

## THE EUROPEAN FOUNDATION

# The Bournemouth Speeches

*The full text of the speeches delivered to the European Foundation meeting in Bournemouth on Tuesday 11th October 1994 by Bill Cash MP, Sir James Goldsmith MEP and The Rt. Hon. Lord Tebbit*

### Bill Cash

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In 1939 as the storm clouds gathered over Europe, Winston Churchill said, *Tell the truth to the British people*. Today, in different times and in a different way, we are locked in struggle for the survival of our democracy and to prevent German domination of Europe. Then, we were faced with bombs and aircraft; now we are faced with pieces of paper. But the same old appeasers have re-emerged.

Of course, we would want a European Community which properly reflected British and European interests, but the Maastricht Treaty has put paid to this. The most positive thing a politician in Western Europe can do today is to say "no" to these developments; to say "no" now to a single currency. Only yesterday we heard that the European Commission insists - insists - as a legal requirement, that we comply with their convergence criteria. The opt-outs and compromises and gestures, such as the veto of Mr. Dehaene, are mere alchemy; illusions about as effective as the philosopher's stone - fool's gold indeed. At Maastricht we handed over the federal agenda to the federalists and only a few days ago Douglas Hurd himself indicated, in *The Independent*, that we could not get out of what we had signed, we should stop the debate and get on with it. We will not.

I would remind you of that great Tory, Edmund Burke, who said, in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, as follows:

*We know that we have made no discoveries and we believe that no discoveries are to be made in morality nor in the idea of liberty, nor in many of the great principles of government, which were understood long before we were born. In England we have not been drawn and trussed in order that we may be filled like stuffed birds with chaff and rags and paltry blurred sheets of paper about the rights of man.*

If Labour were to win the next election, then all would be lost and there are strong rumours that the Government intends to get the election out of the way before the Intergovernmental Conference in 1996. We must, therefore, force the issue of a single currency now throughout Europe and take heed of the new assertiveness of Germany revealed in the Christian Democrats' new paper, which I recommend you read, *Reflections on European Policy*. As Pitt said during the Napoleonic Wars, *England has saved herself by her exertions and will, as I trust, save Europe by her example*.

Today, ladies and gentlemen, we could not have two better advocates of this argument - Norman Tebbit and Jimmy Goldsmith: Norman Tebbit, a truly British

Briton, a man of England; and Jimmy Goldsmith, who has taken the European bull by the horns, who has fought absolutely, completely and entirely with principle and determination and integrity for what he believes in and who has set up this new organisation, getting a tremendous response throughout the whole of Europe and throughout the world. Jimmy Goldsmith, we owe you an enormous and tremendous debt. Thank you for what you've done; thank you for coming this evening. I hand the floor over to you.

## **Sir James Goldsmith**

Bill Cash has just mentioned the document prepared by the German ruling parties, the CDU and the CSU, which gives their vision of Europe and their strategy for the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference. As you know, just about the only good thing in Maastricht was the fact that it states that in 1996 we must look at the whole thing again.

What do they say? Firstly they state quite clearly that they seek a federal state. They want the European Parliament to be what they call a "genuine law-making body". In other words, a Parliament like any national Parliament. They want the Council - and you will remember that the Council currently consists of the elected heads of state - to be converted in a second chamber of Parliament, like a Senate, and they plan to convert the Commission, which consists of unelected technocrats, into a European Government. So the policy is extremely clear - a federal state, with a Parliament, an upper house and a Government: in other words, one state.

They go on to say in this report, *It is essential*, and I'm quoting extracts, *that no country should be allowed to use its right of veto to block the efforts of other countries to deepen integration*. In other words, no right of veto during the creation of the core unitary state. They also say that if European integration were not to progress, Germany might - listen to this, I'm quoting extracts again - *try to affect the stabilisation of Eastern Europe on its own and in the traditional way*. They go on to say, I'm not joking, this is in the document - they go on to say, *the notion of the unsunderable sovereignty of the nation state still carries weight, although this sovereignty has long since become an empty shell*. That is the policy document proposed last month by Germany's ruling parties.

It should be obvious that we, who are opposed to Maastricht, are the true Europeans. We are the ones who want a family of nations, a Europe built on its constituent nations. But the others keep saying that are the pro-Europeans and that we are anti-European. The people who want Maastricht, the sort of state that I've just described, are the ones who are guaranteeing that centrifugal forces will be unleashed which will destroy Europe, rip it apart. So, let it be clear - we are the Europeans, they are the ones who will destroy the hopes for Europe and the European Community of nations. We can already see this. If you look at the elections during the past few days, in Austria, in Belgium, you see the emergence of the far right and of separatist movements. How can it be otherwise? How can one possibly expect that there will not be a reaction, a nationalist reaction, by people who want to protect the identity, and the culture, of their nations? It's obvious, but these people can't see that. I think it was George Orwell who said that the peculiarity of intellectuals is that they can never recognise the burning passion of the day. But everywhere throughout the world the

burning passion of today is that people want to keep their national identity. And that is what these people want to destroy.

So, apparently sovereignty is an empty shell. How did we get there? How have we reached the position where all of a sudden we are told that sovereignty has gone, and that already it is an empty shell? We reached it secretly. You must understand that Europe, on purpose, was built in secret.

This was made quite clear by the French ex-Foreign Secretary, who subsequently became a European Commissioner, one of the technocrats. He is a decent man, a sort of Roy Jenkins type of socialist. His name is Claude Cheysson. He gave an interview to the French newspaper, *Le Figaro*, in May of this year. And in it he explained it all. He said that we couldn't have constructed the Europe of Maastricht except in the absence of democracy - his words. And he said the problems that we are now facing are caused by the fact that we allowed a democratic debate to take place during the referendum in France. This illustrates the extraordinary divorce that exists between the political and economic élites, which, of course, are pro-Maastricht, pro an integrated federal state - and society as a whole which rejects it. You can see it in the opinion polls. There was an opinion poll published not long ago which showed in the twelve European nations only thirty per cent, three out of ten, wanted Maastricht. The majority still wants a European Community of nations but only three out of ten wanted Maastricht.

Here is another example of organised secrecy. Repetitively at successive European Summits the heads of state kept on talking about transparency, openness, documents being made available informing us about how decisions were taken, etc. And then, *The Guardian* wanted some information which was refused. *The Guardian* took the European Council, the Council of Ministers, before the European Court of Justice. And this is what the lawyers for the European Council - not the lawyers for *the Guardian* - said to the judges. They started off by saying that there was no principle of Community law which gives citizens the right to European Union documents - thereby once again demonstrating the belief that citizens are no more than an encumbrance and that only a tiny élite should be entitled to know what is going on. They also went on to say, and these are the astounding words, *although heads of government have repeatedly called for more openness, their declarations, I continue to quote, were of an eminently political nature and therefore not binding on Community institutions*. That, ladies and gentlemen, explains politics in the briefest and shortest number of words that I can imagine.

Now, why do all these European nations want, or rather why do their élites want, to create this federal state? I am sort of a travelling salesman because I am trying to help create coalitions in each European country, coalitions which in 1996 will fight against this project. I was in Sweden the week before last and I saw the people who were involved in the anti-Maastricht campaign, and then I dined with a number of establishment businessmen and I said to them, *why do you want to join this mess?* And they said, *Well, look at Sweden, our debt is equal to ninety per cent of our GNP, it's growing at a rate of about 14%, I think was the figure, of GNP every year; our level of unemployment is immense; and we have a socialist government again; we have no way of solving our problems*. I answered, *Therefore, you want to go into Europe, like many others do, because you prefer to be in the dustbin of Brussels rather than attempt to solve your own problems*. And that, I am afraid, is the principal motivation of many nations. Better let a Brussels bureaucrat handle their problems than their own politicians.

So, the question now is - how do we turn the tide? What can we do? That really is the only interesting thing. I can describe our plans. We have formed a group in the European Parliament called "Europe of Nations", to which we have attracted political groupings from a number of nations. And we are going to prepare a project which will be an alternative to that of the centre right/centre left establishment. The Socialists and the Christian Democrats - I hate to say this in Bournemouth today but among whom are the British Conservatives - share the same project and it is very similar to the CDU/CSU plan that I described earlier. We are going to prepare a project of a quite different kind. According to our plan Europe will be built on the strengths, cultures and heritage of its nations, based on true subsidiarity and that means that everything that can be done by the family, the locality, the region and the nation should be done accordingly, and only those things that cannot be decentralised should be regrouped at the European level. Those are, principally: the co-ordination of defence; the environment, because environmental crises respect no frontiers; and maintaining a free internal market within Europe. To carry out these functions we believe the principal institution should be the democratic one, the Council of Ministers, in which elected heads of state or their representatives would sit. But with one difference. There should be an appointed Vice-President because at the moment the President, who changes every six months, is more interested in what's going on back home and that is how a vacuum was created, which was filled by the Commission. That must not happen again. So there would be an appointed Vice-President who would report to the members of the European Council of Ministers. The Commission for its part would be converted into an administrative secretariat and stripped of all executive and legislative powers. It would be expected to work in the efficient and disciplined manner which democracy is entitled to expect from its functionaries.

Insofar as defence is concerned, there should be a relatively simple system. Nations must not be forced into military initiatives against their will. So our present belief is that we should have some sort of European Security Council in which the main military nations of Europe would be the key members - Britain, France, Germany, Italy. Decisions would be taken in this forum, but any nation could opt out of particular military operations. There would be no Euro Corps, no mixing of the armies. The European Security Council would be able to draw on those armed forces offered by each nation.

As for the European Parliament, I finally discovered why it's there. It's obvious once you see it. At the moment you have the Commission consisting of unelected technocrats, and the Council regrouping elected heads of state. So when there is a conflict between the Commission and the Council, it is embarrassingly obvious that it is a conflict between the technocrats, with no popular mandate, and elected national leaders. That's an embarrassing position. So the Commission needed a democratic disguise. And that is what the Parliament supplies. The Parliament is dominated by the Christian Democrats and the Socialists - and they both share the same objectives with the Commission, that of creating a supranational state. And they have the same enemies, the democratic institutions of the nations. That is because the power of the Commission and that of the European Parliament is in inverse proportion to the power of the democratic institutions of the nations. If the national parliaments are strong, then the European Parliament supranational institutions are weak and vice-versa. That is why the Commission and the European Parliament work together in a symbiosis so as to weaken and humiliate the democratic institutions within the

nations. They need each other because the Commission has executive and legislative power, and the Parliament looks like a democratic institution.

But we do need one other institution. If we succeed in establishing a Community of nations, we must avoid the disease which occurs in most organisations. As they grow older, they become more bureaucratic and the bureaucrats do everything to increase centralisation of power. When the Founding Fathers created America it was supposed to be a free association of states built on what we have come to know as the principle of subsidiarity. That was James Madison's idea. But as the US grew older it became more and more centralised, as is now painfully obvious in Washington. So we must have an institution which guards against this, and whose only function is to prohibit centralisation of power.

That is the sort of project that we are working on so as to establish as much common ground as possible. We will consult like-minded people in each European nation as we did in France. We will attempt to form broad coalitions of citizens, not just politicians although politicians will also be welcome. Our purpose will be to militate for one thing: not that our plan be adopted. But that the public be given the right to vote by referendum on the future of Europe.

## **Bill Cash**

Jimmy, thank you for that stimulating and fascinating indication of your views. Thank you for that wonderful performance and I now have great pleasure in inviting Norman Tebbit to come to the rostrum.

## **Lord Tebbit**

Well Ladies and Gentlemen, first could I say something which suddenly struck me when I was listening to Jimmy, just what is it that Mr. Blair really holds against the undeserving rich? For while some of us as the undeserving poor do the best we can it had to fall to Jimmy with the resources as well as the calm logic and indeed the inspirational wealth to form a political party, which in a matter of weeks could reach parity with Mitterrand Socialists in a general election. No wonder they want to extinguish your kind, Jimmy.

Ladies and Gentlemen, most of you will be familiar with my that whilst it might have been possible for the original six members of the European Economic Community to have achieved economic, monetary and political union, the admission of the United Kingdom effectively closed off that option.

And whilst the six might have been able to remain a separate community, or even a state within Europe, the admission of each additional member state began to close off that option too. The community is now of such a size - and probably soon to be enlarged again - and of such economic importance relative to the remainder of Europe - that it simply could not be allowed to continue as it is - an exclusive club excluding many other Europeans.

If our trading bloc - the European Community - representing such a large slice of Euro trade - is not fully open to other Europeans, their prospects of successfully trading with it and their prospects of successful economic and political progress will be severely, perhaps fatally, blighted.

That prospect we cannot afford for it would induce a dangerous political instability in Central and Eastern Europe. One which Jimmy has just observed and indeed our CDU/CSU friends have observed too, could encourage Germany back to

its old ways. So our Europe of the twelve must now go on to be the Europe of all Europeans.

The economic Europe and geographers' Europe must as nearly as possible become coterminous. Our European community must make itself open to membership of all European nations from the Arctic Ocean to the Mediterranean, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Now, as I have argued in the past, that will require a massive change from the centralised Europe of Maastricht with its ambition to complete the transition from common market to superpower, to a Gaullist Europe of nation states, some of which may wish to integrate, others of whom may wish to disintegrate from themselves. Those states should be bound by treaty to do at supranational level only that which is necessary to ensure the free movement of goods, services and capital. Of course, as Jimmy has said, that would naturally bring about a closeness of relationship and a concern for common security, which would bring those nations together in perhaps an extension of our part of NATO to concern itself with our common security. But clearly there would be a reduction in the scope of the powers of the Commission - and indeed of the Council of Ministers - and there would simply be no role at all for the European Parliament or its hangers on. The European Court would be shorn of much of its power and restricted to a role primarily to hear civil actions from organisations or individuals whose interests had been unlawfully damaged in matters concerning cross-border trade. For example, British Airways would be able to sue the French government and Air France or the Belgian government and Sabena or the Republic of Ireland and Aer Lingus for compensation for the damage done to its business by the subsidies given to those companies.

Now, let me leave that proposition there for a moment. For of course it is in essence part of that great debate of which Jimmy Goldsmith spoke. I make it partly in the hope, but not I fear in the expectation, that the narrow-minded bigots of the so-called European Movement might one day criticise me for the views I hold rather than those which they invent for me.

I would like to turn however to another aspect of the great European disaster which is threatening this country.

We must do more to raise the alarm at the extent and the speed of the destruction of our system of law - and the speed and destruction of our parliament and our conventions of government which have stood us in such good stead over the centuries.

There should be no doubt in the minds of the British people that increasingly they are being ruled by decree, not by law enacted by their parliament. Those decrees (politely called directives) imposed by unaccountable bureaucrats, an alien parliament and a ministerial council of twelve in which but one member is accountable to them through the Westminster Parliament.

Those extended bulwarks of British democratic self-government, government in Parliament, administration by impartial civil servants, accountability through parliament, taxation by consent, law-making open to scrutiny, justice dispensed by an independent judiciary under the statute and common law, are being swiftly eroded.

Let me give you two recent examples.

In the judgement of the Home Secretary, who is responsible for the public safety of this kingdom, it is necessary to ban from the mainland under the powers granted to the Home Secretary by Parliament for that purpose a man notorious for his intimate connections with a bloodstained terrorist group which has under its control a large arsenal of guns and bombs.

The appeal of that man to the High Court - here in this kingdom, the High Court responsible for justice under the laws made by Parliament - to rescind that banning order was effectively not heard. The court referred the application to the European Court since it seems that our law might be in conflict with European law. It is a fine example of subsidiarity. Our law subservient to European judges. So this matter is to be decided by the alien court.

In short, the Home Secretary is responsible for public safety but he can be overruled on the say so of the court in Brussels - a court noted for its arbitrary and partisan rulings and one which is not in any way responsible to the crown, to Parliament or the people of this kingdom.

There can be few more important principles of good government than that those charged with responsibility must also be given authority and that no one should have authority without bearing responsibility. That principle is no longer observed.

Second, the ruling on pensions for part-time workers. I do not wish this even to enter upon the arguments, upon the merits of extending to part-time workers the rights to pensions enjoyed by their full-time colleagues. Different people with different interests may hold different views about that. I will even forbear from arguing that such a matter is one between employer and employee to be locally determined and cannot conceivably be one - any more than a wage settlement could be - a matter required to be settled by the European Court in order to preserve or create a single market.

The point I make is more than that. It is that casually, wantonly, with the lack of respect for long-established conventions which hitherto has been demonstrated only by imperial powers towards colonial subjects, the European court imposed its decree with retrospective effect.

There are few more clearly signalled no-go areas for United Kingdom legislators than retrospectivity. Whilst Parliament may legislate as it will, the restraints placed upon it by convention are far more powerful than those imposed by paper constitutions which have been so frequently torn up on the continent.

It offends our sense of fair play and honest dealing that the rules should be changed during or after the game to invalidate its outcome.

Now I can hear the lunatic fringe of europhiles, many of them members of the European parliament and the like, saying there goes Tebbit again with emotional old-fashioned nationalism. Such decisions, they would say, may be irritating but they are a small price to be paid for the advantages of having Europe at our heart - I am sorry, I meant being at the heart of Europe. Look, they say, at the benefits of being "in Europe". But more and more as I contrast the democratic rights that we have lost alongside the "benefits" we have received, there comes back to my mind the image of those pictures so common on our elementary school walls and in the history textbooks of more than fifty years ago. Pictures of early colonists in America or in the islands of the Pacific persuading the native peoples to sell their land and their birthright for two-penny trinkets.

Are we to discover too late, as those peoples did, that they were conned?

It is, I think, because the Brussels bacon slicer is so sharp and because it slices so thin that there is a risk that we will fail to call a halt to the salami-ing day by day of our right to self-government until it was all but gone.

The British people are tolerant indeed, but for how long will they allow this process of demotion from the ranks of the self-governing peoples of the world to the status of a minority group in a province under foreign domination?

No wonder that respect for Parliament, even the respect of parliamentarians for Parliament, is being so rapidly eroded.

Its powers are diminished day by day. And now it is threatened not only by the superior authority of Brussels, but by Mr. Blair's proposals to undermine it by the creation of rival parliaments which would further confuse and destroy the principle of the identity of responsibility and authority, as Tam Dalyell so brilliantly argued in the devolution debates of twenty years ago.

As the nationhood of this kingdom fades, like Lewis Carroll's Cheshire cat, then it seems to me that Parliament will be left as no more than a silly grin. So let me end with a short piece of advice to Her Majesty's ministers. There may even be one of the friends of one of Her Majesty's ministers here. There may even be one or two of Her Majesty's ministers who would have liked to have been here.

Clear your minds of the ephemera and trivia which envelop like a thick fog this debate on Europe. Let us cease to make policy from the bottom up, constructing our European policy out of deals on the date for mowing the grass on set-aside land, the support level for tobacco growers, the maximum curvature of bananas in the shops, the likelihood of filling Canary Wharf with the Eurocrats of some Euro boondoggling agency or whether Scottish fishermen should be allowed to fish only on the odd or even days in the third week after Easter.

Ask yourselves, I implore ministers, what is now in our national interest? What should be the long term strategy of our relationship with the continental powers?

[Heckler: Withdraw!

Lord Tebbit: Not necessarily, no.

Heckler: Why not?

Lord Tebbit: I have to tell you that it is a geographical fact that these are the offshore islands of Europe. It is an ethnic fact that we are Europeans.

Heckler: So what?

Lord Tebbit: There is no need to get out, there is a need to construct a Europe in which we can respectably as a nation stay in.]

We must decide what sort of Europe suits us, an open liberal world trading nation with cultural, political and economic links which are not confined to Europe. A country which has been independent and free for centuries, which has developed institutions over those centuries which have proved capable of changing within a changing world without those continental afflictions, revolution or dictatorship.

I am sure that the conversion to democracy of some of our friends on the continent is sincere but, like Mr. Blair's attachment to the market economy, it is quite recent and has as yet scarcely been put to the test.

Then once the strategy has been decided, let that strategy decide the tactics. All too often today it seems that it is the tactics which are aggregated into a strategy. Or, as the Foreign Office spokesman would say, *our policy is one of pragmatism*.

We have seen of late how Chancellor Kohl has taken the lead in Europe by practising what I recommend to ministers here.

His policy is economic, monetary and political union. It has been set out many times. He has been open, he has been clear, he has been consistent. Surely we believe Germans or we should believe Germans when they set these things out so clearly. We have not always in the past, of course. Chancellor Kohl understands that political union will follow - inevitably follow - monetary union and that monetary union is impossible without political union.

The policy of his party's parliamentarians is equally clear. As Jimmy has said, it was set out most clearly in their document, *Reflections on European Policy*. That was an alarm call to me. Jimmy quoted some of it to you. Let me have a quote too.

The process of European unification has reached a critical juncture in its development. If, in the next two to four years, no solution to the causes of this critical development is found, the union, contrary to the goal of ever closer union invoked in the Maastricht treaty, will in essence become a loosely knit grouping of states restricted to certain economic aspects and composed of various sub-groupings. It would then be no more than a 'sophisticated' free-trade area incapable of overcoming either the" - existential it said in the text, I think they mean existing - internal problems of the European societies, or the external challenges they face.

Quite right. Ten out of ten for analysis. And it goes on to set out proposals for the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference, calling for a "Quasi constitutional document", *to set out the division of powers between the union, the nation states and the regions*.

Now, your breath may be taken away by that touch of arrogance of Germans seeking to define the relationship between Westminster and Edinburgh or Belfast and Cardiff - perhaps even Newcastle or Birmingham too, but as this kingdom is broken up into länder - we should think - breathe deep - there is more to come. Jimmy quoted it. I will repeat it because it is so important.

*The reforms must be geared to concepts for a new institutional balance, according to which the European parliament will increasingly become a genuine law-making body with the same rights as the Council: the Council, in addition to performing tasks in the intergovernmental field in particular, will assume the functions of a second chamber, i.e. a chamber of the member states; and the Commission will take on features of a European government.*

Now, ladies and gentlemen, those are precisely the propositions which were put by M. Delors in advance of the Rome summit in 1990. And they are precisely the propositions to which the then Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, said, quite precisely, No, No, No. They are proposals to which more recently Prime Minister Major has also adopted a negative stance.

It is not that we are the only ones to have doubts. Our French friends, much attached to the idea that the subtlety of their graduates of Ecole Nationale would let France be the jockey riding the German horse, may soon have cause to reflect upon the fate of the similarly self-confident young lady of Riga - who, you may remember, went for the ride on a tiger. In case you have forgotten, at the end of the ride the lady was inside and there was a smile on the face of the tiger.

As the CDU/CSU document says:

*If Germany puts forward clear and unequivocal proposals, then France must make equally clear and unequivocal decisions, (and so too must Britain). It, that is France, must rectify the impression that, although it allows no doubt as to its basic will to pursue integration, it often hesitates in taking concrete steps towards this objective. Back to Jimmy's quote - The notion of the unsunderable sovereignty of the nation state still carries weight, although this sovereignty has long since become an empty shell.*

It's one in which this particular old crab prefers to live. And for us - the threat is rather more blunt. I quote again.

*These proposals are born of the conviction that determined efforts to spur on the further development of Europe are the best means of exerting a positive influence*

*on the clarification of Great Britain's relationship to Europe and on its willingness to participate in further steps towards integration.*

Once again, ten out of ten for analysis. Perhaps if there are any Germans in this room they might feel that there is some element of hostility towards them. I don't believe they should.

Germany is a large and powerful country. Despite some wobbly moments, West Germany remained a bastion of the west throughout the cold war and she shows no signs of the militarism which led her into two great wars.

Germany is entitled to take a view of what would suit it best in Europe. And so are we.

But since Mitterrand as president has openly pursued the policy he pursued in secret in 1940 - acting as stable lad rather than jockey to the German horse, and since British policy has, in the words of one former president of France, *always said no and then complied*, how will the power and determination of Germany to dominate a Europe made to suit its purpose be balanced by the interests of the other Europeans?

The future of Europe depends upon the decisions - or the failure to take decisions - of the United Kingdom.

We should learn the lessons of history. Not least the lessons of how we misled both our enemies and our friends in the 1930s, encouraging both American isolationism and German aggression. Neither America nor Germany believed we would resist German aggression. The signals given by our Foreign Office were signals of willingness to appease, not to oppose Hitler. Even after Churchill had become Prime Minister in 1940, neither America nor Germany believed we would not make peace with Hitler. Thus was a war made inevitable - thus it was that Britain all but fell before America was mobilised in the cause of freedom.

Today those who might be our allies in building the kind of Europe which I have described are weak and demoralised, for they have no lead from Britain, so they will be dragged along behind those who do lead.

No wonder that it is American policy today to regard Germany as the leader of Europe, and Britain as no more than a reluctant follower, not a dynamic leader. That is why Clinton believes he can push us around even in Northern Ireland as though this was a Caribbean banana republic.

After all, what is our policy towards a single currency? Today it is to sit on the fence until others have taken their decisions. How can other nations take our position into account in formulating their policy if they cannot be told what our position is? And surely we must in principle either favour or disfavour such a step, not least because it could not fail to bring political union - the creation of a Euro state in its train.

But I have little doubt that even after Maastricht, where we gave away our powers of veto on this issue, that if we took a clear and firm decision to oppose and seek to prevent the creation of a single currency through the Treaty of Rome, we could be successful. I have little doubt that if this country made plain that it could never enter a political union with the continental powers, and would within the Community veto any such plans, that would deal a fatal blow to the ambitions of those who seek, as the CDU/CSU coalition does, to create a European state.

In the words of a sage and experienced French statesman, to me in private: *But you could not leave us alone with the Germans! If we thought that you would do that it would change our policy.*

That is the whole basis of what I have been saying to you and even more over your heads to ministers. If you make discussions, if you lead, others will take account

of that leadership. If you do not, they will take account of the views and the interests only of those who do lead.

So be of good cheer. We have the weight to make a difference if we have the will. So let the Prime Minister set aside his Trollope - I mean the author I hasten to say - O my God, if I go on like this they will call me back to being chairman of the party again ... Don't set me aside from my wife. As I was saying, let the Prime Minister set aside Trollope and return to Shakespeare to settle his mind before the battle of the intergovernmental conference.

*And we shall shock them: nought shall make us rue if England to itself do rest but true.*

## **Bill Cash**

Ladies and gentlemen, I think I would deem that a ten minute standing ovation, but what a vintage performance; what wonderful stuff. Norman, thank you very much indeed for that. Analysis, judgement and principle. Thank you.

Now, I'm sure many of you will have questions. We have got 25 minutes or so and I would be very glad to take any from the floor for people who would like to put them to any member of the team at the table here.

## **QUESTIONS**

### **Questioner:**

*I have a question, Mr. Chairman, for Sir James Goldsmith. I was interested in his remarks about the Europe of Nations group. I would be interested if he would tell us who are in this group and presume there aren't any Commissioners from Brussels. I wonder how many members of the European Parliament; I wonder how big it is; I wonder how big it is going to be; and I wonder how it will exercise its influence.*

### **Sir James Goldsmith**

It is small. We have 19 members from three nations - France, Holland and Denmark. It is homogeneous in one sense and that is it wants a Europe of nations and not a European state. So it draws from strands, quite different strands of people - farmers, small businessmen, traditionalists, and not just Conservatives. The French group would be considered Conservative, somewhat to the right, but the Danish group are in fact socialists who are in disagreement with the policy of Maastricht pursued by the Socialist Party in Denmark. So this is typical of what we want to do right the way across Europe. In other words, the enemy of one's enemy is not necessarily one's friend, but he's useful. And what we need is a broad coalition of people who in each nation is going to fight for the right of a referendum and, if we get it and if we win the debate, then I am sure that our coalition will break down into other groups and they will be arguing about other issues. But at the moment the all-important issue is to maintain the sovereignty of the nation and have a Europe of nations and that is what we are combined, agreed on and that is what we are going to fight for. So it is supra-party, it's above the parties. I don't happen to believe that this is a left or right issue; this is a yes or no issue.

**Questioner:**

*Could we have more of an information spread? Now I've been living on the Isle of Wight for five years and I never hear the EU mentioned in public either pro or con. Could you have some local branches, as others like Amnesty International do, and possibly have a popular sort of tabloid paper - I know the European Journal, it makes very good but hard reading - but something for the man in the street, like a tabloid which would spread the news more efficiently.*

**Bill Cash**

Thank you very much. I think the answer to that is that we are taking everything one step at a time. One of the most important things was to get the information out, which is buried under piles and piles of paper, to people. That's what we have been doing. We do get coverage but I quite agree with you that it would be a very good idea if we could manage to get the thing out in more tabloid form. Thank you very much.

**Lord Tebbit**

You can always buy a Sky dish and Austin Mitchell and I will see you every Tuesday and Thursday.

**Bill Cash**

And also, of course, there are the Christopher Booker books and the *Daily Telegraph*, *The Times*, *Sunday Times*, *The Sun* - they are all doing a very good job.

**Questioner:**

*I think we have all heard tonight how vitally important the IGC is, not only for this country but for the shape of Europe to come, and I think it is of paramount importance that all our efforts are focused on this one meeting because, if we miss the chance at the IGC, we are doomed to the road of Euro-federalism. What can we all do to make sure that the message gets across, not only to the ministers but also to the British public, because it's not just here demanding a referendum that will come and achieve that aim. But we must motivate not just Britain, but the entire European Community. Otherwise we're done for.*

**Lord Tebbit**

Jimmy has pointed out some of the way. And I think it is vitally important that we do reach out for those who agree with us in other parts of the European Community and it is important that we do produce an alternative agenda to that of the Commission and of the ruling German coalition towards the IGC. Now, I think that is something where some of us can do more than others and Jimmy has done more than his share and so has Bill Cash. I think then we have to try to change the climate of so-called informed opinion here. How do we do that? We just talk to our friends. We become hopefully not quite Euro-bores, but we do mention the subject now and again. We talk to our Members of Parliament. We talk within the parties to which we belong. And remember, as Jimmy said, it is not only the right of politics which is opposed to much that is going on today. I know that the Labour Party has been anaesthetised or has been drugged with the idea that it could recover for the trades unions all the powers that it lost by my legislation and recover them irreversibly through Brussels, but there are still men and women of principle in the Labour Party who understand that it is more important that the decision should be the one they want. We must similarly tackle that in as generous a spirit. We can do that. As I say, we talk to

Members of Parliament, we write to newspapers, and we just keep on and on and on about it. We make some progress. I understand this week that *the Guardian* is running a series of serious articles on this very subject. That is progress; that is real progress. We've captured intellectually, I think, most of the broadsheet press - a considerable achievement. Mind you, we have had one or two allies behind the lines. I see Conrad Black down here in the front row. But I have to say I doubt if you'll tempt Jimmy Goldsmith back into publishing.

**Sir James Goldsmith**

I think that, as Norman was saying before, withdrawing from Europe is the final retreat; it's not the first solution, it's not the best solution. The best solution is having a Europe which is a worthwhile structure and therefore that means that the IGC has to be fought in every European nation. We have to get such a coalition. It is a ludicrous situation that 30% of the people can impose their will on 70% of the people without a vote and without a vote on the most fundamental issues of all, and that is sovereignty and identity. And that is what is happening. The idea that there shouldn't be a referendum here, when there was a referendum on the Treaty of Rome if you remember, and we're told it's not possible here, is absurd. It was Ronald Reagan, I think, who said the difference between a true democracy and a false one is that in a true democracy it is the people who decide what powers to lend to their leaders and in a false democracy it is the leaders who decide what powers to lend to the people. And we are at the moment in that second position. Thirty per cent is trying to impose its will on the most fundamental decision without a vote. That must be reversed.

**Questioner**

*I would like to commend and thank you very much for this excellent journal, which I subscribe to and I think it is the best £10 worth I have ever spent in my life. However, I am worried that so few people are actually getting to hear the arguments, however much we may talk to each other about these things and spread we read in here. Really, the vast millions who need to understand these basic issues are not getting them and I am afraid that it's largely because of what actually enabled this situation to come about in the first place, which I believe is a basic lack of democracy in broadcasting. And under we resolve that issue, many more things like this are going to happen again and again and again despite the hard work and great efforts of all of you to stop it. And good luck to you all.*

**Bill Cash**

Thank you very much indeed. I may say that we do try sometimes to get off the 6.40 soundbite on the Today programme but we do notice that Leon Brittan and Co. get the 8.15 slot in the same morning.

**Questioner**

*Mr. Chairman, I have been so buoyed up by this meeting. I am passionately anti-Maastricht. I was a member of the Anti-Common Market League, reading Arthur Bryant and so on, but the difficulty Conservatives have is that at the European elections there was no party they could actually turn to in being anti-European. There was a disgraceful thing where you, Mr. Cash, and other Members of Parliament were told that unless you voted for Maastricht there would be a general election. So what do Conservatives actually do at the next election? We don't want*

*the Liberals, we don't want the Socialists, but do we want the Conservatives who seem to be forcing us further and further into an integrated Europe?*

### **Bill Cash**

Could I say that they did do their best to bring us to our knees but they did not succeed. There was only one reason why it was necessary to ensure that that confidence motion went through and it was simply this - otherwise, as I said in the debate and the late John Smith looked at me very intently as I spelled it out to him - otherwise we would have handed over, after the ensuing general election, the Maastricht, the Socialist federal arrangements straight to the Labour Party and we would have been lost for ever. That was the problem. But I have to tell you that we are gaining in strength the whole time and only today, or was it yesterday, *On The Record* showed that in the last year those who are opposed to a single currency have gone up from 58% last year to over 71%. Now the Government has got to listen to that and therefore what Norman and Jimmy and I have been saying this evening, which is we've got to bring this thing forward, we've got to have a thorough open debate about it, is absolutely essential, and a referendum goes with it.

### **Lord Tebbit**

Remember there is nothing that appeals more to politicians than to be in government. The Labour Party is hungry for it. The Tories are extremely anxious to remain there. There is little doubt in my mind that the next general election will probably be a close run thing. If we can persuade the leaders of either of those parties that the way to turn the tide is by following the wishes of the majority of the British people on the European issue, we will have persuaded them how to win that election. That's our task. So it is, as I say to my friends in the Labour Party, not necessary for you to desert your party at this stage in order to save this country. What it's necessary for you to do, as it is for Conservatives to do, is to try to recapture your party. Four years ago there was a clarity about our policy towards Europe which has perhaps been lost more recently. We can regain that clarity under the press of the need to gain the support of the British voters for the next election. It can be done. There may be the odd body along the way. During the process one might be wise not to walk below the windows of the Foreign Office for fear of falling bodies - a price worth paying.

### **Questioner**

*Bill, I understand that the Prime Minister referred to you as a bastard. I'm not going to call you a bastard. I'm going to call you magnificent but I'm also going to qualify that by saying I think you are largely ineffective. I appreciate that this is rather a contentious thing to say but, nevertheless, those of us out here who are dead against Maastricht and all it stands for and the European Community, we are entirely disenfranchised from voting because there is no single party who is prepared to say "Join us and we'll get you out". (I have just joined the UK Independence Party, thank you.) The point I am trying to make is that, whilst everything you say is absolutely right, it seems to me you are making very little progress in preaching to the converted, which you are doing today, and also that you are shedding crocodile tears in Parliament because basically, and you only have to refer to Norman Tebbit's dissertation a moment ago to see what we have lost already, I have the feeling, and many other people do too, that we are heading headlong down the tunnel into the arms of Brussels and how the devil are we doing to stop it? My question to you is this - what is it that gives you confidence that by remaining in this Government, which has*

*so badly served us in the past, can you believe that you can really pull the thing together because, if you can, you're a better man than I am.*

**Bill Cash**

I will respond to that very quickly by simply saying that here we are at a Conservative Party Conference, I am a Tory and I am determined to fight and win this battle inside the Conservative Party. I may say that we've been through similar problems in the past and they have recurred about every fifty or so years. We had them over the whole question of appeasement in the 1930s, we had them over tariff reform and indeed they occurred over the Corn Laws. The greatest mistake that Robert Peel made was not to change his mind eighteen months or so before the whole thing was lost and it was as a result of his failing to make that decision that what actually happened was that the Conservative Party was propelled into the wilderness for the next fifty or sixty years. Now that can be avoided now. We are fighting that battle, believe me, with absolute determination. The room here, the number of people in it, the quality of the speeches, the arguments, everything that we've brought forward, have in fact been built up over the last two years. We are winning. We're winning with public opinion. We're winning in Parliament. What we've got to do is to carry that forward and, believe me, we can and we will succeed.

**Lord Tebbit**

Have no doubt that, even if we had here a Jimmy Goldsmith to form a new party with all the push and shove which he has given to his party in France, which gained 13% of the poll in the European elections - the result of that is our system would undoubtedly be to put into office some form of coalition government which would surrender in Brussels. We have to change the minds of one or the other of the great national parties. They have both changed of late. They can be changed back again because they both did it in the belief that it would get votes. When they come to realise, as they are coming up towards the general election, that that may be a very very bad judgement, I think there will be a great deal of pressure on them. Already, have no doubt about it, Government policy is trying to inch its way towards our views. Once you've got them on the move, just keep pushing. There have been many things said in politics about being inside and outside tents, but remember the Arab wisdom that once the camel gets its nose inside the tent, the whole damn thing will be in before long.

**Questioner**

*It seems to me that if you look for federalism inside the Party, you don't get it in the Parliamentary Party; still less, as this meeting shows, do you get it in the constituencies. You seem to get it again and again amongst the Tory MEPs. Every one I know is a dripping federalist and I want to know what can be done about getting a few Euro-sceptic MEPs.*

**Bill Cash**

As an ex but still desired Chairman of the Party, Norman -

**Lord Tebbit**

You know there is an element of political correctness within Central Office and always has been and so the candidates have been broadly selected from people who have been on the list because they are quote pro-Europe unquote. And, of course, they are primarily the people who have gone forward for selection in that way. So I

think we shouldn't be surprised. I don't think we should worry too much about the MEPs. I think that their political life will be relatively short. But don't despair of all of them. The other day when there was a debate in the Parliament on broadly the agenda set out by the CDU/CSU, there were three Conservative MEPs that voted against it all. There was one who voted for it. The others in masterly fashion decided they couldn't take a decision and abstained. We just have to put some pressure on them. After all, they want to be re-elected. They want to be re-selected. We have some power, you know.

### **Questioner**

*The historically tolerant is admirable if you are at the apex of power, when you manage a vast empire, when you have huge resources. But do you think, Mr. Tebbit, and you are very English, do you think that the English have become so tolerant, after their years of success, now that they have failed for half a century? Do you think that tolerance is so great that the English nation is prepared to sit and let itself be led into Europe, and I assure you that tolerance is not what the English have to call upon now, but something more serious.*

### **Lord Tebbit**

Tolerance is the most essential part of a decent society or indeed of a democratic society. If we don't maintain our tolerance, we slip into the world of the politically correct and, from that, on downwards into the sort of world which I don't think we would wish to live in. The problem, of course, is that sometimes people confuse tolerance with civility or indeed an attitude of being simply maliche [ed. apathetical, lackadaisical] which is very different to being tolerant. But the history of this country has shown that there is a limit beyond which we will not be pushed. And when that limit is reached, then we make ourselves very plain. All too often, that tolerance extends until it is almost too late, but so far never right to being too late. I think we are going to play it very close again but I still believe that it is better that we live in a tolerant society than the one that becomes aggressive or domineering too soon.

### **Bill Cash**

Ladies and gentlemen, we have now reached 8 o'clock and I am now going to bring the proceedings to an end. Before doing so, I would like to thank Jimmy Goldsmith and Norman Tebbit and I would be grateful if you would stand and give them an ovation to register your approval of what they've been saying tonight.