

## 18. Community railways

DATE: 27 September 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME : 120 Seconds

Mr President, this report proposes the harmonisation of rail passenger rights and compensation liabilities throughout the European Union. Such legislation faces the opposition of national railway companies who know they will suffer increased administrative burdens, the cost of which will be passed on to passengers.

Mr Sterckx says that we should not tinker with international agreements which are already satisfactory. He says that we must not take over the role of railway company marketing managers. Above all, he says that the system must benefit passengers. Only an EU politician could say all that and then propose extending the scope of legislation. There is already a perfectly good international agreement in place between 42 nations, including many non-EU countries, to facilitate cross-border railway travel. In 2002 international railway companies signed a voluntary Charter containing quality standards for rail passenger services – the COTIF Convention.

We cannot legislate, for example, for French, German and British railways. They all operate under very different conditions. National governments, in conjunction with railway operators, should decide what regulation is appropriate, not the European Union. To be fair, the Commission only wanted regulation to cover cross-border rail travel, but Mr Sterckx goes further by proposing regulation for in-country domestic rail travel.

In another report from the Committee on Transport and Tourism concerning the certification of train crews, the rapporteur, Mr Savary, calls for the psychological testing of train crews. May I suggest that psychological testing be extended to the rapporteurs of this Parliament? Perhaps a simple word association test would be useful. If in response rapporteurs used the words ‘integration’, ‘harmonisation’ or ‘regulation’, they should be immediately disqualified from holding office. This might possibly cut down the amount of this kind of nonsense, but not, I suspect, until we have first legislated for harmonised and integrated psychology tests.



## 19. Prisoners' voting rights

DATE: 12 October 2005 - Brussels

TIME : 60 Seconds

Mr President, last week the European Court of Justice made a ruling that British prisoners should have the right to vote in elections. This followed an appeal by a British prisoner that his human rights were being violated by the English law that prevents prisoners from voting.

The European Court of Justice is of course not a court of justice. Its purpose is to ensure that the political will of the European Union is enforced in Member States.

This particular piece of idiocy is a direct consequence of the Labour Government's decision in 1998 to incorporate the European Convention on Human Rights into English law. If enforced, this verdict means that Ian Huntley, the Soham murderer; Ian Brady, the moors murderer; Robert Black, the child killer; and every paedophile and criminal in British prisons will have a say in what kind of government we elect. This ruling clearly demonstrates why Britain should regain control of its own affairs.

## 20. Iran

DATE: 12 October 2005 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Madam President, we have heard about two key issues regarding Iran: its programme to develop nuclear weapons and its record on human rights. However, a third factor is becoming apparent: Iran's role in training and equipping insurgents in Iraq who are not only killing British and American soldiers, but also working to ensure that Iraq's painful transformation to a democratic state is unsuccessful.

If Iraq does not successfully transform into a democratic state, then the whole region will be destabilized. Mr Fige had nothing much to say except to offer more of the process of proffered dialogue and cooperation. As the British Government has discovered over the last few years, this approach has so far not yielded much success.

The seriousness of the situation and the difficulty in resolving it peacefully cannot be overstated, but it will not be solved by the European Union. Once again the EU presumes to take on the attributes of a political state. The serious situation posed by Iran must be addressed by the properly constituted sovereign states working within the properly constituted international institutions.

If the EU successfully develops its European defence identity – that is, an EU military force – and if Turkey becomes a member of the EU, then a militarised EU will share a border not only with Iran, but also with Iraq and Syria. If the current situation is alarming, then just imagine that one.

## 21. Leave the EU & trade with Europe and the world

DATE: 24 October 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, there is a very good Sunday newspaper in Britain called *The Business*. Yesterday's edition was of particular interest. It reports that British economic growth forecasts for 2005 and 2006 are being revised downwards.

A survey from Morgan Stanley reveals that Europe's largest companies are planning to make 40% of their investments outside the European Union. The reason for this is obvious. It is the brake on enterprise and business exerted by the ever-growing bonds of regulation and red tape from the European Union. A report from Open Europe and Oxford Economic Forecasting shows that the United Kingdom could increase its gross domestic product by 1.4% if it traded freely with the rest of the world, while maintaining a free trade agreement with the European Union. In other words, leave the European Union, but trade freely with Europe and the world. That, of course, is the policy of the United Kingdom Independence Party. Common sense may eventually prevail.

## 22. Arms exports

DATE: 16 November 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, in these three reports we have another proliferation of crackpot ideas from the European Parliament, but they do show where this place and the European Union intend to head. They call for the rejection of a new generation of nuclear weapons, for progressive and significant steps towards nuclear disarmament by Britain and France and for the harmonisation of arms exports – all this when the world is growing more dangerous and not less so.

The incompetent left-wing utopian dreamers who predominantly make up this deeply stupid and corrupt place do enough damage with their legislative efforts without meddling in defence issues. National governments might one day, eventually, be able to undo the EU's idiotic policies on agriculture, fishing, commerce and finance, but if the EU manages to take control of defence there may be consequences that cannot be undone.

All these reports are building blocks for a common European security and defence policy. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that a harmonised defence procurement policy appears in one of these reports, despite being an element of the failed European Constitution.

Britain's armed forces are being merged into a European army. Britain is sleep-walking towards the day when we will wake up and find that we have no independent military and defence capabilities. If the day ever dawns when Britain's national defences are controlled by the European Union, then God help us. (*Speaker interrupted by shouts and jeers*) Yes, may He help us, you bunch of buffoons.

### 23. Statements by the President of Iran

DATE: 16 November 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, Iran is developing a nuclear programme that it does not need since it is sitting on a sea of oil. It is clearly intended to provide the country with nuclear weapons. The President of Iran thinks that Israel should be wiped off the map. The ability of the West to deal with the threat posed by Iran has been severely restricted by the war in Iraq, a war Britain entered into because of the lies and deceit of our Prime Minister, Mr Blair. We all hope that the situation in Iran can be resolved peacefully, and this is certainly one of those cases where the West needs both to speak softly and to carry a big stick.

Unfortunately Britain's big stick – its armed forces – is being merged into the euphemistically named European Defence Identity, i.e. a European army. If accomplished, this will prevent Britain from being able to embark on any independent military actions in the future. But once again, the EU assumes the attributes of a political state in order to address this problem and its pretensions are fully supported by a minister of Her Majesty's Government. Meanwhile, this Parliament continually calls on both France and Britain to decommission their independent nuclear deterrents. If they did so there would not be the big stick that might ultimately be needed in any negotiations with Iran.

## 24. Imposition of criminal penalties and infringement of Community law

DATE: 30 November 2005 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, on 13 September 2005, the so-called European Court of Justice made a ruling that gave the European Commission the right to impose criminal sanctions on the citizens of Member States. For the first time since King Henry VIII ended the jurisdiction of the Pope in ecclesiastical matters in England, a power other than the British Parliament will have the right to create laws and set the penalties for transgression. The European Court of Justice is not a court of justice it is an engine of political integration for the European Union. This particular ruling applied only to environmental law, but it has left the way wide open for the Commission to apply it to other areas.

The Commission has ruthlessly exploited the decision of the court in order to publish a list of nine new areas of competence, which gives it the right to create new laws and impose criminal penalties. It has also stated its intention to extend its power to create further criminal offences. When this case first went to the court, 11 of the then 15 Member States opposed it; the court ignored them. A Commission lawyer has stated that it could compel the British Government – and the British Parliament – to punish its citizens for something that was not a criminal offence in Britain. If a British government were to refuse to implement these criminal offences, then it could be taken to the European Court of Justice, which would compel it to do so. The court would then act as judge and jury in its own case. So much for the separation of powers of the executive, legislative and judiciary that has protected English freedoms for centuries!

The decision by the so-called European Court of Justice is nothing less than a judicial coup d'état. The Court has seized power from the Member States and handed it to the Commission

## 25. Tony Blair will surrender the British rebate

DATE: 30 November 2005 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, it is always a pleasure to see you\* in the Chair, because one knows things will run smoothly. That is more than could be said about Britain's six-month Presidency of the Council, which will soon come to an end, and what an ignominious end it will be.

Mr Blair started out with a sweeping agenda for reform of the common agricultural policy and cutting-back on overregulation. What exactly has he achieved? Nothing! The CAP is as unreformed as ever and rules, regulations and directives have increased, not decreased.

That is not to say that the British Presidency will not be significant. Mr Blair has been under intense pressure to surrender the British rebate of £3 billion per annum in order to prevent the collapse of the EU budget talks for 2007 to 2013. In the tradition of British governments since 1972, it is almost certain that Mr Blair will surrender the British national interest – in this case the budget rebate – while no doubt still finding a way of trumpeting it as a triumph of diplomacy.

*\*The Vice President referred to was Edward McMillan-Scott, a Conservative MEP.*

COMMENT

*The actual amount surrendered was £7.7 billion as confirmed by the Chief Secretary of the Treasury, Andy Burnham MP on 15th January 2008.*

## 26. Data retention and ECHELON

DATE: 13 December 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, the reasons given for this directive are the usual ones about the fight against terrorism and organised crime, but this is a red herring. Governments already use the most sophisticated means to monitor national and international communications. The United States of America has the Echelon system that enables it to intercept every form of international communication. The British Government has GCHQ in Cheltenham. Terrorists and organised criminals are well aware of this and do everything they can to avoid being tracked and caught by these means.

This directive is really about formalising the creation of a surveillance society and the control of individuals. More and more powers are being concentrated in the hands of the state, at the expense of the individual. The UK Presidency is trying to use this Parliament to implement a policy that has already been rejected by the UK Parliament. This directive represents another step on the road to a police state. I hope this Parliament will reject it.



## 27. Bulgaria - Romania

DATE: 14 December 2005 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, these reports state the wish of the majority in this Parliament to see Bulgaria and Romania join the European Union by 1 January 2007. However, these reports contain many instances detailing their total unsuitability to join according to the EU's own membership criteria.

These reports highlight their levels of corruption, the proliferation of organised crime, and the need for the reform of their legal and economic systems among many other things. It is unlikely that these countries will be able to transform themselves into the paragons of virtue they are supposed to be before they can join in one year's time.

But we all know that sadly it does not matter what state they are in. It does not matter what their levels of corruption and organised crime are. They are going to be welcomed in anyway. Their membership is part of the grand plan for the creation of a United States of Europe, and all other factors are subordinate to that ambition.

## 28. The EU Budget – How much will Britain pay?

DATE: 16 January 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, President Barroso's final proposal for the 2007-2013 financial perspective contains the following, seemingly contradictory, proposals. In general point 4 it is stated that: 'the maximum total figure for expenditure ... for 2007-2013 is €862.363 million' and that 'all figures are expressed using constant 2004 prices', but that 'there will be automatic ... adjustments for inflation'.

The British rebate under point 78 is qualified as follows: 'During the period 2007-2013 the additional contribution from the UK shall not be higher than €10.5 billion'. These two points seem to be in conflict and raise the question of whether the €10.5 billion is subject to an automatic annual technical adjustment for inflation. If so, there will be a substantial extra cost.

British Parliament votes are expressed in current sterling values and are not subject to automatic adjustments for inflation. Exactly how much is the EU expecting the British taxpayer to pay, and is this legal?

### COMMENT

*While UK contributions are increasing the rebate is decreasing because any expenditure in new member states is not included in the calculations of the British rebate. In the event of further EU enlargement before 2013 (excluding Rumania and Bulgaria) the ceiling on the UK's increased contribution of €10.5 billion will be raised: More enlargement means less rebate. See How much does the EU cost Britain? 2008 edition by Gerard Batten.*

## 29. Standards of conduct of Members

DATE: 18 January 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, since my party, the UK Independence Party, came to this Parliament in 1999 and returned in more force in 2004, we have established the first genuine opposition to the process of European political integration. My concern is that the proposed measures may be used to try to stifle the voice of national independence and opposition to the European Union. If that is the case, it will not succeed.

However, I should like to offer some constructive suggestions to improve the proceedings. Firstly, the presiding Presidents should ensure that speakers are kept to their allotted time: pro-EU speakers are given much more leeway to overrun than anti-EU speakers. Secondly, during the vote some presiding Presidents need to slow down a little.

In that way we might have time to vote properly. At the same time, the Presidents might not make so many glaring mistakes in estimating the vote and there would be less call for electronic checks.

### 30. Implementation of the European Charter for Small Enterprises

DATE: 18 January 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, this report calls for a reduction in bureaucratic obstacles and the simplification of taxation for small businesses. Who could disagree with that?

But then the report goes on to say that EU legislation should be implemented equally across Member States and, in the case of non-compliance, rapid infringement procedures should be applied. We are immediately transported back into the world of one-size-fits-all EU legislation and penalties, which are guaranteed to strangle enterprise, initiative and business creation.

My own party pointed out during the British Presidency of 2005 that over 4,000 new regulations and legislative instruments were enacted, despite Mr Blair's rash promise to reduce overregulation.

If small and medium-sized businesses are to thrive in the EU, which is vital for job creation, then the simple answer is to reduce EU regulation, not increase it. Otherwise, one day the only way to own a small business in Europe will be to buy a big one and wait.

### 31. European Neighbourhood Policy

Date: 18 January 2006 - Strasbourg

Time: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the European Neighbourhood Policy calls for the consolidating of democracy and the rule of law in the EU's neighbouring countries. How can the EU seriously consolidate democracy in non-EU countries when the central driving force of EU membership is itself the inexorable removal of any real, meaningful, democratic accountability in its Member States? How can the EU seriously call for the extension of the rule of law in non-member countries when the EU itself ignores its own laws?

I speak, of course, of the proposed EU Constitution which should be dead under Treaty law because of the 'no' votes in the French and Dutch referendums. Instead, however, the Constitution is being kept on a life-support machine until the inconvenience of democratic rejection can be overcome by some underhand means. Mr Tannock\* would do better to concern himself with the interests of those he was elected to represent rather than those who did not elect him.

COMMENT

*\*Dr Charles Tannock is a Conservative MEP for London.*

### 32. The future of the Lisbon strategy from a gender perspective

DATE: 19 January 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, the Lisbon Strategy set out the objective of an employment rate of 60% for women to be achieved by 2010 and a full employment rate for those available for work by 2010. This will not be achieved. The Lisbon Strategy is yet another way of damaging European economies through state interference and over-regulation.

This report is typical of the socialistic approach so beloved of this Parliament. It recognises the problem, which is that the economies of Europe need to be more competitive and that Europe is rapidly losing its competitive position, but then sets about devising measures that are either irrelevant or will actually make the problem worse.

The report recommends that Member States take measures to ensure that the most disadvantaged women, especially single parents, are guaranteed a minimum income. What could be more calculated to create unemployment than guaranteeing a minimum income for not working? The report states that earnings and working conditions in many Member States, particularly in large commercial chains, are an affront to women's dignity and are often the cause of miscarriages and disability. Absolutely no evidence is produced for this outrageous statement. I can assure you that any commercial chain in Britain that caused miscarriages and disability would soon find itself in the law courts.

The way to ensure maximum employment for those people, both men and women, who want to work, is to get off the backs of businesses and deregulate. There should indeed be equal pay for equal work, and to help those parents who wish to stay at home and look after children we should lessen the tax burden on the parents who work, as indeed we should lessen the tax burden on all who wish to work. Such policies will never happen in the socialistic EU, which is another reason why Britain should leave the European Union and take the actions required to ensure economic regeneration and prosperity while it still can.

### 33. Mozart was an Englishman!

DATE: 1 February 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, there have been reports recently in the British press about a conference held in Salzburg hosted by the Austrian Presidency. The purpose apparently was to discuss how Europe might re-engage with its citizens. This event happened to coincide more or less with the 250th anniversary of the birth of the immortal and glorious Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. Mozart was presented at this conference as some kind of proto-European federalist, because of nothing more than the fact that in his short career he travelled extensively in Europe.

However, what were Mozart's political views, if any? On hearing the news of Britain's relief of Gibraltar and the victory over the French navy at Trincomalee, he wrote to his father, Leopold: *'Indeed, I have heard about England's victories and I am greatly delighted too, for you know that I am out-and-out Englishman'*. Did the Austrian Presidency know that it was celebrating the birth of a self-proclaimed Englishman?

### 34. Common foreign policy perspectives

DATE: 1 February 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, yesterday marked the death of the 100th British serviceman killed in Iraq. These brave men made the ultimate sacrifice of giving their lives for their country. But they were betrayed. They were sent to war on the basis of the lies and fantasies of Prime Minister Tony Blair. This happened for one simple reason: Mr Blair and the Labour government have no conception of what constitutes the British national interest.

Now Mr Blair wants to embroil the British nation in yet another lie and fantasy. That lie is that Britain's national interest lies in something called a European common foreign policy.

Yesterday also marked another significant event. In London, Mr Javier Solana spoke on the Palestinian issue on behalf of the European Union. He did so in the de facto role of the European Foreign Minister. This is despite the fact that the European common foreign policy should be dead and buried because of the rejection of the European constitution. This is a clear signal that the Labour government is surrendering control of foreign policy to the European Union. Chancellor Bismarck once famously remarked that the whole of the Balkans were not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier. Well, the whole of the European common foreign policy and the planned European army is not worth the bones of one single British serviceman or woman.



### 35. The UK police and a United States of Europe

DATE: 13 February 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the British Government is proceeding with a programme of reorganisation of the English and Welsh police forces on a regional basis. The stated reason is that the existing structures cannot deal adequately with terrorism, extremism and serious and organised crime. However, the real reason is not to make them more effective, but to further the EU's policy of regionalization of Member States.

Where the British people have been given a choice, they have rejected regionalization overwhelmingly. The police forces are to be given no such choice: the Home Secretary, Charles Clarke, gave the 43 Chief Constables an ultimatum to produce plans for a mass merger, like it or not. The Treaty of Rome speaks of the regions, and their significance is becoming more and more apparent. Few people in Britain realise how their country is being fundamentally changed in order for it to become merely a region of a United States of Europe.

### 36. The Human Rights and Democracy Clause

DATE: 14 February 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, this clause was drafted ten years ago and applied in certain agreements. This report wants new criteria which must apply between EU Member States and third countries. Suspension of agreements with those countries would follow if the clause was contravened.

This report criticises the fact that the clause does not exist in three big areas, namely agriculture, fisheries and textiles. Of course democracy and human rights should be encouraged in all the states of the world which are unfortunate enough not to enjoy them already. All decent democratic states should use their relations with other countries – diplomatic and trading, cultural, etc. – to encourage the growth of democracy and human rights, something that my country, Britain, has done for many years.

However, this report says that the clause must apply in all countries equally. Has this been properly thought out? If so, it will apply to China and other developing economies in the Far East and other parts of the world. Many jobs depend on trading relations with China and the number will increase in the future. Are we really saying that we are going to turn the tide of history by telling China to turn into a democratic country with full human rights overnight, just on the basis of one report from the European Parliament? I think not.

Today the United Nations has called for Guantánamo Bay to be closed and there are many human rights questions hanging over what the Americans are doing in Guantánamo Bay. If this agreement is to apply equally to all countries, are we going to suspend relations with the US if we think that it is contravening human rights in Guantánamo Bay?

I was also struck by the arrogance of the Commissioner in demanding that other countries, such as China and Japan, abolish the death penalty if they want to have relations with the EU. I think that is an unbelievable intrusion into the democratic and sovereign right of other countries to have a penal system that suits them and their citizens rather than the European Union. The European Union itself is

undermining democracy in all its Member States. I know at first hand how democracy in Britain has been undermined by our relationship with the European Union and our increasing political integration into a United States of Europe. So I think perhaps the European Union should put its own House in order first, as far as democracy is concerned. Perhaps it could make a start by paying attention to the results in the Dutch and French referendums on the Constitution.

I suggest that this report is not properly thought out. Yes, we want democracy and human rights in all the countries of the world. But let us try to do it by setting an example in friendship, rather than setting criteria and conditions that will not be met.

### 37. Confrontation between Iran and the international community

DATE: 15 February 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, it is estimated that Iran could have nuclear weapons within three to ten years, although the point of no return in stopping that development could be reached much sooner. Dealing with Iran has been made all the harder by the Iraq war, which was not just a disaster but could turn out to be an act of geopolitical folly. The Iranian regime cannot be allowed to develop nuclear weapons. It is a religious fundamentalist, barbaric, pro-terrorist and anti-Semitic regime.

The world became used to the nuclear stand-off between the democratic west and the communist east during the Cold War, but in that confrontation, disaster was avoided because ultimately both sides were rational. The religious fundamentalists of Iran are not rational. An Iranian nuclear device could turn out to be the biggest suicide bomb the world has ever seen. In this situation all the options are dangerous but the most dangerous option is doing nothing at all.

### 38. Community action programme in the field of consumer protection

DATE: 16 March 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, the European Union wants to fund consumer organisations, both governmental and non-governmental, to the amount of €1.2 billion, to bring them into line with existing and future legislation. Like so much that comes from this Parliament, it is not possible to object to the subject-matter itself. Who would object to better and more efficient consumer protection measures where they are required?

In Britain we already have high standards of consumer protection legislation and have had for many years. No doubt European countries should learn from each other and from non-European countries by adopting international best practice on a national basis, selecting that which is best suited for their particular needs.

But as we would expect, this report speaks of uniformity, integration and harmonisation. The objective of this report is not the adoption of legislation – that is good in itself – but, like everything else that comes from this Parliament, it serves the purpose and process of extending power and dominion to the European Union. It will add to the *acquis communautaire*, the body of law that, once accrued to the European Union, is never returned to nation states.

There are also some disturbing overtones contained in suggestions that patterns of consumption, linked to sectors of the population, should be adopted. Such intelligence-gathering in terms of consumer consumption could compromise the privacy of the citizen. That is already being done in Britain by private retail companies using such devices as loyalty cards. However, the consumer has some choice about whether to participate, depending on where and how they choose to shop.

That kind of information-gathering on the citizen is not something that should be undertaken by the state; certainly not in the form as represented by the European Union.

39. **Community action programme in the field of health**  
*(Intervention during vote)*

DATE: 16 March 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, I rise on a point of order pursuant to Rule 151(3). When you asked if there were any objections, I stood up, but obviously you were unable to see me. Rule 151(3) states:

‘The President shall decide whether amendments are admissible.

‘The President’s decision pursuant to paragraph 3 concerning the admissibility of amendments is not based exclusively on the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Rule but on the provisions of the Rules in general.’

On the Rules in general, there is another rule that says our business should always be transparent. We have here 140 different amendments, which Mrs Sinnott wishes to change – even as we are discussing them – with an oral amendment. How is it possible to vote ‘yes’ or ‘no’ on 140 different amendments? This is pure nonsense. I would ask you to interpret the Rules to the effect that they are inadmissible and that we vote on them on an individual basis.

COMMENT

*I was drawing attention to the fact that many votes consist of a simple ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ on multiple amendments, in this case 140, but sometimes more. The Vice President in the chair replied, “That is the way we conduct business Mr Batten, please sit down”.*

#### 40. Red diesel and boating

DATE: 22 March 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, Britain currently enjoys a tax derogation on red diesel that applies to leisure boating. That derogation expires in December 2006. If the derogation is not extended, the price of fuel for motorboats could treble. If this happens there will be an inevitable decline in leisure boating. The Exchequer will receive less tax revenue, not more, and economic damage will be done to local communities. The continuation of the derogation is a matter between the Council and the Commission, but tax policy should be the sole prerogative of sovereign national governments.

All British MEPs should lobby the Minister responsible to ensure that the derogation continues. They should also join the campaign to save the derogation started by Motorboat Monthly magazine. I will be pleased to supply them with details of how to do so.

## 41. Security of energy supply in the European Union

DATE: 22 March 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, the EU's shambolic liberalisation of the energy market has already resulted in gross distortions. Good Europeans, like Britain, diligently liberalise their markets but bad Europeans, like France and Germany, have refused to do so.

Liberalisation has directly resulted in enormous increases in the wholesale gas price in the UK. The EU has added more than £200 per annum to the average UK gas bill. Now the EU wants a common energy policy so it can get its hands on what remains of Britain's gas and oil reserves. Mr Chichester asks how the Council and Commission will react to developments in the world energy market and how supplies will be secured: it is the right question, but it has been put to the wrong people. He should be putting it to the British Government.

The Conservative Party, in the form of Mr Chichester, is yet again inviting the European Union to meddle further and deeper in Britain's affairs. Britain should follow the example of France and Germany and protect its own national interests and those of its domestic energy consumers.



42. **Community action programme in the field  
of consumer protection** (*Intervention during vote*)

DATE: 23 March 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 10 Seconds

Mr President, you may have an appointment somewhere else later on, I do not know, but we are here to do a job and to vote. You are going at such a furious pace that we cannot put our hands up in time in order to vote. Could you please slow down?

COMMENT

*The president in the chair was the French MEP Gerard Onesta, who usually conducts votes at such a furious pace it is often impossible to vote in the right place. He merely shrugged off my complaint and carried on regardless.*

### 43. Alexander Litvinenko and Romano Prodi

DATE: 3 April 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, one of my constituents, Alexander Litvinenko, was formerly a lieutenant colonel in the Russian Federation's FSB, the successor to the KGB. Mr Litvinenko's exposure of illegal FSB activities forced him to seek political asylum abroad. Before deciding on a place of refuge, he consulted his friend, General Anatoly Trofimov, a former deputy chief of the FSB. General Trofimov reportedly said to Mr Litvinenko: *'Don't go to Italy, there are many KGB agents among the politicians. Romano Prodi is our man there'*. In February 2006, Mr Litvinenko reported this information to Mario Scaramella of the Guzzanti Commission investigating KGB penetration of Italian politics.

This allegation against a former head of the European Commission is one of the utmost seriousness. It should be thoroughly investigated. The European Parliament should conduct its own investigation.

#### COMMENT

*The President of the Parliament, Mr Borell, asked me if I was in fact asking for an investigation. To which I replied.*

"I am suggesting it would be appropriate for Parliament to conduct such an investigation in view of Mr Prodi's former position as President of the European Commission. It seems that the much-vaunted democratic credentials of this Parliament could be enhanced by such an investigation".

*Needless to say, an investigation never happened and I was unable to secure the necessary number of MEPs' consent to force an investigation under the Rules of Procedure. I did attempt to hold a special meeting in Brussels at which Mr Litvinenko and others could come and speak to MEPs, but unfortunately Mr Litvinenko was murdered before that could happen.*

#### 44. Situation in the Middle East following elections in Israel

DATE: 5 April 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, you introduced Mr Solana as the High Representative of the European Union's common foreign and security policy. Which common foreign and security policy is that? Perhaps it was the one contained in the proposed European Constitution so roundly rejected by the French and Dutch in last year's referendums, and which would be rejected by the British, if they were given the opportunity.

The European Union's common foreign and security policy has no legitimacy. Mr Solana has no legitimacy as the EU's de facto foreign minister. Mr Solana speaks as though the European Union common foreign and security policy is an accomplished fact. Again and again the EU assumes illegitimately the role and characteristics of a political state. This is not a debate about how to solve the problems in the Middle East. This is a debate about how to further an illegitimate United States of Europe.

#### 45. Work of the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly 2005

DATE: 6 April 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, how to help the countries of Africa and other parts of the developing world is a key factor in ensuring a more prosperous and therefore a more stable world.

What Africa needs in particular is respect for the rule of law, respect for contract law and the protection of private property. Under those circumstances there will be economic development and prosperity. This is very hard to achieve when many of the governments are socialist or quasi-socialist or simply kleptocracies. The story of international aid to these countries is sadly one of waste, embezzlement and corruption.

If the EU really wants to help these countries, it should not help consolidate corrupt systems through more aid. What it should do is embrace free trade and lower the trade barriers and tariffs – in fact remove trade barriers and tariffs that are holding back the economic development of these countries.

#### 46. Alexander Litvinenko and Romano Prodi – continued

DATE: 26 April 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, at the last part-session I revealed the allegation that Romano Prodi had been an agent of some kind of the KGB. Since then, Mr Prodi has become Prime Minister of Italy. As such, he will be a member of the European Council and will have access to confidential information.

The KGB – now the FSB – is central for the institutionalised web of organised crime and corruption that dominates Russia. It is not possible to resign from the KGB any more than it is from La Cosa Nostra. Therefore, I repeat my request for this Parliament to conduct an investigation into these allegations. Former senior members of the KGB are willing to testify in such an investigation under the right circumstances.

It is not acceptable that this situation is unresolved, given the importance of Russia's relations with the European Union. Parliament should not be constrained by the fact that former senior Communist Party members from Eastern Europe currently sit on the Commission.

#### 47. Suspension of aid to the Palestinian Authority

DATE: 26 April 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, my party, the UK Independence Party, constantly criticises the European Union, so it makes a pleasant change for me at least partially to be able to support the Commission's decision to suspend funding to the Palestinian Authority. The Palestinian people have made the sad decision to elect Hamas, a terrorist front organisation, to government; they now have to live with the consequences of that decision.

The spending of taxpayers' money in Palestine by the European Union has long been a scandal in that these monies have never been fully accounted for and have almost certainly found their way into terrorist pockets. The Palestinian people as such may be a deserving case for humanitarian aid, but such aid should not come from the European Union, whose own accounts have not been signed off by its own auditors for 11 consecutive years. The spending of international aid should be returned to nation states.

#### 48. Suspension of aid to the Palestinian Authority

DATE: 31 May 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, the US experienced its first serious terrorist attack on 9/11. Its response was entitled 'A war on terrorism' – a highly dubious military proposition.

For decades, Britain experienced sustained terrorist attacks launched from the Irish mainland. Those terrorists were substantially funded by US citizens. The US Government was instrumental in forcing the British Government to capitulate in the face of that terrorist campaign.

Now the US is at risk, a different double standard applies: the US Government believes that it has the right to disregard the Geneva Convention and all civilised standards and to kidnap, detain, abuse and torture terrorist suspects. Some of those suspects are British citizens. They may be completely innocent or they may be guilty. Who knows? No evidence is produced, no trials take place. If they are real terrorists, then let them face justice and not languish in a detention camp that the Americans do not even dare to put within their own country.

#### 49. Malcolm Cubin and the European Arrest Warrant

DATE: 12 June 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the dangers posed to traditional British liberties by the European Arrest Warrant are demonstrated by the case of my constituent, Malcolm Cubin. Mr Cubin is one of three divers threatened with extradition to Spain on charges of damaging Spanish heritage and stealing artefacts from a wreck. Mr Cubin maintains that those are trumped-up charges and that no evidence has been produced to substantiate them.

It used to be that prima facie evidence had to be submitted to a British court before a British citizen could be extradited. The crime in question had to be recognised as such and a proper legal system had to be recognised in the country requesting extradition. All those safeguards are now gone and, providing the extradition form has been filled out correctly, a British citizen can be shipped off with as little ceremony as posting a parcel.

The British Government should refuse to allow Mr Cubin and his colleagues to be extradited until proper evidence has been produced and it is satisfied there will be a fair hearing.



## 50. Nuclear research and training activities

DATE: 13 June 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 180 Seconds

Since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution Britain was able to rely predominantly on its own indigenous energy resources: coal and then natural gas. But Britain, like many European countries, now faces an impending energy crisis. Coal still meets 35% of our energy needs but it is environmentally unfriendly. North Sea gas, which met 37.5% of our needs, is rapidly running out and since 2003 we have been forced to import gas. We have already passed from a surplus to a shortage and we are heading for an ever-widening shortfall.

Nuclear energy provides about 22.5% of our needs but that nuclear capability is now rapidly coming to the end of its life cycle and our nuclear power stations will have to be decommissioned, so that by 2014 we will have lost about 70% of our capacity. Britain faces losing a very large proportion of its energy supplies relatively quickly. Unless other provisions can be made, very soon we will be forced to rely on foreign, unreliable and not necessarily friendly suppliers, for example, the Russian Federation.

Energy conservation measures are necessary and desirable, but cannot make the necessary impact. With the best will in the world, renewable sources of energy, such as wind and waves, simply will not supply the amounts of energy required for major industrialised societies. Wind turbines will only work when the wind blows, which is 30% of the time, and require conventional power stations to back them up when the wind does not blow. They are worse than useless. Wave power only works in specific geographic locations. Other alternative methods are equally ineffective. France has already tackled the problem and installed the latest range of modern nuclear reactors, to the extent that they now supply about 70% to 80% of its electricity needs.

Therefore I found much to agree with in Mr Buzek's report. He is quite right to think in terms of a 50-year plan for sustainable and secure nuclear energy supplies that are safe and environmentally friendly. The first stage of that plan is to build sufficient new-generation nuclear

power stations for the next 30 to 50 years. Stage two of the plan must, as he rightly says, consist of the development of nuclear fusion to deliver viable fusion plants within two generations.

Where I have to part company with him is on the notion that this project should be done under the auspices of the European Union. Britain could build ten new nuclear power stations for the equivalent of less than two years' contributions to the European budget. That would be money much better spent.

The development of nuclear fusion is precisely the kind of international cooperative project that could be undertaken by independent sovereign governments, without any need for the institutions of the European Union intended to promote political integration by economic means, as indeed Euratom has done since its creation.

51. **Period of reflection on European Constitution**  
*(Intervention during vote)*

DATE: 14 June 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 20 Seconds

Mr President, on a point of order, I would like to invoke Rule 35 with reference to this vote. Under Rule 35(1), for all Commission proposals of a legislative nature, the committee responsible shall verify the legal basis. Rule 35(4) says that the committee should have disputed the validity of the proceedings regarding the period of reflection and the ratification process. This is for two reasons. First of all, under the EU's own rules, any Member State rejecting the Constitutional Treaty has right of veto, and therefore it should be dead. My second point – and the most important point to me – is that the European Constitution is unconstitutional in terms of the British Constitution in relation to Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights and various other acts of ...

*At this point the president cut-off the speakers microphone.*

COMMENT

*Before I was rudely interrupted I was trying to make the point that ratification of the European Constitution is unconstitutional under England's existing written constitution embodied in various constitutional statutes.*

52. **The Austrian Presidency – Who do you think you are kidding Mr Schüssel?**

DATE: 20 June 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, we must be very grateful to Mr Schüssel for his honesty in saying that the substance of the Constitutional Treaty must remain untouched. The message is loud and clear. The political elite knows best; full steam ahead with the Constitution; and do not listen to the people.

Not only that, but Mr Barroso has told us that the next stage, next March, will be a political declaration, the Berlin Declaration. In time he might see that as a public relations miscalculation. Mr Schüssel finished by referring to Beethoven's Ode to Joy, the anthem of the European Union.

I have always thought it unfair that Beethoven should be associated with the European Union given that in his own day he was a fervent opponent of European political integration under Napoleon.

*(Laughter)*

But the musical theme reminds me of another little tune. It did not have as great a composer as Beethoven; it did not have as great a poet as Schiller to write the words, but its words sum up the attitude of Britain towards the European Union:

'Who do you think you are kidding Mr Schüssel, if you think old England's done? We are the boys who will make you think again, we are the boys who will stop your little game. Who do you think you are kidding Mr Schüssel?'

### 53. Extraordinary rendition

DATE: 5 July 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, it was entirely predictable that whatever the findings of this report, it would call for increased powers to be taken by the European Union and, indeed, we were not disappointed. It states that the rules of cooperation between national security services should be established at EU level, that effective parliamentary scrutiny of national intelligence services should be at European level and that the Commission should immediately legislate to harmonise laws on the surveillance of non-commercial civil aviation. There never seems to be an ill wind that cannot blow the European Union some good.

The report and the minority opinion expressed agree that some illegal detentions and transportations may have taken place. However, it is unlikely that the real truth will ever be known. I have no time whatsoever for illegal detentions and transportations of citizens or of non-EU citizens. The existing legal means are draconian enough.

In this morning's Daily Telegraph , the leader of the UK's Liberal Democrats, Sir Menzies Campbell, said that Britain's extradition arrangements with the USA were a constitutional disgrace. Surprisingly for a lawyer, he does not seem to know that very similar arrangements exist with the European Union. Britain's extradition arrangements under the European Arrest Warrant and under the similar and non-reciprocal arrangement with the USA amount to little better than the judicial kidnap of British citizens.

#### 54. Results of the WTO meeting in Geneva

DATE: 6 July 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, as Commissioner Mandelson knows, increased trade and prosperity go together. Increased trade and prosperity means a reduction in migration, a more stable society and peace. The Third World needs as big a share of world trade as anyone else, but the current regime of tariffs and subsidies stifles it. Why not drop barriers against the Third World in return for domestic, legal and infrastructural progress?

The EU will not look again at tariffs before 2013 and precious time will be lost. Now we come to the issue of globalisation. Why on earth are such high tariffs being put on shoes from China? Are we afraid of China's massive population out-producing Europe? We must think again; trade is a two way thing. Buying from China means that 500 million Europeans will get an entry into a market of 1.3 billion Chinese. That is an enormous opportunity for European producers.

So I would urge the Commissioner to please have the courage and the daring to reduce tariffs and subsidies drastically and stimulate free trade worldwide. Let us not just talk about reducing poverty and making poverty history, but let us take real concrete steps to promote trade, which offers the only real solution.

## 55. EU-China relations

DATE: 6 September 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, we must congratulate the people of China on the progress they have made since the death of the tyrant Mao Tse-tung 30 years ago. Mao's legacy of murder, oppression, suffering, misery, starvation and death is in a league of its own. He brought China to its knees. His instrument for enforcing this tyranny was, of course, the Chinese Communist Party, which still governs China. The recognition by Mao's successor Deng Xiao Ping and his successors of some capitalist and free market realities has enabled China to progress economically to the point it has reached today.

However, at the heart of the Chinese economic phenomenon lies an unresolved contradiction: China's new-found prosperity is based on capitalist principles applied by the Chinese Communist Party, which is the only political party in China. We have the curious spectacle of a communist party that no longer believes in communism applying capitalist ideas that it is not supposed to believe in. Its only real belief is in ensuring its own survival, and the European Union should not assist it in that aim by lending the kind of support that we have already seen.

Progress in China will inevitably be limited to the economic sphere for as long as the Chinese Communist Party retains power. Progress will not extend to freedom of association, freedom of speech and democracy. The Chinese people are at long last beginning to reap some of the material benefits of the capitalist system. But when are they going to reap the benefits of the Western democratic system? Mr Belder's report rightly calls for political pluralism, an independent judiciary and for the EU not to lift its arms embargo until China properly addresses the situation regarding human rights and civil and political freedoms.

Mr Belder calls for a consistent and coherent policy towards China. Such a coherent policy should promote the interests of the Chinese people, but not the interests of the Chinese Communist Party. Therefore, we should not lift the arms embargo and we should

continue to recognise Taiwan as an independent democratic State.

Unfortunately, I have to say that this report should be rejected because it advocates the further development of an EU strategy regarding relations with China. That would be bad for the Chinese people. It would also restrict the political and economic decisions of the United Kingdom and would dilute its influence and priorities. In the long run, that would also be bad for the Chinese people.



## 56. Situation in the Middle East

DATE: 6 September 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, we have heard several times during this debate of the need for a negotiated settlement and a peace process. But with whom do we negotiate and on what basis? The war in Lebanon was caused by Hizbollah kidnapping Israeli soldiers which, unsurprisingly, triggered retaliation by the Israelis and the escalating conflict we have witnessed.

The leader of Hizbollah, Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah, said that he would not have ordered the troops' capture and kidnapping if he had known that it would lead to full-scale war. What did he expect? Those are not the words of a political leader but of a political gangster and terrorist. He ordered the kidnappings because he thought he might get away with it. He did not, but he got a war that he could blame on the Israelis anyway.

The Palestinians have elected a terrorist government under Hamas and the Lebanese have two Hizbollah terrorist representatives in their government. These decisions have consequences for the Palestinians and the Lebanese, as we have seen. How does the European Union react to this? By sending the protagonists more money: €435 million so far this year to Palestine and €42 million to Lebanon.

We should let the Hamas and Hizbollah ministers in question renounce their intentions to drive the Israelis into the sea before we consider sending their governments aid. Otherwise such payments amount to nothing more than financing terrorism.

## 57. Use of passenger name data Agreement with USA

DATE: 7 September 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, this report states that the EU-US agreement in this sphere is going to become 'the standard, both for European legislation and globally'. Well, what a reference standard to have! It is already an embarrassment. The European Court of Justice has annulled the original agreement, and yet the replacement agreement only differs in its legal basis.

This Parliament challenged the original agreement between the US and the EU because it believed that the legal basis was wrong and disagreed with the substance. However, despite this Parliament appearing to win the case in the European Court of Justice, nothing substantial has changed. The legal basis will be altered, but since the European Court of Justice did not comment on the substance, in real terms nothing has changed except, of course, the fact that the European Court of Justice will not have competence over the new agreement.

It is clear that the Council is going to continue with this agreement in its original form, just changing the legal basis but still ignoring Parliament in the process. So why is this Parliament again indulging in pointless activity by writing, debating and voting on this report? It will be ignored by the Council.

In-fighting within the European institutions brought about the premature termination of the original agreement. This whole process illustrates the chaotic nature of the European Union. This indicates clearly once again why the United Kingdom would be so much better served by organising such international agreements and arrangements on a bilateral basis.

## 58. Switzerland and its EU cost benefit analysis

DATE: 25 September 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, in its Europe 2006 report the Federal Government of Switzerland published a cost-benefit analysis of possible membership of the European Union. It examined three alternatives: to continue the current set of bilateral sector-specific arrangements, to join the European Economic Area, or to become a full member of the EU.

The Swiss calculated that full EU membership would cost between six and nine times as much as the current system of bilateral trading arrangements. They decided that the resulting loss of sovereignty and freedom of action and the negative economic effects would far outweigh any supposed benefits.

The report concludes that Switzerland's interests are best served by staying out of the EU and continuing with its existing sector-specific trading arrangements. It is good to know that there is still at least one European government that understands the meaning of the words 'in the national interest', even if it is not the British Government.

59. **Taking into account previous convictions in another Member State**

DATE: 26 September 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, in this report we see another example of the so-called beneficial crisis which gives the European Union the opportunity to press forward with yet more political integration. There is indeed a problem. In London, the Metropolitan Police admit that most of the organised crime is now run by a variety of ethnic gangs, many of them from EU countries. This is quite apart from individual criminals who have come to Britain to pursue their professions.

The real problem lies with Britain's open border policy and the right of EU citizens to unhindered entry to the UK, as well as the Government's complete abdication of any control over who can and cannot come in from anywhere in the world. But the telling part of this report is the reference to the Tampere European Council which intends to force a European system of justice on the UK and the comment that 'there is a long way to go until justice is procedurally, evidentially and substantially administered in a more or less similar way in all the Member States'.

Yes, indeed there is, and long may it remain so. Britain still has habeas corpus – the right to trial by jury and the presumption of innocence until proven guilty – and some of us in Britain intend, and want, that we should keep those safeguards. The UK Independence Party's response to this report is 'thanks, but no thanks'.

## 60. Turkey's progress towards accession

DATE: 26 September 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, why on earth does Turkey want to join the European Union in the first place? Perhaps it wants to join the mass ranks of the parasite nations that already live off the backs of the British and German taxpayers. Perhaps it sees an opportunity to export some of its unemployed and criminals to Britain. But the Turks should think about the impact on their own society.

Only yesterday, the Turkish Army Chief of Staff, warned of the dangers posed by Islamist extremists politicising religion, and pledged that the Turkish army would protect the secular nature of the Turkish Republic. But in the past the Turks have not had to contend with the European Union. They may find that their Islamist extremists are able to exploit the EU's non-discrimination, equality and human rights legislation to their advantage. Perhaps the Turks will have to learn the hard way that membership of the European Union means losing control of your own destiny.

## 61. Israeli passport stamps and Algeria

DATE: 11 October 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, next week a LIBE Committee delegation will visit Algeria. However, one of the Algerian visa requirements is the absence of an Israeli visa passport stamp. Mr Gaubert noticed this and was rightly appalled at this blatant anti-Semitism. He demanded an explanation. The matter was referred to you, Mr President, and you were asked to make representations to the Algerians. I understand that you refused to do so, saying it was a matter for individual MEPs. Mr Gaubert has quite rightly refused to go on the trip.

This raises two important issues. First, why has the European Union sent almost one billion euro to Algeria since 1996, when that country is implementing a blatantly anti-Semitic policy? The EU should stop these payments immediately.

The second issue is the apparent dereliction of duty by you, Mr President, when you could have made a stand against Algeria's anti-Semitism, backed by the weight of your office. Please reconsider and rectify this situation.

## 62. The Bowbelle and Marchioness disaster

DATE: 23 October 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, on 20 August 1989, on the River Thames, the gravel dredger Bowbelle collided with the pleasure cruiser Marchioness and 51 people lost their lives. That tragedy resulted in the Government implementing stricter safety requirements for those navigating on the River Thames.

These safety regulations are now in danger of being diluted as a direct result of the Government's intention to implement EU Directive 96/50/EC. The current United Kingdom standards will be replaced by much lower standards under a harmonised European boatmaster's licence. However, this is not necessary, as the same directive allows, under Article 3(2), for Member States to apply exemptions on national waterways and issue boatmaster's certificates under their own conditions.

I therefore call on all United Kingdom MEPs to write to the Minister, Dr Stephen Ladyman, asking him, in the interests of higher safety standards on the River Thames, to apply the derogation allowed under the directive.

### 63. EC-Syria Euro-Mediterranean Association Agreement

DATE: 25 October 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, this report asserts that an EU-Mediterranean agreement would give decisive impetus to the political, economic and social reforms needed in Syria, yet the report also deplors the signing of a military agreement between Syria and Iran, which the Syrians say will increase cooperation against what they call the common threat presented by Israel and the USA.

Since 1995 the European Union has given Syria €259 million. The EU pays millions of euros to support the tyrannical Syrian regime in the hope that somehow it will make them believers in democracy, civil liberties, human rights, etc. The Syrians, on the other hand, now find that they have enough spare cash to be able to afford a military alliance with Iran that will inevitably make the world a more dangerous place.

EU taxpayers' money should not be spent in supporting tyrannical and murderous regimes which are the enemies of democracy, freedom and peace.



## 64. Implementation of the European Security Strategy

DATE: 15 November 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, in the early 1950s Jean Monnet proposed a European Defence Community, with a European army run by a European Minister for Defence, a common budget and common arms procurement. This project was thankfully rejected by the French after President de Gaulle opposed the idea.

Undeterred, Jean Monnet and his acolytes pursued the idea of a European political union by economic means rather than by defence and military means. Over 50 years later, we have a European Union which has almost completed its political agenda: it has its own President, its own cabinet in the shape of the Commission, its own Parliament, a single currency, flag, anthem and Court of Justice, just to name a few of its attributes.

However, if it is to be a real state it must have its own military forces, and that is what this report is about. The report calls for a common equipment and equipment procurement policy and for integrated command and control and communication systems. What better way to ensure the integration of Europe's national military forces than by ensuring that they will become so interdependent that they will not be able to operate independently. The militaristic pill is sugared, however, by reference to humanitarian operations and crisis management. However, call it what you will, it is an army, and if war is the continuation of politics by other means, then the European Union needs an army to pursue its foreign policy ambitions.

I am not surprised that Mr von Wogau pursues political integration by these means. He believes in political integration and is open about it, and I respect him for that. What disgusts me is that Britain's Prime Minister, the liar Mr Blair, and his rotten and corrupt Labour Government collude with the process of integrating Britain's armed forces into the planned European army, while pretending to defend Britain's national interest.

## 65. Biological and Toxin Weapons

DATE: 15 November 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, Mrs Lehtomäki spoke of the European Union's action plan in relation to the Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. Yet again, the European Union falsely assumes the attributes of a political state empowered to determine policy on what are military and defence measures, which are the proper responsibility of sovereign nations.

The EU has never had to militarily defend its citizens and let us hope that it never has to, for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, countries like mine, Great Britain, which are serious military powers, have to discharge that responsibility. Cluster bombs do indeed need greater international regulation, especially in regard to the so-called dumb bombs, which have no self-destruct mechanism. Britain is also a leading power in research into defence against biological and toxin weapons, and given the current terrorist threat by fundamentalist Islam, Britain has to maintain its independence and freedom of action in this sphere.

## 66. The murder of Alexander Litvinenko

DATE: 29 November 2006 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, I should like to pay tribute to my constituent, Mr Alexander Litvinenko. Alexander was fearless in exposing the political gangsters that now run Russia, and the creatures of the KGB and FSB that still hold political office in Europe. For his bravery, he paid the ultimate price.

In April, I made two speeches in this Parliament repeating allegations made to me by Alexander that Romano Prodi had been an agent of some kind of the KGB. Alexander told me that the key figure to understanding Mr Prodi's alleged relationship with the KGB in the 1970s was a man named Sokolov, also known as Konopkine, who worked for TASS in Italy.

Since Alexander can no longer testify to this effect, as he was ready, willing and able to do, I am pleased to provide this service for him posthumously.

### COMMENT

*Mr Litvinenko met with Mario Scaramella on 1st November 2006 who warned him that he had received threats on both their lives. Later he met two Russian businessmen, Andrei Lugovoi and Dimitri Kovtun at the Millennium Hotel. Mr Litvinenko later felt unwell and was admitted to hospital on 4th November. On 20th November he was moved to intensive care and died on 23rd November. He was later found to have died from Plutonium 210 Radioactive poisoning.*

**67. Alexander Litvinenko and Russia's international murder squads**

DATE: 11 December 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, this summer the Russian State Duma introduced two laws allowing action to be taken against Russian and non-Russian citizens abroad. Authorised by a decision of the President of the Russian Federation, euphemistically named 'special assignment units' of the federal security services may be used against so-called terrorists or those who have allegedly libelled the state. Those laws are a licence to kill, and the first public execution of a British citizen was carried out last month when Alexander Litvinenko was poisoned and died in London. However, the murder was bungled and a radioactive evidence trail stretches from London to Moscow.

Tony Blair's reaction was to say that nothing must come between Britain's relations with Russia. The Russians' reaction was to say that no suspect, whatever the evidence, will be extradited to Britain. But the reaction of the world must be to exclude Russia from the civilised community of nations until its international murder squads are no longer operational.

## 68. EU enlargement strategy and capacity to integrate

DATE: 13 December 2006 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the European Union has a seemingly limitless need to absorb more countries. More and more power is taken away from democratic nation states and concentrated in a centralised and undemocratic European Union. As Mr Stubb puts it, he wants to see a single entity with a unified structure and a legal personality, in other words, a 'United States of Europe'.

Mr Stubb will not be surprised to know that the UK Independence Party does not agree with that, but I have found something in his report that we can agree with. When speaking of a revised Constitution, he calls for the adoption of a clause enabling Member States to withdraw from the European Union. Eventually, Britain will leave the European Union, Constitution or not, withdrawal clause or not, but at least Mr Stubb has the decency to recognise that countries should have the right to secede from the new European empire.

## 69. Annual reports on arms exports

DATE: 17 January 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, the Committee on Foreign Affairs states that it ‘finds it unacceptable that no steps have been taken to adopt the Code as a common position’. A common position would not be binding as such, but would define the general guidelines that Member States must conform to. The rapporteur describes the common position as ‘legally more binding on EU Member States than a code of conduct’.

The report calls on the Presidency and Member State governments to explain why the Code has not been adopted as a common position. Regret is expressed at the absence of a common position, with the justification that this has weakened both the further development of EU export controls and prevented moves towards further general harmonisation of EU export controls.

The report states that it is ‘convinced that the development and implementation of a harmonised European arms export control policy would contribute decisively to a deepening of the Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy’. There we have it put plainly enough. The arguments contained in the report are devices to further the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the ubiquitous and relentless need for all things to be harmonised.

The United Kingdom has a different story and background to the other countries of Europe. We have long and historic ties with our allies in the Commonwealth and throughout the world. Britain has a so far unbroken record, and a far more successful record, of defending her vital national interests than any other country represented here. Therefore, the UK Independence Party rejects this report because it must be up to Britain to decide its own arms export policy in the light of her own national and international and foreign policy and defence interests and in accordance with any legitimate international agreements she has entered into.

## 70. Voluntary modulation of direct payments under the CAP

DATE: 13 February 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Madam President, here we go again. The Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development keeps rejecting this proposal and the Commission keeps on batting it back. If nothing else this ping pong tournament clearly shows the pointlessness of this Parliament and its committees.

This Parliament is supposed to represent democracy in the EU, so why is it that the Commission shows it such contempt? Possibly because it knows that in reality this Parliament is a sham of democracy, a glorified talking shop with little or no meaningful influence over anything.

The UK Independence Party finds itself in the unusual position of being against giving the British Government more freedom, in this case to siphon off CAP funds away from food production and into nebulous rural development schemes which could mean anything from maintaining village greens to building theme parks or running animal reserves. We are, after all, supposed to be talking about the common agricultural policy and not the common rural development policy.

The British farming community needs support. It is not the healthy option for my country to move away from producing its own food. A country should not be reliant on imports to feed itself, and this is where Britain is heading if we take money away from genuine farming and instead pour it into feel-good environmental projects.

The UK Independence Party is no supporter of the EU and its subsidy regime. But while Britain remains a member, we might as well ensure that the funding we receive – which is merely our own money that the EU sees fit to return to us anyway – is spent in the right place.

Feeding the British people must take priority over what might, in some cases, be termed ‘cosmetic environmental projects’.

## 71. External dimension of the fight against terrorism

DATE: 14 February 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Madam President, this report starts from the false premise that international terrorism constitutes the greatest threat to the democratic international community. Likewise, President Bush's concept of a war on terror is mistaken.

Violence and terrorism are only means to an end. The greatest threat to the free democratic world comes from an ideology. The ideology in question is that of the fundamentalist and extremist Islam, which by means of terror seeks first to impose its psychological, and then ultimately its physical dominion on the world. They believe that time and demography are on their side and they have declared war on us.

Sun Tzu remarked that the first place to win a war is in the mind of the enemy. Islamic fundamentalists might conclude that they are well on the road to winning that war when its victims do not confront the fundamental cause of the problem. The solution is not for the European Union to concentrate more power in its hands, as is predictably recommended in this report. The solution is to recognise that fundamentalist, extremist and literal Islam is incompatible with Western liberal democracy and indeed any kind of civilisation. From that starting point we can begin to adopt concrete measures to combat its manifestations through the actions of nation states and international cooperation. Had I longer than 60 seconds to speak, I could have told you what some of those measures might be.



## 72. Transportation and illegal detention of prisoners

DATE: 14 February 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the essence of this report is the expression of two themes very popular with many Members of this Parliament: their inherent anti-Americanism and their never-ending desire to use any pretext to call for more powers to be given to the European Union.

The kidnap, mistreatment and imprisonment without trial of suspects is wrong and, incidentally, that is why I and the UK Independence Party are opposed to the European arrest warrant and the UK's current extradition arrangements with the USA. That being said, this report is speculative and lacks any firm evidence.

The free democratic world is not engaged in a war on terrorism. This is a misconception repeated in this report. We are engaged in a war on ideology – a war we did not start. The ideology is that of fundamentalist and extreme Islam, an ideology without any humanitarian or civilised constraint. Thankfully, the United States of America is leading the resistance against it.

### 73. Incandescent light bulbs

DATE: 12 March 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, last week the European Union announced plans to phase out incandescent light bulbs by 2009. Europe currently consumes about two billion such bulbs per annum and simply does not have the manufacturing capability to make two billion alternative lamps. Demand would require about 300 new production lines – that is about 75 new production lines for each one of Europe’s four main lamp manufacturers. None of them currently has more than ten production lines. The cost of new machinery alone would be about £450 million. If this undertaking is enforced, then the lamps will have to be sourced from elsewhere – probably China – if indeed it can meet the demand.

Did anyone on the Council of Ministers not think to ask if we had any new light bulbs in the cupboard before they decided to throw away the old ones? This is another example of what the European Union does best, which is driving business elsewhere and destroying jobs.

#### 74. Negotiation of EU Central, and Andean, Community Association Agreements

DATE: 14 March 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, what is the best way of increasing living standards and human and civil rights in Central American and the Andean Community countries? The question could equally well be applied to the whole of Central and South America and the rest of the economically developing world.

It is in the long-term self-interest of the economically developed and democratic world to use its economic strength to promote economic growth and democracy in the developing world. The best way to do this is by reducing trade barriers worldwide and by concluding trade and cooperation agreements conditional on respect for the rule of law, respect for property and contract rights and respect for human and civil rights.

We have seen how China, even while under the yoke of a dictatorial communist regime, can nevertheless achieve staggering economic development when it embraces capitalist, free-market practices. Capitalism, for all its faults, works. It delivers prosperity, choice and the conditions required for democracy and civilised values. Socialism, for all its idealism, does not work. It delivers oppression, lack of choice and material and political stagnation.

So what the developing countries of the world need is not to follow the example of the quasi-Marxist European Union. They do not need what these reports recommend, which is the export of the worst features of the European Union: economic and political integration and harmonised legislation.

The last thing that these countries need is to follow the example of the failing economic model and increasingly centralised European Union, with its increasingly undemocratic and unaccountable political institutions. These reports call for free trade – which is good – but that must not be conditional on recreating the failing structures of the European Union.

75. **Prospects for the EU's Common Foreign Policy in 2007, including the deployment of anti-missile defence systems in Europe by the United States**

DATE: 29 March 2007 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, I understand that Mr Solana is looking for a new job. On a personal basis, I wish you well in any new career you may choose, Mr Solana, but I am pleased that the role of European Foreign Minister is no longer viable because of the rejection of the proposed European Constitution in 2005.

European foreign policy, because we all have different histories, international commitments, interests and allies. Take Britain, for example. We do not necessarily share with our European neighbours the same perspectives on the international crises we face today. As you will be well aware, Britain faces a very grave situation in Iran, which has illegally detained British troops. It would be ridiculous for an EU Foreign Minister to try to negotiate the release of members of Her Majesty's Armed Forces. However, Britain is also now in an equally ridiculous position as a result of our membership of the European Union. If diplomatic efforts fail to obtain the release of the British troops, then Iran's illegal actions may have to be met with sanctions. But Britain could not enact sanctions against Iran, even if it wanted to, because Britain no longer has control over its own trading rules. Trade policy is now under the control of the European Union.

This is yet another example, if one were needed, of why Britain must leave the European Union and restore control of her own affairs.

## 76. Galileo satellite system

DATE: 24 April 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, there is a perfectly good existing satellite system available for EU citizens' use. But we all know that Galileo is really about extending the power and dominion of the European Union and it is eventually intended to be used for military purposes by the planned EU armed forces.

Meanwhile, the funding plans of this grandiose project, which will run into billions of euros, are encountering severe difficulties. The British Government, ever with an eye for an additional taxation opportunity, plans to use it to implement road-charging schemes so that British citizens can help pay for it by being charged for the privilege of driving on their own roads.

Galileo has all the makings of an Airbus in space and, as Galileo Galilei pointed out, what goes up must come down. In this case it would be much better if it did not go up in the first place.

77. **Mario Scaramella is a European political prisoner!**

DATE: 25 April 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, on the subject of human rights I would like to draw attention to the plight of a political prisoner in the European Union. He has been imprisoned in Rome for the last four months. He is now in poor health both physically and mentally. He is being held without prospects of release or trial to try and break his will, in an attempt to force him to sign false confessions against himself and others. His name is Mario Scaramella and his alleged offences are contrived accusations without foundation.

Mr Scaramella was, of course, the man who went to London in November 2006 to warn Alexander Litvinenko that he was about to be murdered. Mr Scaramella and Mr Litvinenko had both been associated with the Mitrokhin Commission for investigating links between Italian politicians and the KGB. Mr Scaramella should be released and returned to his family immediately, pending any trial.

## 78. A posthumous pardon for Steve Thoburn, Metric Martyr

DATE: 9 May 2007 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, the European Commission has wisely dropped plans to enforce complete metrication in the UK. It realises that nothing would be more likely to ferment rebellion against the European Union amongst the general population than for them to lose the pound, the pint and the mile. This is a victory for Britain, but it is only a skirmish that has been won. The European Union has made a tactical withdrawal in order to fight more strategic battles later. The struggle for British independence is still being waged and the final victory, when Britain leaves the European Union, is still some way off. The next big confrontation will be over the revised European Constitution. At this point I would like to add my voice to those calling for a posthumous royal pardon to be granted to the metric martyr, Steve Thoburn, who was convicted in the year 2000 for the heinous criminal offence of selling bananas in pounds and ounces.

## 79. EU-Russia summit

DATE: 9 May 2007 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, I heard a comment earlier that Russia is a leading strategic partner, but really, should it be? Russia is a gangster state heading for complete dictatorship. Russia has nothing much of international value but its energy resources and it is skilfully using those resources to engineer its resurgence as a world power. Russia is using those energy supplies to further its international geopolitical ambitions by locking the West into those supplies and by establishing international supplier alliances with states unfriendly to the West.

The democratic, energy-hungry West is sleepwalking into a Russian trap baited with energy supplies. Look at what President Putin said in 2003 to Novaya Gazeta : *'The European Commission had better forget about its illusions. As far as gas is concerned, they will have to deal with the Russian State'*. We should be very concerned about what kind of state that is. It is a state where the security services have transformed themselves into a gangster class that rules unrestrained; a state where over 300\* journalists have been murdered to discourage those who remain from reporting the truth. It is a state where Russian citizens can murder a critical British citizen on British soil and remain protected in Russia without fear of justice.

The European fly should not accept any invitations into the Russian spider's parlour. The United Kingdom should ensure its own independent energy supplies by further investment in nuclear energy without delay.

\* *This is an error and I should have said over '30'. The official figure is 20 since 2001, killed 'while performing their professional duties'. This does not include killing of people not necessarily linked with their work as journalists, deaths in suspicious circumstances and suicides.*



## 80. Weekly bin collections

DATE: 21 May 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, two completely new and unnecessary laws will soon have an impact on the British people. One is the requirement for a home information pack at a cost of at least £600, without which homeowners will not be able to sell their properties. The other is the reduction of household refuse collections from once a week to once every two weeks. Both these pieces of legislation are a direct result of EU directives. The directives are those on the energy performance of buildings and landfill waste. Weekly household refuse collections were established by law in 1875 to stamp out diseases such as cholera and other epidemics which killed thousands of people. Only the EU could take Britain back to where it was prior to 1875, while requiring the British people to pay through the nose for the privilege. Two more good reasons – if they were needed – why Britain should leave the European Union.

## 81. Excise duty on alcohol

DATE: 22 May 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the Council and the Commission want to increase the minimum rate of excise duty on alcohol, supposedly to reduce the distortions in competition and to promote the single market. The rapporteur states that the minimum rate set in 1992 and applied by a minority of Member States has not prevented other Member States from widening the gap by increasing their rates. The conclusion is that it is pointless to set minimum rates when Member States are free to set higher rates and the directive should be abolished.

However, the EU is never going to relinquish control over anything, however pointless it may be, and certain countries will see their rates rise when the minimum rate is increased in line with inflation. This at least will teach new Member States a valuable lesson: the EU will interfere in that which is closest to their hearts and it will cost them money.

## 82. Common Foreign and Security Policy 2005

DATE: 22 May 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, this report calls for an EU foreign minister, a common foreign policy, a common EU seat on the UN Security Council and much more and, of course, for the all too predictable full ratification of the rejected European Constitution in order to make it all possible. The parts that amused me the most were those calling for a foreign policy to be decided by qualified majority voting and for national security services to be subject to democratic scrutiny by the European Parliament.

The justification for all this is that this is what the people of Europe want from the European Union. I do not know which people Mr Brok has been speaking to, but they certainly were not British. The idea that they would want to hand over control of their foreign policy, defences and security services to the European Union is laughable. The frightening thing is that Mr Brok is serious.

### 83. The situation concerning the President of the World Bank

DATE: 24 May 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, the resolution talks about the Wolfowitz affair in terms of 'the World Bank's failure to live up to the globally shared standards of transparency and democracy'. What utter humbug! Any standards of transparency and democracy in the world are practised on a strictly limited basis, and the European Union hardly sets an example.

Mr Wolfowitz has been hounded out of office by those opposed to his anti-corruption agenda. The worst thing that the executive directors of the Bank could find to say against him was that 'a number of mistakes were made'. If Mr Wolfowitz's worst offence was giving his girlfriend a job, then it would hardly qualify as a minor error of judgement compared to the legendary levels of nepotism and corruption that the European Union has been guilty of over the years and the usual levels of corruption associated with the World Bank. Mr Wolfowitz wanted to clean it up and now he will not be able to, but it is an ill wind that cannot be used by the European Union to its advantage.

This brings me to paragraph 6 of the resolution that calls for the Commission to have observer status at the Bank and for it to attend and intervene at certain councils. The key phrase here is 'pending legal personality for the Union'. That legal personality depends on the ratification of the European Constitution that the European Union intends to stuff down the throats of the peoples of Europe whether they want it or not.

President Bush should nominate a new head of the World Bank whose girlfriend or boyfriend already has a job and who will either clean it up or close it down, and he should make sure that the European Union is let nowhere near it in the meantime!

#### 84. Michael Davidson and the illegal seizure of his goods

DATE: 6 June 2007 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, in 2005 one of my constituents, Mr Michael Davidson, had a quantity of cigarettes and alcohol and his motor car seized by Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs when re-entering the UK at Dover. Their justification is that, purely in their opinion, he intended to use the goods for commercial purposes, something he strenuously denies. Such seizures are illegal under Council Directive 92/12/EEC.

In 2006, Commissioner Kovács postponed proceeding against Her Majesty's Government in the European Court of Justice on the understanding that it would comply with the law. However, HM Revenue and Customs are still illegally seizing goods and refusing to restore the monetary value of goods previously seized. The British Government has subjugated British citizens to EU law, but choose to ignore it when it applies to them. I intend to write to Mr Kovács asking him to re-open the proceedings against the British Government in the European Court of Justice.

## 85. The Prüm Treaty

DATE: 6 June 2007 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the purpose of the Prüm Treaty clearly states that it is to play a pioneering role in the integration of the EU. We all know that talk of combating crime and terrorism is secondary to the real purpose. As a framework decision of the Council, it will become part of the EU body of law, its provisions set in stone and not subject to any real democratic scrutiny or approval. The British Parliament will have no opportunity to prevent the implementation of this Convention, and even this Parliament only has a consultative role.

Britain faces a particular danger. For example, it has the largest DNA database in the world with samples collected from over 4.2 million people, many of whom are entirely innocent and have never been charged with any offence. These people are suspects in waiting. This is the creation of a Big Brother Europe by the back door in pursuit of further political integration.

## 86. Enrico Mariotti and the European Arrest Warrant

DATE: 18 June 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the dangers posed by the European arrest warrant are clearly illustrated by the case of Mr Enrico Mariotti. Mr Mariotti was granted sanctuary in England in 1998 after being accused of crimes allegedly committed in Italy more than 30 years previously. The hearsay evidence presented against him would never have been allowed in an English court, let alone result in conviction and a prison sentence. Despite the support of many people and sections of the British media, he was recently deported to Italy by means of a European arrest warrant. He now languishes in a remote prison facing a 26-year prison sentence.

Mr Mariotti is an Italian, but the same rules apply for British citizens. The European arrest warrant means that our traditional safeguards against arbitrary arrest and extradition have been circumvented. People can now be transported to foreign courts with as much ceremony as posting a parcel.

## 87. How much does the EU cost Britain?

DATE: 3 September 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, how much does membership of the European Union cost Britain? Last week I published my second annual report on that very subject. By calculating the direct and indirect costs, I established that EU membership costs Britain at least £60.1 billion per annum gross, or £50.6 billion per annum net. That equates to over £1,000 gross, or £843 net, for every man, woman and child in the UK. Put another way, that is £114,000 per minute gross or £96,000 per minute net. The majority of the British people realise that this is a colossal waste of money.

It is no wonder that UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown is refusing to give the British people a referendum on the new reform treaty. If he thinks that the EU is value for money, he should accept my challenge and commission an independent cost-benefit analysis to prove it. That would be the prudent thing to do.



## 88. The murder of Rizwan Darbar and the return of the death penalty

DATE: 10 October 2007 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, earlier today Mr Pöttering made a statement on the World/European Day against the death penalty and said he rejected the death penalty 'in any form'.

He seems to assume that we all agree with him. I do not. Last Sunday, just a mile from my home in London, an innocent boy of 17, Rizwan Darbar, was stabbed to death in West Ham Park because, it is reported, he attempted to stop a friend's mobile phone from being stolen.

This is not an unusual occurrence in Britain. Innocent people are being shot, stabbed and beaten to death with increasing frequency. Why is this? It is because the thugs and criminals do not fear the law. Even if they are caught and convicted, they often receive very lenient sentences. Personally, I would like to see the reintroduction of the death penalty in Britain for perpetrators of these kinds of murders.

Of course this could not be done unless we were outside of the European Union, which is yet another good reason for leaving.

89. **A maritime policy for the EU  
Britannia Rule the Waves!**

DATE: 10 October 2007 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, the Commissioner made some nautical historical allusions, so I would like to do the same. Most people are familiar with the chorus of the anthem 'Rule Britannia', but people sometimes get one word fundamentally wrong. The correct version is not 'Rule Britannia, Britannia rules the waves'; it is 'Rule Britannia, Britannia rule the waves'. The word 'rules' makes the meaning a bombastic assertion. The correct word, 'rule', makes the meaning an exhortation and a warning. It used to be understood that Britain had to rule the waves in order to maintain her freedom and independence. Now the British do not even rule themselves, with over 80% of our laws made by the European Union. The common fisheries policy has ruined Britain's fishing industry and caused an ecological disaster in British waters. Given the EU's record, why should we think that the EU maritime policy should be any less disastrous than the common fisheries policy?

## 90. Explanations of vote – Number of MEPs representing the UK

DATE: 11 October 2007 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

I voted against Amendment 25 because, while the UK is still a member of the EU, the number of MEPs representing the UK should not be reduced at all. Therefore, to vote in favour of 74 MEPs would have been to vote for a reduction of four. Under the proposed principle of ‘degressive proportionality’, which is yet to be defined, small countries and microstates would be disproportionately represented while larger states, such as the UK, would be under-represented. Considering that large numbers of the population of Eastern Europe have migrated to the UK since 2004, and that they are currently entitled to vote in European Parliament elections, the number of UK MEPs should at least remain at its current 78, if not be increased.

## 91. The 'Reform Treaty' is treason!

DATE: 22 October 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, Gordon Brown said today that there will be no need for another EU Treaty for at least 10 years. He knows full well that there will never be a need for another Treaty. The proposed Reform Treaty is a self-amending Treaty. What little will be left of sovereign power can be transferred to the EU by decisions of the European Council without recourse to Parliament, let alone the people.

The Reform Treaty formally states the legitimacy and supremacy of EU law over national law. If the British Houses of Parliament accept and practise the provisions of the Reform Treaty as superior and at the expense of existing English and Scottish law, then it is an act of treason under the existing treason laws. Any member of the House of Commons or House of Lords that votes for ratification of the Reform Treaty is therefore, literally, a traitor to their country.

*(Laughter)*

Go and look at the treason laws if you do not believe me!

92. **Intervention – Mr President slow down!**

DATE: 24 October 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 20 Seconds

Mr President, on a point of order, you are again conducting business at a speed at which it is impossible to vote. Yesterday, the President of Parliament told us that it was acceptable to make a number of mistakes, getting the vote wrong, because statistically that would happen anyway. That does not apply in your case because we are voting so fast it is impossible to see how people are voting anyway. Can you please slow down?

*(Applause)*

### 93. EU-Serbia relations

DATE: 24 October 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, this report's opening sentence is: '... the future of Serbia lies in the European Union'. It goes on to say: '... the future of all countries in the region lies in the EU'. The countries of the region are of course Croatia, Kosovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania. Some of them have historic enmities that have erupted in tragic wars in recent times.

The EU, of course, believes that if they joined everything would resolve itself in sweetness and light. But follow through one consequence of what would actually happen if they did join. These states have a combined population of over 24 million people. Many of these people would take up their right to move to other parts of the EU. On past experience, many of them would come to Britain. Britain is already swamped with immigrants and asylum seekers from the EU and beyond. The British Home Office has an unofficial policy of moving different ethnic and religious groups of asylum-seekers to different parts of the UK for fear of the violence and conflicts that might erupt between them. If Serbia and other Balkan States were eventually to join the EU, Britain would import yet more of their historic hatreds and blood feuds onto British soil.

The way forward for Serbia and for her neighbours is as democratic, independent nation states, resolving their problems peacefully – not to join the European Union.

## 94. EU-Turkey relations

DATE: 4 October 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the resolution emphasises that Turkey must fully comply with the Copenhagen criteria as a basis for accession to the EU. The report also urges the Turkish Government to bring its approach to freedom of religion in line with those principles as defined by the European Court of Justice.

Since Kemal Atatürk, Turkey has maintained a secular state against the growing power of fundamentalist and literalist Islam. I wonder whether the Turks realise that entering the EU will fundamentally undermine their ability to resist militant Islam. If Turkey joins the EU, their Islamists will use the human rights legislation as a shield from behind which to advance their jihad in Turkey and Europe.

The British people are coming to realise that if Turkey joins the EU, another 70 million people will have the right to come to Britain. Turkish accession will be a disaster for the Turks and a disaster for Britain.

95. **Intervention – on behalf of Mr Martin**

DATE: 25 October 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 30 Seconds

Mr President, on a point of order, I rise under Rule 166, which says that the Member shall first specify to which rule he is referring. I am referring to that one.

I understand that you cut off Mr Martin before he had a chance to finish what he wanted to say. He was making a point about yesterday.

Yesterday, Mr Schulz made a lengthy political statement without referring to the rule under which he was speaking. It was allowed by the President, whereas Mr Martin was cut off.

I think there is a bias at work here and a double standard, where those in favour of the EU are allowed to say what they want and those who are not in favour of it are cut off.

Could we have an even application of the Rules please?

*(Applause)*



## 96. Another nail in the coffin of British liberties

DATE: 12 November 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the European Court of Human Rights recently made a ruling with far-reaching implications. The case in question was that of the Amalgamated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen versus the UK. It concerned Mr Jay Lee, who had been a member of ASLEF and the British National Party. Mr Lee was expelled by ASLEF because of his BNP membership. The Court upheld this action.

The BNP is a political party with its roots in neo-Nazism. Nevertheless, under UK law, membership is perfectly legal. The British Government has conceded that trade union law must now be amended so that unions can expel members whose political views they do not like.

The role of trade unions is to collectively represent the material interests of their members in the workplace, not to decide what political views are acceptable or unacceptable. The Court's decision is yet another European nail in the coffin of British liberties.

## 97. EUROMED

DATE: 13 November 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Thank you, Mr President. Mr Magalhães stated that the Euromed meeting on 18 and 19 November would be the first meeting by Euromed on immigration.

Illegal immigration to Europe is indeed a massive problem for many European countries, posing particular problems for those countries with coastlines within easy reach of North Africa. Great Britain has its particular problems with immigration, too. Illegal – and legal – immigration to Britain is now uncontrolled, unlimited and indiscriminate, in the true meaning of that word. Britain has a massive problem with illegal immigration, but currently the biggest problem is caused by legal immigration from the European Union. The rate of immigration to Britain, as far as anybody can tell, is running at about 500,000 – 600,000 people per annum, with a net change to population of about 200,000 people per annum, adding one million people to the population every five years. Britain is one of the most densely populated countries in the world, and England, taken on its own, is right at the top of the league of densely populated countries. Immigration to Britain on this level is simply unsustainable. It is putting unbearable strains on infrastructure and public services. It would be possible to control immigration into Britain by taking some very basic measures.

None of these measures would be possible while we are a member of the EU: they would all be illegal. The solution for Britain, if it wants to control its immigration, is simply to leave the European Union.

## 98. Strengthening the European Neighbourhood Policy - Situation in Georgia

DATE: 14 November 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, this report clearly demonstrates how the Europhile political elite in this place are completely out of touch with reality and the wishes of their constituents.

The report asks for the processing of visas to be urgently improved so that travel from some non-EU states can be made easier and less burdensome. This is not what most Londoners want. They do not want to make it easier for people to come to Britain: they want to make it harder. They want to be more selective of the people we invite to our country, not to extend the current open-door policy.

The report anticipates Ukrainian entry to the EU. Ukraine has a population of 46 million and, as EU citizens, they would all have the right to enter Britain. The majority of my constituents do not want millions more people given the right of entry to Britain. They do not want any more indiscriminate immigration from Eastern Europe. We already have enough immigrants driving around London without tax and insurance; we have enough criminals, drug dealers, fraudsters, people traffickers and sex slaves.

Another crackpot idea in this report is the call for a EU Neighbourhood Parliamentary Assembly – another talking shop of politicians, out of touch with reality, dreaming up more ways of wasting taxpayers' money. These politicians would, of course, need to be handsomely rewarded for their efforts.

It should surprise no one that one of the authors of this report is a member of the British Conservative Party, a party that pretends to be Eurosceptic at home, but is enthusiastically Europhile here. No wonder that in London Mr Tannock is known as the Member for Eastern Europe.

I totally oppose these policies; they damage the interests of my constituents. That is why I will be re-elected in London in 2009, and Mr Tannock may not be.

## 99. First anniversary of the murder of Alexander Litvinenko

DATE: 10 December 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, 23 November saw the first anniversary of the murder of my constituent, Alexander Litvinenko, in what was an act of state-sponsored nuclear terrorism. The substance used to kill him, polonium-210, is strictly controlled and is easily traceable back to its source in Russia, even down to the original batch from whence it came. The crime could only have been authorised at the highest level in the Russian political establishment.

The British authorities have requested the extradition of only one person, Andrei Lugovoi, but the murder was not the act of an individual: a team of trained operatives were involved. The British Government has ensured that Mr Lugovoi appears to carry sole responsibility, in order to divert attention from where guilt ultimately lies. The finger of suspicion points straight back to the Kremlin. If President Putin did not order the deed, he certainly knows who did.

COMMENT

*The other suspects in the case are Dimitri Koutun and Vyacheslav Sokolenko.*

## 100. Second EU/Africa Summit

DATE: 11 December 2007 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, Mr Mugabe claimed a diplomatic victory at Lisbon in that he had ‘defeated the British’. In a way he was right. Instead of attending the conference himself, Gordon Brown sent Baroness Amos, who is, with no disrespect to the Baroness, a relatively minor figure in the British Government. In the same way, he will send his errand boy, Mr Miliband, off to Lisbon on Thursday to sign up to the Lisbon Treaty.

It fell to Angela Merkel to rebuke Mr Mugabe with wonderful, almost British understatement that ‘Zimbabwe damages the image of the new Africa’. Well, you could certainly say that!

Mr Brown should have attended the conference and taken the opportunity to tell Mr Mugabe to his face that he is a bloodthirsty tyrant who has no place in the modern community of civilised nations. That would have given heart to oppressed Zimbabweans, and it would also have required real leadership – which is precisely why it did not happen.

## 101. Mario Scaramella – still a political prisoner

DATE: 30 January 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, Alexander Litvinenko testified to the Mitrokhin Commission in Italy and made to me personally the allegation that Romano Prodi was an agent of some kind of the KGB. Mario Scaramella of the Mitrokhin Commission later came to London to warn Mr Litvinenko of murder threats. Mr Litvinenko was soon murdered.

Mr Scaramella returned to Italy, where he was immediately arrested. He has been detained for the last 13 months on trumped-up charges, without trial and denied access to the outside world. Mr Scaramella has lost his income, his home, is separated from his children and his health is at risk. Mario Scaramella is a political prisoner. His continued detention is a scandal at the heart of the European Union. His only offence, if it can be so called, was to help shine a light into the rotten corners of European politics. All democrats should call for his immediate, unconditional release.

**102. Accomplishment of the internal market in Community postal services – closure of British post offices**

DATE: 30 January 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, this directive is yet another example of how one-size-fits-all, incompetent EU legislation adversely affects the lives of British people. This directive is the reason why post offices are closing and why postal workers will lose their jobs. Post offices play a vital role in the community, especially for the old, the poor, the immobile and the disabled. This is just one of a multitude of EU laws that have damaged, and will continue to damage, my country. The British people know this, and this is one of the reasons why they are being denied a referendum on the EU Constitution. If it is ratified, they can look forward to a lot more of the same.

103. **Situation in Iran** (*Continuation of debate*)

DATE: 30 January 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, deceit is a weapon of war approved of in the Koran under the doctrine of taqiyya. Iran professes no plans to develop nuclear weapons. Evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. They had 3,000 uranium centrifuges already. Not one can be used to generate nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Together they will produce one bomb's worth of weapons-grade uranium a year.

Now Iran plans to build 5,000 more centrifuges. Meanwhile, illegal secret imports of raw uranium arrive from the Congo, a country the EU supports with humanitarian aid. Britain still allows Iranian students to study nuclear physics at our universities. In addition to this, Iran, Syria and North Korea are working together to assemble missiles and chemical warheads. Last year, technicians from all three countries were killed when something went wrong in Syria. Traces of Sarin gas were later detected in the atmosphere.

Whether or not these countries successfully develop nuclear warheads, chemical warheads would certainly be deployable in the near future.



## 104. An EU Strategy for Central Asia

DATE: 19 February 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Madam President, this report expresses concern that the new Kyrgyz Constitution, voted on in a referendum in October 2007 without wide-ranging debate, could alter the balance of power. The Kyrgyz Constitution was amended in a controversial referendum in 1996, and in 2003 there was another referendum which approved further constitutional change.

The report goes on to deprecate, in the Central Asian republics, the ‘anxiety to maintain internal control’, which ‘is a given in regimes which show little interest in seeking popular consent on which to base their rule’.

Hang on a moment, who are we talking about here? Constitutional change that will ‘alter the balance of power’. ‘Anxiety to maintain internal control’, with ‘little interest in seeking popular consent’ on which to base the rule of a political elite. This sounds like an extract from a UK Independence Party report on the European Constitution – sorry, I mean the Lisbon Treaty.

I doubt that the five Central Asian republics are models of democracy and the rule of law, but at least when the politicians of Kyrgyzstan wanted to change the constitution, they had the decency to ask the people for their approval in a referendum.

That is something the European Union has had neither the decency nor the courage to do of the European people.

## 105. The demographic future of Europe

DATE: 20 February 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, inside the European Union, Britain has lost control of its borders. Immigration to Britain is now uncontrolled, unlimited and indiscriminate. As far as anyone knows, immigration to Britain is currently running at about half a million people per year. Taking into account those who leave, the net increase in population is about 200,000 per year, or a million people every five years.

The birth rates of the immigrant population are much higher than that of the indigenous population. The dramatic rise in population in England, in particular, is fuelled purely by totally unnecessary immigration. Demographers have calculated that, on current trends, within two generations, the native British, and especially the English, will be an ethnic minority in their own land. Britain simply cannot control its immigration policy inside the European Union, and that is yet another good reason why we should leave.

## 106. The first ten years of the Euro

DATE: 7 May 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, the basic economic problems of the euro cannot be reconciled. In the long term, it is not possible to have one common interest rate for a multitude of differently performing national economies. It is not possible to have one common external exchange rate for a multitude of differently performing economies. It is possible in the short term and even the midterm, but eventually these irreconcilable economic contradictions will pull the European single currency apart. This does not even take into account the undemocratic and un-accountable decision-making processes of the European Central Bank. There is an economic crisis looming and, when one eventually comes that is big enough, it will destroy the European single currency.

## 107. 2009 Budget: Parliament's estimates

DATE: 19 May 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Mr President, on 21 April the Bureau adopted preliminary draft estimates totalling over €1.5 billion for the cost of the European Parliament. 2009 will see the impact of the Lisbon Treaty – if indeed it is ratified by all Member States.

We were told that the Lisbon Treaty – in fact, the European Constitution by another name – was just a tidying-up exercise which would simplify the workings of Parliament. But €2 million is being asked for by officials to cover the additional costs that will be created by the Treaty and 65 new jobs will be required in Parliament alone to help political groups understand it. This is all being approved before the Treaty is ratified in Britain and before the people of Ireland have had their say in a referendum.

Of course, Parliament has already decided that it will ignore the decision of the Irish people if they vote 'no', and, in order to encourage the Irish to vote 'yes', the EU has promised Ireland another €332 million in funding. Let us hope that the Irish do not hold their freedom so cheap. But as that great Englishman, Ken Dodd, once remarked, every cloud has a silver lining, plus VAT.

The report notes that there is an additional need for more money for the Visitors' Centre. I have always thought that the more visitors that come to Parliament and see the great talking shop and legislative sausage-machine in action, the more they will turn against it.

If every European citizen could see the chaotic and shambolic way in which legislation is voted on in this Parliament, then there would be a party like the UK Independence Party in every EU Member State. That, at least, would be money well spent.

## 108. Trials in absentia

DATE: 19 May 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, Britain is one of seven countries proposing legislation to adopt a Council framework decision for common rules on the enforcement of legal decisions rendered in absentia. It will mean that a British citizen can be tried, convicted and sentenced in a foreign country without their presence in a court of law, and then removed to that country for imprisonment. They will find themselves in a position not of defending themselves in a trial, but of proving themselves innocent after a conviction.

Whilst there is a provision for retrials, not all EU Member States recognise retrials under their legal systems. This will further destroy the principle of habeas corpus and the freedom from arbitrary arrest and imprisonment traditionally enjoyed by British citizens and fundamental to English law and freedoms. Everything that was good about Britain is gradually being destroyed by membership of this malignant organisation known as the European Union.

## 109. Situation of the Roma in Italy

DATE: 20 May 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Madam President, what is happening in Italy is an example of what can happen when reality collides with the utopian idealism of the European Union. The idealism of the EU is that it can bring about a great, new, borderless state by means of unlimited, uncontrolled and indiscriminate immigration. The reality is that such mass and unregulated immigration brings with it massive social problems. I and my party totally condemn the violence recently seen in Italy perpetrated against groups of people because of their ethnic origin.

We have heard about the integration of communities into host societies, but how can that happen when the sheer numbers of immigrants do not allow it? The EU's mission is to create a great borderless state, and this has brought about vast movements of people in Europe in recent years, surely unparalleled since the fall of the Roman Empire. Signor Frattini, the new Italian Foreign Minister, wants to bring about tougher immigration laws. This is the same Signor Frattini who, when he was an EU Commissioner, said that Europe needed at least 20 million new immigrants from Africa and the Third World. Now that Signor Frattini has left the ivory towers of the EU and has a job in the real political world, he has changed his tune.

The open-border policy of the EU means that no Member State can control who can and cannot enter their country. In Britain this has led to unbearable strains on infrastructure, public and social services and housing. It has brought about increases in disease and crime. Most of the organised crime in London, my constituency, is now the province of foreign ethnic gangs. Any country should be able to have a controlled immigration policy so that they can select what immigrants they want in the appropriate numbers for their needs. The appalling scenes of violence in Italy are a direct result of the European Union assuming control of what should be solely the province and control of nation states.

110. **Global treaty to ban uranium weapons.**  
**Alexander Litvinenko – killed by state sponsored terrorism**

DATE: 21 May 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, while we are on the subject of radioactive weapons, this Parliament has been remarkably quiet about a British citizen – unfortunately consequently an EU citizen – killed by a radioactive weapon in London in December 2006. I refer of course to Mr Alexander Litvinenko, who was murdered in an act of state-sponsored terrorism by means of polonium-210.

The chief suspect for the crime is Mr Andrei Lugovoi, who is now a Member of the Russian Parliament and cannot be extradited under the Russian Constitution. Meanwhile Mr Litvinenko's widow is denied an inquest into her husband's death in the British courts, which could scrutinise the evidence of his murder in the absence of a trial of those suspected of the crime.

This murder was an act of war by Russia on the UK. The British Government does not want to confront that fact. But if you want to discuss radioactive weapons, why not hold a debate on Mr Litvinenko's murder and its far-reaching consequences?

## 111. Rachel Margolis and Lithuanian Jewish Partisans in World War 2

DATE: 4 June 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, my London constituent, Mr Budd Margolis informs me that his Lithuanian relative, Rachel Margolis, has published her memoirs recounting her experiences in the Second World War. She escaped from the Vilna Ghetto and then worked with the partisans fighting against the Nazis. The Lithuanian authorities are now using her memoirs as evidence to prosecute surviving Jewish partisans as war criminals. These include Yitzhak Arad, the former director of Israel's Holocaust Centre, and Fania Brancovskaja, the librarian at the Yiddish Institute at Vilnius University.

Lithuania is under an obligation to prosecute surviving Second World War criminals but so far has not successfully prosecuted one. Jewish partisans who fought against the Germans and their collaborators are regarded by some as traitors to Lithuania.

On behalf of many of my Jewish and non-Jewish constituents, I ask: where is the justice in persecuting Jewish partisans who fought against the Nazis, while the murderers of the Jews go unpunished?



## 112. 2006 Annual report on the Common Foreign and Security Policy implementation of the European Security Strategy

DATE: 4 June 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 180 Seconds

Mr President, both of these reports assume that the Lisbon Treaty/ European Constitution will be ratified, despite the fact that the result of the Irish referendum will not be known until 12 June. But of course this Parliament has already decided that it will ignore the Irish referendum if it results in a 'no' vote.

The European Union does not want its foreign policy and military ambitions to be subject to the will of the people of Europe's nation states by means of referenda, because it knows very well that they will reject those ambitions if given a choice. And what ambitions they are. These reports show how the EU intends to build its military forces by such means as combining multinational forces, building common command and control structures, adopting common equipment and systems procurement policies, and implementing common communication systems. They envisage combining existing multinational forces and that there should be a standing force under EU command. And there we have the beginnings of a European standing army. These plans endanger NATO and undermine the nation states' positions within the United Nations – which the European Union seeks to usurp.

I recently attended a security conference in Brussels in which someone posed the question: who fears the European Union? Meaning, of course, that without the threat of military force, no-one will take the EU's foreign policy pretensions seriously. During the latter part of the Second World War, one of Stalin's staff said that the Pope disapproved of certain of his foreign policy actions. To which Stalin replied: 'and how many divisions does the Pope have?'

The European Union intends to have its divisions in order to enforce its will and make itself feared on the world stage. And if we want to know what that will look like, just imagine the common agricultural policy and the common fisheries policy repeated with guns, tanks and aeroplanes.

The only people in Europe being allowed a say on this are the Irish

in their referendum of 12 June. One of the key factors influencing the minds of the Irish will be to preserve their historical policy of neutrality. But do they realise that if Lisbon is ratified neutrality will end and they will become subject to the foreign policy and military ambitions of the European Union? But they will not only lose their neutrality, they will find themselves helping to pay for soldiers and armaments to undertake military operations that they may not approve of.

They should seriously consider these things before deciding which way to vote in their referendum. The British Government and Houses of Parliament have shamefully betrayed the British people by denying them a referendum on Lisbon. Irish neutrality is at stake, but so is the very ability of Britain to defend itself.

### 113. The body of the European Constitution is beginning to stink!

DATE: 16 June 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, I would like to congratulate the 862,415 Irish people who voted 'no' to the Lisbon Treaty in last Thursday's referendum. They voted for freedom, democracy and common sense. Were the British people to be allowed a referendum, they would undoubtedly vote 'no' in even greater numbers than the Irish. Given the chance, many of the other European nations would also vote 'no', just as the French and the Dutch proved in 2005.

With breathtaking arrogance and disregard for democracy, the European political elite intend to bulldoze onwards with the ratification of the Treaty. The Treaty is dead but the EU refuses to bury it. The EU's ongoing love affair with the Treaty is an act of political necrophilia. But the body is beginning to stink and, the longer it is unburied, the worse the stench is going to get. We must bury the Treaty. It is polluting the political atmosphere.

#### 114. Common standards and procedures for returning illegally staying third-country nationals

DATE: 17 June 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, this proposal would make it much more difficult for Member States to remove illegal immigrants and return them to their own countries. To what extent will it affect the United Kingdom and particularly my constituency, London? London already bears a disproportionate burden of legal and illegal immigrants and asylum seekers. It is stated that Britain has not opted into this area of Community law and the inference is that it will not affect us – but is that true?

Once illegal immigrants have been allowed to stay in Member States, they can then travel to other EU Member States. They could only be excluded on the grounds that they pose an actual threat to security, public health or public policy. And who in the UK, I wonder, is going to enforce that? The British immigration and asylum systems are in total chaos. If Britain indeed is opted out of this legislation, then European illegal immigrants may not have entry by the front door, but this proposal gives them the key to the back door.

Then of course there is the whole issue of the Lisbon Treaty and the Charter of Fundamental Human Rights. Could human rights legislation be used to enforce parts of this proposal in Britain? Who knows? For that will be decided not by the British Government or Parliament or courts, but by the European Court of Justice.

**115. Preparation of the EU/Russia summit (June 2008)  
and Justice for Alexander Litvinenko**

DATE: 18 June 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, I raise an issue on behalf of Mrs Marina Litvinenko, whose husband, Alexander Litvinenko, was murdered in London in December 2006. The murder weapon was polonium-210, a radioactive material, 97% of which is manufactured in the Avangard nuclear facility in Russia. The murder has all the hallmarks of a highly sophisticated assassination, such as those carried out by the Russian security services. The chief suspect in the case, Mr Andrei Lugovoi, is a Member of the Russian Parliament and cannot be extradited under the Russian Constitution.

If I may address myself to Mrs Ferrero-Waldner directly: Mrs Litvinenko asks that the Council and the Commission raise the issue of Mr Litvinenko's murder with President Medvedev during the summit. Mrs Litvinenko wants the murder of her husband to be solved and those concerned brought to justice. The summit is an ideal opportunity to move that process forward. Please assist her.

*(Applause)*

## 116. Formation of Political Groups

DATE: 7 July 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, this Parliament frequently talks about openness, transparency and democracy, but does not always display it.

In this instance, the rapporteur, Mr Corbett, has been very open and transparent about what he seeks to achieve: he wants to make it harder for small groups to form and function; he wants to deny them the resources and privileges they are currently entitled to, which enables them to represent the will of those who elected them. Mr Corbett wants to put political groups that he does not approve of out of business if he possibly can. This is totally undemocratic. Why should not the will of European electors be expressed in political groups, formed by those they elect, however small those groups may be. Why not? Because Mr Corbett does not think they should be allowed to!

These rules, if adopted, would, for example, put my own – the Independence and Democracy Group – out of business. The IND/DEM Group was, of course, formed to oppose the European Constitution, and we have been very successful, having spent money on the ‘no’ campaigns in the French, Dutch and, most recently, Irish, referendums. That is why Mr Corbett and other Europhiles want to try to put us, and any group like us elected after 2009, out of action if they can. His totally undemocratic credentials are transparent for all to see.

117. **The work of the Plenary and initiative reports**  
*(Amendment of the Rules of Procedure)*

DATE: 7 July 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, sometimes when writing these short speeches, it strikes me that it would really take the talent of a George Orwell to do justice to these reports.

This report from the unconscious satirist and humorist, Mr Corbett, is a case in point. What monumental undemocratic arrogance it is to suggest that Members of this Parliament should have their questions to the Council and Commission censored! We are told that this is to avert abuses by the right or stop use of offensive language.

Perhaps Mr Corbett is concerned that we might ask questions about some Commissioners' criminal records or their past careers as apparatchiks of Eastern European Communist regimes, or perhaps about former EU Presidents' alleged careers as KGB agents?

Recently the President of Parliament assumed arbitrary powers to control the right of MEPs to speak in this Chamber. Now Mr Corbett wants to censor what MEPs can say on behalf of their constituents to the Council and the Commission.

If I may respond to Mr Corbett's comment about my speech in the last debate, I was of course referring to his proposed rules on the formation of political groups in relation to the Independence-Democracy Group as it is currently constituted. It is the Labour Party that is facing annihilation in Britain. One reason is its Europhile fanaticism, and I can assure him that in 2009 UK Independence Party MEPs will return here in even greater numbers.

## 118. Stabilization of Afghanistan

DATE: 8 July 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, we all remember why Afghanistan was invaded in the first place: it followed the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the USA, masterminded by al-Qa'ida from bases in Afghanistan under the protection of the Taliban. The USA, along with its allies, most notably the UK, launched a successful attack to displace al-Qa'ida from its stronghold. The West's serious military forces did what was needed to be done to confront terrorism.

This report states that the presence of NATO is essential in order to ensure the country's future. It is true that only the combined military force of the free and democratic world united in NATO can defend our democratic freedoms from attack, but I am very dubious about the chances of grafting democracy onto a country that has no history of it, especially where the monopoly religious ideology is one that is antipathetic to the West's view of liberal democracy.



## 119. Space and security

DATE: 9 July 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 180 Seconds

Mr President, this report opens by saying ‘the various political and security challenges which the European Union is increasingly facing make an autonomous European Space Policy a strategic necessity’.

If you accept this opening proposition at face value then of course the report’s recommendations follow as a logical consequence: a common European space policy, the implementation of the European security and defence policy, the use of the Galileo satellite system for military purposes, and, of course, a budget to pay for it all.

But if we do not accept the proposition, the logic falls apart. There are indeed political and security challenges facing the continent of Europe, but why should the European Union have an autonomous space and security and defence policy?

As far as the overwhelming majority of its citizens are concerned, the European Union is not, and should not be, a political state. And only states legitimately have security policies and military capabilities. As the report says, the Lisbon Treaty includes a legal basis for the European space policy and the possibility for permanent structured cooperation on security and defence.

But of course, legally, the Lisbon Treaty is dead. It was killed by the Irish ‘no’ vote in the recent referendum, so the implementation of a space and security and defence policy should also be dead.

Space and security and defence policy would of course require a common communication system, and the report underlines the necessity for Galileo to be used for an autonomous European security and defence policy. But until recently we were told that Galileo was for civilian purposes only. Finally it has to be admitted that its real use is for EU military purposes.

The report also wants it both ways. It wants an EU space programme linked to the security and defence policy but at the same time says that the space policy should not contribute to the militarization and weaponization of space. Of course space will be militarized and weaponized. That is inevitable. It will be done by the

USA, probably by Russia and in due course certainly by China.

The security interests of the West should be represented in space not by an illegitimate European Union but with our ally the USA, in partnership with the only legitimate security organisation that has the democratic backing of the people of Europe, NATO.

## 120. The Commission's 2007 enlargement strategy paper

DATE: 9 July 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, there is an acknowledgement in this report that enlargement has not been an unqualified success. Mr Brok concedes that, without a serious alteration in the current EU policies, the EU's internal cohesion may be undermined by enlargement.

The EU has let in countries that it knew full well did not meet its own entry criteria, as was the case with Romania and Bulgaria. This may well be repeated with yet more Eastern European states and Turkey.

Tremendous strains are being put on Member States such as the United Kingdom as a result of uncontrolled, unlimited and indiscriminate immigration resulting from continued EU enlargement.

This is just one of the reasons for the growing hostility to the European Union among its citizens. Mr Brok's solution is to propose a massive propaganda budget to convince people of the benefit of enlargement. The solution for Britain is to leave the European Union and regain control of its borders.

121. **European Judicial Network - Application of the principle of mutual recognition of judgments in criminal cases. (Andrew Symeou and the European Arrest Warrant)**

DATE: 1 September 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, here is a concrete example of what a one-size-fits-all integrated European judicial system leads to.

A 19-year-old man in London, **Andrew Symeou**, faces extradition to Greece on a manslaughter charge. Mr Symeou maintains that he has nothing whatsoever to do with the crime in question. The evidence against him is suspect, depending on dubious identification and statements allegedly beaten out of his friends by the Greek police.

That evidence should be scrutinised by a British court before it agrees to his extradition. However, under a European arrest warrant, a British court now has no right to examine prima facie evidence in order to satisfy itself that extradition is justified, and no power to prevent it.

The European arrest warrant means that British citizens now effectively no longer enjoy the basic protection of the law against arbitrary arrest and detention as established by Magna Carta. That does not serve the interests of justice for the victim or the accused, both of whom deserve it.

## 122. The immunity of Europol officials

DATE: 22 September 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, we vote tomorrow on a report that appears to limit the immunity of Europol officials, but is a smokescreen for future legislation that will actually extend this until after 2010. There is no debate. The vote is merely a consultative exercise. The decision will be made by the European Council.

Europol officials will be able to operate in Member States in a wide variety of capacities that will give them immunity for anything that they do and anything that they say in the course of their duties – a privilege not even enjoyed by the NKVD under Stalin’s ‘Great Terror’.

This will be an innovation in England, where no public official has immunity from prosecution. Under the Lisbon Treaty, Member States’ parliaments will not be able to block the further extension of Europol’s powers, amended by Council decisions. These are the first steps in the creation of a European Union police state.

123. **Immunity of Europol officials** (*Explanation of vote*)

DATE: 23 September 2008 - Brussels

COMMENTS IN WRITING:

*This amendment appears to limit the immunity from prosecution of Europol officials but it only does so for those operating as part of Joint Investigation Teams. This is a smokescreen to make it appear that Europol officials' immunity will be limited when in fact Europol's powers will be extended after 2010 and the immunity of its officials will be even more far-reaching. I do not believe that Europol officials should have any immunity from prosecution whatsoever and therefore I voted against this amendment.*

## 124. Combating terrorism - Protection of personal data. A European Police State

DATE: 23 September 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, these Council decisions are part of the process of harmonising our national justice and legal systems into a common EU system. Already any EU citizen can be extradited from one EU country to another by means of a European arrest warrant with minimal safeguards. Even when a national legal system or national government knows that a gross injustice is being done, it cannot prevent it.

Under the new rules on trials in absentia, we can now be tried and sentenced in another EU state without even being aware that this has happened, and then face extradition and imprisonment. We can be fined or have our property confiscated, again without our own national legal systems or governments being able to prevent it or protect us.

Under the Lisbon Treaty a European public prosecutor is planned, with wide-ranging powers to investigate and prosecute those charged with offences against the Union's interest – aided by Europol, whose officials have immunity from prosecution for anything that they do or anything that they say in the course of their duties. And, of course, we have the European Union's own paramilitary police force, the European Gendarmerie, being constructed in Vicenza, which will have the power to cross borders to suppress civil unrest in EU Member States.

All this is being done in the name of protecting us from terrorism; but what is actually happening, of course, is the never-ending mission of the European Union to increase and entrench its own power and dominion in every area of our national lives. Terrorism is indeed a real threat, the single biggest source of which in the world today is the ideology of fundamentalist, literalist and extremist Islam. But terrorism should be combated by national governments working in co-operation with each other, not used as an excuse to increase the power of the European Union.

125. **Combating terrorism - Protection of personal data**  
*(Intervention on Point of Order)*

DATE: 23 September 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, I will be brief. I speak under Rule 145 to rebut remarks and comments made about me by Dame Sarah Ludford\* in her speech in this debate.

She said a number of things, but in particular she said that I was ‘a Europhobe’ and that in relation to extradition, I would ‘give a cheery wave to criminals who made it to the Channel’.

I would like to correct her factually. I am not a Europhobe. I love the continent of Europe, its history, its culture, its achievements as much as anybody, but I am an EU-phobe. I hate the European Union, which is anti-democratic and undemocratic. In relation to the European arrest warrant and the trials in absentia, what I want is for an English or Scottish court to be able to consider prima facie evidence against a suspect before granting extradition and, indeed, have the power to prevent it. They must be able to decide that there is a proper case to answer and that a fair trial will be given.

I do this in order to protect the interests of British citizens, such as exemplified by the case of **Andrew Symeou**, a 19-year-old London man who faces extradition to Greece on 30 September on a manslaughter charge. The evidence against him is extremely suspect, and no account can be taken of that or the fact that witnesses have been allegedly tortured in order to extract statements from them.

I understand Dame Sarah’s sensitivity on this issue since her party, the Liberal Democrats, have obviously backed the wrong horse and she fears – quite rightly – the electoral consequences in 2009.

\* *Dame Sarah Ludford, Lib-Dem MEP for London*



## 126. Dr Frederick Toben and the European Arrest Warrant

DATE: 8 October 2008 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, for years I have been warning that the European arrest warrant could be used to suppress free speech on the Internet. This has now happened. On 1 October, Dr Frederick Toben was arrested at Heathrow Airport on a European arrest warrant issued in Germany for alleged xenophobic crimes committed on the Internet.

Dr Toben is a Holocaust denier. His views are repugnant to all reasonable people. But this is not the point. He has been arrested in Britain for publishing his views on the Internet in Australia. Holocaust denial, while repellent, is not illegal in Britain or Australia. If this European arrest warrant is executed, its use proves that, if someone expresses themselves on the Internet in terms legal in their own country, they can be extradited to another EU country where those views are illegal. This would have profound implications for free speech within nation states.

### COMMENT

*On 19th October Dr Toben was released after the magistrate ruled that the warrant was "vague and imprecise". The German prosecutor had been confident of his extradition but withdrew after the defence lawyer pledged to appeal up to the House of Lords. The indications are that the case was dropped because of political considerations, and the high profile and adverse publicity that would accrue to the European Arrest Warrant if the case was pursued.*

**127. Applicable law in matrimonial matters – Amendment of regulation as regards jurisdiction and introducing rules concerning applicable law in matrimonial matters**

DATE: 20 October 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Madam President, Dr Johnson was once asked what advice he would give to a young couple contemplating marriage. His reply was ‘don’t’. He also described second marriages as ‘the triumph of hope over experience’.

This report must elicit similar responses. What advice should be given to nations contemplating having their divorce laws made by the European Union? The answer is obviously ‘don’t’. To do so, given all the precedents of incompetent and damaging EU legislation, is surely the triumph of hope over experience, to say the least. Amazingly, that also seems to be the conclusion of the Council in this case. The Council does not want the proposals made by the Commission. The Council seems to be very sensibly pulling back from the brink and listening to that old adage, ‘marry in haste, repent at leisure’. What fun it is going to be when the Commission comes up with proposals to harmonise gay marriage and sharia law!

## 128. EU-Russia relations

DATE: 21 October 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the Kremlin has got all it wanted from its bargain with President Sarkozy. President Sarkozy's 'peace in our time' deal gave them what they wanted, and the diplomatic way out. Since the Second World War, the fundamental principle in international relations was that aggression must not pay, or that political concessions should not be made to aggressors, but Moscow has been victorious and NATO humiliated, with the EU playing both sides.

As an institution, the European Union is simply not on the democratic Western side in the new Cold War. The EU does not belong to the free world. It is anti-democratic, undemocratic and imperialistic. Institutionally, it is inclined to side with other anti-democratic empires, not free nations. The EU is not governed by law but by ideology.

Unfortunately, European governments – as good Europeans – will choose to follow the EU's disastrous position towards Russia, rather than their own collective national interest.

## 129. Airport charges

DATE: 22 October 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Madam President, this report is supposed to prevent individual airports from abusing their dominant position in the market, and to create a level playing field for operators and safeguard consumer interests.

How many times have we heard those kind of arguments before? If implemented, this harmonisation of airport charges is likely to be as successful as the harmonisation that brought us the common agricultural policy, the common fisheries policy and the ever-increasing burden of EU regulation on businesses, which costs the UK at least £26 billion per annum.

What it will do is require a completely unnecessary change in British law relating to airport charges and transport-related matters. It will require the setting-up of a supposedly independent supervisory authority that will add yet another layer of bureaucracy, and the inevitably increased costs that will follow.

There is, of course, existing price-cap regulation in the UK, designed to incentivize airport operators to achieve cost efficiencies. The objective of this continual torrent of legislation is to harmonise every aspect of life in the European Union and bring it under the ultimate authority of the European Union. Any other consideration is secondary or unimportant. What we can be absolutely sure of is that these measures will mean increased costs to the air traveller.

130. **Democratic Republic of Congo: clashes in the eastern border areas – Human rights debate**

DATE: 23 October 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the atrocities endured in the Congo are unimaginable to those of us who live in peaceful civilised societies. How can we offer practical help to people such as the Congolese? Direct military intervention and humanitarian aid must only come from international effort under the auspices of the United Nations, but time and time again we see the leaders of these types of failed states being allowed to plunder their countries and enjoy their wealth in the Western world. The stable and peaceful countries of the world should unite to ensure that vast amounts of wealth cannot be stolen and then deposited in western banks with impunity.

International agreements should be reached to ensure that leaders of such states cannot live off their ill-gotten gains. This would be at least one small element of an overall solution to help develop stability in countries such as the Congo.

### 131. Burma – Human rights debate

DATE: 23 October 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, earlier this year we saw the failure of the Burmese Government to deal with the consequences of a natural disaster in that country. Considering the amount of money spent by the military on its own upkeep and the tight hold it has on national life, one might at least have expected it to be able to respond to the needs of its own people in a humanitarian crisis. It did not, because it has no real function, except to perpetuate its own existence and stranglehold on power.

Referring back to what I said in my previous remarks on the Congo, I wonder how many of the military junta have bank accounts in Western banks and enjoy shopping trips to London, Paris and Rome. A direct way of showing support for the Burmese people would be for democratic countries to stop them coming until human rights and democracy are practised in Burma.

## 132. Venezuela – Human rights debate

DATE: 23 October 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, President Chávez has been something of a darling of the Left in Europe. Most notably, in my constituency, he was championed by the former Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone. This allowed his unsavoury image to be somewhat airbrushed with a veneer of spurious respectability. President Chávez has, of course, presided over a diminution of the rights and freedoms of the Venezuelan people. He has undermined political freedom, the rule of law, the independence of the courts, and the freedom of the media and organised labour. Politicians like Mr Livingstone who endorse leaders like President Chávez undermine genuine democracy and reveal a great deal about themselves.

133. **First ten years of the Euro – The UK needs the Euro like a drowning man needs a straightjacket**

DATE: 17 November 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, it has always been economic nonsense for a number of differently performing economies to share the same interest and exchange rates. In addition, the primary function and legal obligation of the European Central Bank is to control inflation, which in the developing economic crisis is the least of our problems.

These are the fault lines that will eventually tear the European single currency apart. But Europhiles in the UK are now using the argument that the falling rate of the pound is an opportunity for us to join the euro. A knowledge of basic economics would tell them that this is precisely the reason why Britain should not join.

The ability of the pound to find its own value against other countries will be an essential factor in helping Britain to weather the coming economic storm. The United Kingdom needs the European single currency like a drowning man needs a straitjacket.

COMMENT

*The next to speak was Christopher Beazley Conservative MEP for Eastern Region, who said: " I look forward to the next Conservative Government applying to join the Eurozone really quite shortly".*

*There for me speaks the authentic voice of the Conservative Party.*



## 134. Support schemes for farmers under the CAP

DATE: 18 November 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

The common agricultural policy forces British consumers to buy food at inflated prices from continental farmers rather than at lower prices available on the world market. It is estimated that the CAP causes prices to be at least 23% higher than those prevailing on the world market.

It is also estimated by economists that the cost of the CAP to UK consumers equates to at least 1.2% of GDP - which is currently an astonishing £16.8 billion per annum.

I represent many people in London who struggle to pay their bills. They face ever-rising taxes and ever-rising prices. They do not owe continental farmers a living. If countries want to subsidise their agricultural industries that is their own business, but it should be paid for by their own tax-payers.

The common agricultural policy is paid for by those least able to afford it: pensioners and those on low incomes, those who pay a higher proportion of their disposable income on food. The CAP is just one of the many reasons why Britain should leave the European Union.

### 135. Conditions of entry and residence for third-country nationals

DATE: 19 November 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, the European Union prefers to import yet more migrant labour rather than try to deal with the problem of those Europeans already unemployed in Member States. Successful applicants for the so-called Blue Card work permit, who are allowed to enter one Member State, will be permitted, after 18 months, to move to another Member State. This includes their family and dependants. This is part of the European Union's emergent common immigration policy, in which it will dictate who can and cannot migrate to Member States and on what terms.

Britain claims to have an opt-out from this policy, but the Queen has given royal assent to the Lisbon Treaty, and we face the prospect of its full ratification by the other Member States. If and when the Lisbon Treaty is fully ratified, Britain's opt-out will prove to be worthless and it is almost certain that we will be forced to comply with this directive.

## 136. Presentation of the Court of Auditors' Report 2007

DATE: 20 November 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, as my friend Mr Bloom quite rightly said earlier, it is simply not true to say that the accounts have been fully signed off by the auditors. It seems that about €6 billion cannot be properly accounted for. At current exchange rates that is about £4.7 billion. Britain's net contribution to the EU budget in 2007 was £4.3 billion. The net amount is after the UK rebate and our own money spent in our own country. There is of course no such thing as 'EU money'. An amount of money exceeding the UK taxpayer's net contribution to the EU budget is quite possibly finding its way into the pockets of fraudsters.

This neatly sums up British membership of the European Union: a complete and utter total waste of money. More and more British people are realising that the European Union...

*(The President cut off the speaker.)*

### COMMENT

*What I had intended to say had I not been so rudely interrupted was "is an economic and democratic disaster and the only solution is unconditional withdrawal".*

## 137. The Greek riots and the Euro

DATE: 15 December 2008 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, as the world faces an economic downturn of unknown proportions, the value of the pound sterling is falling against the dollar and the euro. But the ability of the pound to adjust itself against other currencies is a benefit not enjoyed by members of the European single currency.

Civil unrest and rioting has broken out in Greece. The Greek writer, Mimis Androulakis, has said: 'There is a deep dissatisfaction among young people today against the structure of Europe. We cannot reduce the price of the euro to give us an advantage in exports'.

Membership of the EU and the euro has led to increased living costs in Greece, and the younger generation fear that their future is one of poverty. The European Union is an ideological project being forced upon European peoples who would rather live in democratic nation states. The price of political ideology is always human misery.

**138. Sustainable use of pesticides - Placing of plant protection products on the market**

DATE: 12 January 2009 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, the common agricultural policy has done enormous damage to British agriculture at enormous financial and economic cost.

Now we have these proposals on pesticides. It is estimated that this directive could mean the banning of 15% of pesticides. It is estimated that such a ban would cut wheat yield by 26% to 62%, potato yield by 22% to 53% and some other vegetable yields by 25% to 77%. This will have the effect of sending retail prices soaring, affecting worst those least able to pay.

I wonder whether the rapporteurs could give us the identity of just one person afflicted by, or who has died from, the effects of these pesticides? Probably not! But I could tell you of lots of my constituents who cannot afford to pay more for their food bills.

### 139. The British want a referendum on EU membership

DATE: 12 January 2009 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, a new opinion poll commissioned by the Campaign for an Independent Britain has just been published. Most of those surveyed said that the European Union is out of touch, corrupt and is poor value for money; 83% of those polled want UK law to be paramount and, therefore, to revoke the supremacy of EU law; and 71% want a referendum on continued British membership. Unfortunately, there is not much chance of that, given that the Labour Government will not even give them a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty, which it promised in its election manifesto.

The British people want free trade, friendship and cooperation with Europe and the world, not to be governed by the European Union. If there were a genuinely fair referendum that asked the British people if they want ever-closer political and economic integration with the EU or to leave, an overwhelming majority would vote to leave.

## 140. Security features and biometrics in passports and travel documents

DATE: 13 January 2009 - Strasbourg

TIME: 90 Seconds

Mr President, I am very pleased to say that the UK is excluded from this regulation because it is not part of the Schengen zone. However, the British Government has said that it will keep in step with the regulation to ensure that its documents are not perceived as second class. This implies that it thinks the proposals are first class and then it will be bound by the substance of the regulation anyway.

But, as this report shows, all kinds of issues are raised concerning the authenticity of biometric data and its verification. What kind of originating documents are used for the initial identification of the applicant, and how can it be sure that they are authentic? Once a passport has been issued, it is not of much use unless the data on it can be checked against the identity of the holder on some kind of national or centralised identity database.

The report acknowledges that there should be highly secure storage mediums for keeping such information, but we all know from experience in Britain that there is no such thing as a highly secure medium for storing such data. Personal and highly sensitive information for literally millions of people has been lost or disclosed from government databases over the last few years. Everyone in the UK knows that their personal information is not safe in the hands of our government.

This report does not speak about the reliability of biometric data itself. In fact the UK Passport Service's biometrics enrolment trial in 2004 showed a failure rate of 1 in 3 for facial recognition, 1 in 5 for fingerprints and 1 in 20 for iris scans. Biometric identification is an attractive idea, but it is not the fail-safe mechanism we all might imagine. The UK Independence Party will therefore be voting against this report.

## 141. Gas supplies by Russia to Ukraine and the EU

DATE: 14 January 2009 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, I quote from a speech made on this subject by my colleague, Godfrey Bloom, on 25 October 2006: ‘The thought, the idea or the concept that the United Kingdom’s energy supplies could possibly be controlled by some sort of arrangement with a gangster like Putin is absolutely ludicrous. It is absolute madness to expect anything from a piece of paper signed by Putin. The man is a gangster’.

Mr Putin is now doing what any competent gangster would do – withdraw supply and force the price up. Europe will face two options: be prepared to pay much, much more for a precarious gas supply from Russia, or find alternative suppliers, if that is possible. The UK must ensure its dwindling gas supplies are kept as a national resource and not allow them to become an EU common resource. We must also embark on a programme of building new nuclear power stations.



## 142. The Czech Presidency's programme

DATE: 14 January 2009 - Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

In writing, – Some of us are very much looking forward to being addressed by President Klaus in February. How refreshing it will be to hear someone who has the intelligence and honesty to doubt the ideological orthodoxies of ever-closer European Union and climate change.

President Klaus has been quite right to compare the European Union to the old Soviet Union. My friend, the heroic Russian dissident, Vladimir Bukovsky says of the European Union, 'I have lived in your future and it doesn't work.' Mr Bukovsky is quite right, the EU is a form of soft communism.

We can only hope that the Czech presidency will be a little more sceptical of the great European project than some previous presidencies. One thing that the Czechs can do is to delay ratification of the Treaty of Lisbon until after the second Irish referendum. Then when the Irish vote 'no' again to the failed constitution the Czechs can acknowledge the democratic decision of the only EU nation allowed a referendum and stop the Treaty in its tracks by withholding their ratification. Let's hope that President Klaus is the man to do that.

### 143. Dutch MP Geert Wilders denied entry to Britain

DATE: 18 February 2009 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, on 12 February 2009, the Dutch MP, Geert Wilders, was refused entry to the United Kingdom by order of the Home Secretary. Never before has a democratically elected politician, representing a democratic party from a democratic European country, been denied entry.

It seems odd that the British Government can find the legal means to ban Mr Wilders, but is powerless to prevent the entry of assorted terrorists, political and religious extremists, gangsters, criminals, rapists and paedophiles from the European Union and, indeed, the wider world.

Perhaps Mr Wilders' banning had something to do with the alleged threat by a British peer, Lord Ahmed, that, were Mr Wilders to appear in the House of Lords, 10,000 Islamist demonstrators would appear outside. This was an act of appeasement to a Dark Age ideology and it seems that we do not quite have the free movement of ideas across European Union borders.

144. **Annual Report (2007) The EU's Common Foreign & Security Policy, European Security & Defence Policy, and NATO**

DATE: 18 February 2009 - Brussels

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, these are own-initiative reports and therefore they might be dismissed as so much hot air. But we know that such reports are sometimes used as a means of introducing the policy aspirations of the EU.

Mr von Wogau was once the Chair of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and was instrumental in bringing about the European single currency. He is now Chair of the Subcommittee on Security and Defence, and, when he writes a report saying that the European Union needed its own armed forces, then we can be confident that that is precisely what the European Union intends to bring about in due course.

These reports call for the EU to develop its own armed forces by means of common weapons procurement, a common communication system and an autonomous common command and control structure. Mr von Wogau advocates an EU standing army of 60,000 soldiers permanently available for deployment. The EU wants its own soldiers, guns, tanks, aeroplanes and bombs in order to 'fulfil its responsibilities in the world'.

What are those responsibilities exactly? To find out, you will have to wait to see if the Lisbon Treaty is fully ratified and brings about 'a common foreign and security policy, leading to a common defence'. No one can say that they were not warned of the EU's military aspirations.

## 145. Future of the European Common Asylum System

DATE: 9 March 2009 – Strasbourg

TIME: 120 Seconds

Madam President, the number of people seeking refugee and asylum status is growing alarmingly. As the report states, there are currently about 12 million refugees and about 26 million internally displaced persons worldwide. This is hardly surprising, as some countries in continents such as Africa and Asia slide further into political chaos and the world slips further into a financial and economic crisis of as yet unknown depths.

What we can be sure of is that over the coming months and years there will be yet more refugees and asylum-seekers. It will surprise no-one that the European Parliament solution is harmonisation of national asylum systems. The report proposes a common European asylum system and a common asylum support office with common standards for granting refugee and asylum status. It proposes that national governments should not be able to hold an asylum-seeker in detention solely on the grounds that they are asylum applicants, and that refugees should be allowed to request movement from one European country to another. It proposes that where an applicant is held in detention, that person should have the right to a remedy before a national court.

All this is a recipe for chaos and gridlock in national asylum systems. Many, if not most, of those people who seek refugee and asylum status in European countries far from home are, of course, economic migrants seeking a better life. And who can blame them? But the easier we make it for them to come to Europe, the more will come.

The common systems proposed here will make it even harder for nation states to protect their own borders and easier for untold numbers of economic migrants to cross those borders. Britain needs even stricter controls, not more lax ones imposed by the European Union.

## 146. Progress reports: Croatia, Turkey, & Macedonia, 2008

DATE: 11 March 2009 – Strasbourg. Revised edition

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, if Turkey joins the European Union it will be the poorest and most economically backward Member State, with a population of over 72 million people. Hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people will migrate to countries like Britain.

The European Union will border countries such as Syria, Iraq and Iran, with enormous potential for future conflict and confrontation.

However, the people who should really be worried about Turkish entry are Greek Cypriots: if Turkey joins the EU, the Turks will have the right to go anywhere in the EU. Thousands of Turks will be able to legally go to Southern Cyprus and effectively occupy it, quite legitimately, if they so wish.

In the European elections on 4 June, voters of Greek origin in London should remember that the Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat and Green Parties all enthusiastically support Turkish entry. The only British party in the European Parliament that opposes Turkish entry is the UK Independence Party.

**147. Recommendation to the Council on the new EU-Russia agreement – justice for Alexander Litvinenko**

DATE: 1 April 2009 – Brussels. Revised edition

TIME: 60 Seconds

Madam President, how can Mrs Ferrero-Waldner refer to Russia as a partner and Mr Vondra seek assurances on democracy and human rights?

Russia is a gangster state where troublesome political opponents, dissenters and journalists are simply murdered. The Russians even have a law that allows them to murder anyone – Russian citizen or foreign national – on foreign soil whom they deem to be a threat or a nuisance. Such a murder was carried out on my constituent Alexander Litvinenko in London in 2006 in an act of state-sponsored terrorism. His family are still waiting for justice to be done and his murderers brought to justice or trial in England.

Personally I do not want the European Union to negotiate agreements with anyone on anything. But, if the Commission is serious, why did it not request the extradition of the suspects as a sign of goodwill and a precondition for opening negotiations?

## 148. What has the EU ever done for Britain?

DATE: 21 April 2009 – Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

After 36 years of membership, what has the European Union meant for Britain?

It means we no longer govern ourselves: between 75% to 85% of our laws now come from the EU and not our own Parliament. The EU costs Britain at least £56 billion per year, or the equivalent of over £900 for every man, woman and child.

We no longer control our own borders and suffer unlimited and uncontrolled immigration. EU Human Rights legislation means that we can no longer effectively protect ourselves from foreign criminals, illegal immigrants and bogus asylum seekers. The European Arrest Warrant and Trials in Absentia mean that we have lost our most basic protections from unjust arrest and imprisonment.

EU membership is a disaster for Britain. It is a grievous and unnecessary self-inflicted wound. The only solution to the problem is Britain's unconditional withdrawal from the European Union.

149. Debate on discharge of the budget in relation to the members additional voluntary pension scheme (*Intervention*)

DATE: 23 April 2009 – Strasbourg

TIME: 60 Seconds

Mr President, can I reply to Mr Cohn-Bendit's point and Mr Hans-Peter Martin's point? I think that there is a simple solution. I can quite happily declare myself as a participant in the voluntary pension scheme, along with 399 other Members, and I intend to vote against my own interests and in favour of the taxpayers' interests. The simple solution is for the other 399 Members to do the same.

COMMENT

*This intervention was made prior to a vote to discharge an aspect of the EU Budget. It concerned the Additional Voluntary Pension Scheme. Mr Cohn-Bendit and Mr Martin had raised the point that MEPs who are members of the scheme should not be allowed to vote as they had a personal interest in the outcome. One contested that MEPs should declare their personal interest and the other that they should not be allowed to vote because of it. I voted against, but unsurprisingly it was passed by a large majority.*





Gerard Batten was a founder member of UKIP in 1993 and was elected as a UK Independence Party Member of the European Parliament for London in June 2004

He is a member of the European Parliament's Security & Defence Committee, and is the UKIP spokesman on Security & Defence.

He publishes an annual report entitled *How much does the European Union cost Britain?* He has also written on a number of other subjects including, the terrorist threat to Britain, immigration, energy, electoral reform and the European Single Currency.

He is a regular columnist in *Freedom Today* the magazine of the Freedom Association and has appeared on national radio and television including, BBC2's Newsnight.

He uses his position as an MEP to campaign for Britain's unconditional withdrawal from the European Union.