

THE FINNS PARTY'S

EUROPEAN UNION POLICY

21.1.2019



THE FINNS PARTY

INTRODUCTION: THE FINNISH PEOPLE IN EUROPE

The backbone of the Finns Party's role in Finnish politics is the defence of Finnish democracy, culture and way of life. That fact is the reason for the Finns Party's critical approach to the increasing efforts of the European Union to advance political and economic integration of its members into the Union. The endurance of Finnish democracy and its valued 'welfare society' in the future is dependent on Finland prying itself loose from the intrusion of Brussels into all aspects of daily Finnish life. This encroachment of European 'bureaucracy' does not represent - or advance - the real value and virtues of European values.

The European Union has now, unfortunately, by its actions, changed the true nature and meaning of what Europe actually is. The crucial difficulty and problem here is that the EU does not reflect the true uniqueness of the European civilisation - and the Finns Party believes Finland is a valuable part of that experience. The success of Finland has been built on the true sacrifice of a generation of war veterans and the following hard work of reconstruction. The accomplishments of a 'modern' Finland have been the result of vigorous and continued effort by the Finnish people.

The Finns Party is the only political party in Finland that bases its 'European policy' on appreciation and acknowledgment of traditional Finnish and classic Western values which have been shaped by well-established, Christian fundamentals. Quite to the contrary, the other main Finnish political parties pontificate with messages of open immigration, globalisation and economic policies that are moving to create an economy that is more and more socialising risk while maximising private profits. There is also significant acceptance of 'crony capitalism' whereby private business interests use personal 'connections' to distort a free market. Unfortunately, these attitudes and approaches are rampant, as well, in Brussels. It's thus no wonder that these parties are so easily prepared to sidetrack the many-thousand years' heritage of Finnish and other European cultures.

As a result of the Euro currency-crisis, the immigration dilemma and Brexit, the European Union is in a decided state of turbulence. Alongside the usual 'EU-integration-friendly' attitudes of France and Germany, there is a present and growing trend towards opposing the concentration of power in Brussels - especially in regard to immigration policy. In addition, smaller member states

- such as Denmark, Hungary and Austria - have become fed-up of what they view as 'dictation' by the European Commission in Brussels. These countries believe the important questions of proportionality and local prioritisation must be considered in future reforms of the European Union.

Finland, in these circumstances, is now presented with the opportunity to choose and develop its own independent, original policy and avoid seeming to be a country composed of naive simpletons depending on other nations and devoid of the possibility for self-determination. Finland will not have any kind of voice in an EU-federation led by France and Germany - its possibility to be influential lies with being in an alliance with other critical EU nations!

The European Union is not, in any case, "forever". Even before any final disintegration of the European Union, the Finns Party sees the longer-term strategic goal of Finland's withdrawal - either alone or as part of a wider group of EU-critical nations. It is delusional to think that peace among European nations and the functioning of an internal, common market requires the formation of a political union!

Finland needs the Finns Party in the European Parliament to further the cause of the Finnish people and to protect their rights and interests. It is wrong - and ineffective - for Finland to be dependent on the benevolence of other EU-nations. Finland's fulfilment of Finnish well-being is the responsibility of Finns!

PUTTING AN END TO THE FEDERALISATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

During the entirety of Finland's membership in the European Union, Finland has supported the so-called 'strong' European Commission. According to this doctrine, a properly-working, effective Commission will be independent of member states and protect the interests of smaller members - especially with respect to the powerful influences of France and Germany.

In reality, Finland has been mistaken in this thinking because the Commission has not been the neutral arbiter its official status would suggest. It's been evident that the European Commission has bent with pressure from the larger members when it is preparing draft regulations and directives; these proposals have been tailored to appeal to France, Germany, Italy and Spain.

For its acquiescence, Finland wins the Commission's

praise as it has behaved as a model student. Indeed, it even announces, in advance, its commitment to what have turned out to be bad compromises. In contrast to Denmark and Sweden, Finland rarely votes against the Commission - even on issues of national importance to itself.

Finland has even been in favour of increasing the application of qualified majority voting (QMV). This voting-methodology even lessens the future influence of Finland in EU matters as it increases the decision-making power of the larger countries.

Finnish decision-makers and their supporters have argued that by 'going along' with the stronger powers, Finland is collecting 'gold stars' for 'good behaviour' and in so doing, gets a place in all 'forums.' There's been no accounting by anyone as to what good this over-accommodation has actually benefited Finland. To use another metaphor, when does Finland get to 'cash in' these 'chips?' The reality is that Finland is actually destroying its negotiating position, as the other members have long learned that Finland is inclined to go along with every compromise and will not 'make trouble.'

The structure for democratic representation in European Union decision-making is in serious need of reform. Presently, very much power is given to the European Commission which is not elected by the EU's population and is only subject to very indirect processes of selection. More power must be available through long-established democratic means at national levels - the present autocratic approach of the European Commission is not compatible with democratic principles.

The political nature presently seen at the European Commission level is to be unequivocally rejected. The European Commission was established for the role of supervising the implementation, by the EU member states, of treaties, directives and legislation of the EU - and the Commission's work should be returned to that purpose. The Commission should not have a place in the initiation of the EU legislative process; that function should belong exclusively to the European Council and thereby subject to its democratic influence.

The progression to an ever-increasing integration of the member states into the EU must be halted. This disengagement should be achieved by dismantling various federal structures as well as the cessation of the attempt to create 'Europe' as the object of loyalty. As examples, the foreign and security policies - and immigration policy - should be left to the individual member nations who will be more able to effectively manage those policies from the

perspective of their own national interests - and knowledge!

The approach of considering 'Europe' as the 'motherland' has brought about an EU-wide internal market and associated legislation. The current 'mantra' is to think of the 'four freedoms' of the EU internal market to be the free movement of capital, goods, services and labour. The Finns Party believe that 'labour' must be removed from this list.

This EU-internal labour mobility has led to a sizeable migration of young and skilled workers from Eastern Europe and the Baltic nations - with a resulting general decline in wages and working conditions in the Western European countries to which they have moved. This 'free movement' has also facilitated the movement of criminal groups and influences to Finland - both on an individual basis and via 'organised crime.' Moreover, there has been developing a very unwelcome phenomenon of desperate destitution - namely, 'begging.'

The most striking example of the far-reaching consequences of 'EU-free movement' is Brexit - which was largely influenced by the rather massive immigration to the United Kingdom of EU citizens over recent years.

With the background of Brexit, an unofficial group of eight northern European countries has been formed which are especially committed to a 'critical financial discipline.' The group includes the 'non-Euro currency' nations of Denmark and Sweden - as well as the Baltic countries which have clear geopolitical needs that favour EU 'integration.' Finland is a virtual 'island' - located in the extreme north-east corner of Europe - and it is not advantageous to tie its hands to the objectives of 'heterogeneous land coalitions' in goals related to European Union policy.

Finland should always be seeking its best partners on a 'case-by-case' basis when negotiating European Union issues. Forming particularly close relationships with Sweden and Denmark would be very rational as those countries share many of the social and cultural values and environments of Finland.

EXIT FROM THE EURO-AREA IS POSSIBLE

The decision for Finland to join the Euro-area was primarily a solution for the Finnish security policy. Solidifying all possible contacts with Western Europe was considered to be a good strategy with regard to Russia if, indeed, Finland was not to become a member of NATO. As to actual economic policy, it was thought that the Euro could be expected to increase foreign trade and investment,

reduce inflation and provide 'stability'. The disadvantage of abandoning the national currency (markka) would mean Finland was without its own mechanism to adjust to country-specific adversities. However, the thought was that these negative effects were estimated to be roughly equal or even less than the positive consequences. In any case, there was no strong voice raised against the adoption of the Euro.

The Finns Party believes that Finland taking up the Euro was a huge political and economic mistake - in terms of both the resulting structure and composition. Countries which kept their own national currencies - such as Sweden, Denmark, the United Kingdom and many Eastern European nations - have fared better, on the average, than the Euro-area.

The two main problems of the Euro-area are that there is the same monetary policy for all Euro-members and the same financial responsibility and accountability. This means the same central bank's interest and exchange rates for all Euro-countries - and the result is either interest rates are too high or the Euro is too strong - or the interest rates too low and the Euro too weak. There is no possibility to seek the 'Goldilocks solution' - 'just right'. The Euro-area is thus subject to unacceptable economic fluctuations and destabilisation. This unstable environment seemed to lead to apparent peaceful growth but unfortunately created the huge southern European deficits and the Euro-crisis.

The Euro-area is not organized in the same way as the United States: there is no central government body that can offset instability with a common monetary policy using unified taxation rates and income transfer systems. The lack of these possibilities causes distressed individual Euro-nations to experience lengthy periods of austerity which is a form of internal devaluation. This is a painful 'remedy' which is bringing about serious political disagreements and many signs of 'rebellion' which have culminated in demonstrations and even 'riots'.

The Euro-area has elements of both direct and indirect 'common responsibility'. For example, the European Central Bank's acquisitions of corporate and a nation's sovereign debt are the direct responsibility of the individual Euro-area nation. The Euro-system also has a payment system for transactions between national central banks - but the fluctuations in the amounts of debts and receivables of different countries can become problematic. 'Crisis' countries will have a significant debt level while nations, such as Germany and Finland, should be on the receiving end. When any single member adopts the Euro

as their currency, it can well be that there will be other countries not recovering their claims in full.

In the Euro-area, the common responsibility principle holds for member nations via the stability mechanisms but in actuality they are technically implemented outside the EU through intergovernmental decisions. Non-Euro-area nations do not participate in these mechanisms.

The proposed common deposit guarantee for the 'banking union' is dangerous for Finland. Even if banks in 'crisis countries' were to be put in good shape before the formation of such a union, there is the very real possibility that the same banks in the same countries would again experience serious difficulties and the losses for Finland could be considerable.

It is generally thought that there are two major ways to progress in the Euro-area - either a consolidation of the Euro-area into an economic and political federal state - or a continued decline of the Euro-area with its ultimate disintegration. The Finns Party cannot support the formation of a federalised Eurozone with all that it entails: the Party believes the way forward is to create a 'well-controlled exit' from the Euro.

The important benefit of Finland's exit would be a return to its own independent national currency and monetary policy. This move would mean, for example, control over its own debt interest rates, setting exchange rates and using its own central bank's financial status for debt security programs. At the same time, Finland would avoid taking responsibility for other Euro-area nations, the economic policies driven by a non-Finnish central government - and a deepening federal state.

TWO WAYS TO IMPLEMENT A FINNISH EXIT FROM THE EURO

One way for Finland to leave the Euro is to secretly inform a select group and quickly activate the exit over a weekend. If the plan 'leaked,' many people would transfer their bank holdings abroad and sell as many other financial assets as fast as possible in fear of devaluation and other financial degradation. Due to this 'dangerous' possibility of leakage about the 'exit,' comprehensive, in-depth preparation would be difficult. Also, the resulting capital control requirements and other logistical considerations during the implementation phase would be economically expensive - even if ultimately feasible. However, there would still be possibly significant political costs inasmuch as it would become obvious that this had been a 'secret' plan all along!

There is, however, a second option which could prove to be more palatable. That path would be a gradual withdrawal of the Euro from Finland by officially introducing a parallel currency - for example, a new 'Suomen markka/Finnmark.' Over time, the Euro would be phased out - but in the transition period both the Euro and *Finnmark* would be legal tender and both would be used for accounts, loans and commerce.

Payments are already made in various currencies - for example, dollars and bitcoins. If Finland was joined by other Euro-area nations with the concept of dual currencies, one could think of the Euro as a '*valuta franca*' - and there eventually could be the possibility to convert a national currency back to the 'basket' currency - much as the ECU was used before the Euro was fully introduced. Obligatory notes and other financial agreements, denominated in Euros, could be handled by a national currency exchange rate. This 'currency re-organisation' would also give Finland a needed national payment system - a system which would facilitate managing the Euro differential and would also be important in times of crisis.

A return to the national currency possibly elicits old financial nightmares in Finland, as many might recall the serious recession of the early 1990's. At that time, the combination of a government policy of maintaining a strong Finnmark and its incorporation into the European exchange rate resulted in high interest rates. The preferred path for a return to the Finnmark would combine a floating exchange rate with the setting of inflation targets.

National currency 'floating' is a technique used in many European Union countries and also in almost all industrialised countries throughout the world. Experience has shown that the use of floating exchange rates has not led to interest rate shocks or acceleration of the rate of inflation. Finland experienced the same result between the years 1992 and 1997 - many believe the flexibility offered by the floating mechanism to have been a key factor in the economic recovery in those years.

Finland does a significant amount of trading outside the Euro-area and is quite accustomed to handling 'floating currencies' and has done so successfully. Even though 'floating' would now be a characteristic of Finland's own currency, Finland would not consider it to be a leap into the unknown - a claim made by some.

COMMITTING THE EUROPEAN UNION TO A "DIET"

When Finland became a member of the European Union

in 1995, there were almost boundless promises for the future - yet nothing was said about the actual costs of membership! The 1994 EU referendum campaign saw Finnish media extol the future of improved living standards coming with Finland's EU membership. However, the EU has not made good with this 'pie in the sky' promise from European Union activists. Instead, Finland has seen itself become a clear net 'payer' to the EU when its size is considered. During almost the entire period of its membership, Finland has paid more to the European Union than what it has received - the peak was reached one year with a deficit of nearly one billion Euros!

Management of the EU finances has continuously received serious criticism from the European Court of Auditors over the years. In particular, there have been some ambiguities and inconsistencies with 'cohesion funds' occurring in several member nations (*a mechanism for addressing economic and social disparities and inequalities among EU nations*). Partly due to these 'difficulties,' the EU has attempted to make its budget more independent of member nations and, using what could be loosely termed as 'EU taxes,' instituted a system for having its own resources - a system where an automatic proportion of revenue goes to Brussels.

Finland must view this system very critically and must support the current practice of the European Council where the fees of EU membership are calculated according to the gross national income of a member nation - in this way the member nations are able to keep control of the size of the European Union budget.

It is important that Finland acts together with those other EU members that are promoting financial discipline as a vital issue. Finland should oppose the European Commission's proposals for an increase in membership fees for the period 2021-2027. It's of especial import, that Finland's 'political conversation' critically analyze the idea that adding funds to the EU also adds value. No one is explaining what these 'added values' are - other than extraordinary administrative costs!

Finland must also demand that all spending of the European Union must be subject to cost-reductions - and giving the possibility for lower reductions for the important sector of Finnish agriculture. For example, the EU's European External Action Service (*EEAS*) costs some one billion Euros each year and would be a good target for savings. Other examples are the European Committee of the Regions (*CoR*) and the European Economic and Social Committee (*EESC*) which spend annually hundreds of millions of Euros - they should be abolished as they

only have advisory roles.

Inasmuch as the European Union is already the world's largest donor of development aid, it can reasonably afford to cut 1-2% from its development aid contributions. Aid to third countries with the idea of future accession should be cut aggressively - in particular, convergence aid funds for the Islamic Autonomous Region in Turkey must be abolished as must the hopeless negotiations for the future accession of Turkey to the EU be abandoned.

Finland must oppose the creation of any new EU agencies. The planned European Union Employment Agency, for example, would result in costs of 50 million Euros per year. The Strasbourg 'circus' for an additional bureaucratic EU locale must be abolished. The monthly movement of the entire EU 'parliamentary machine' from Brussels to Strasbourg is producing nothing more than high costs (some 114 million Euros annually) and a sizeable, detrimental impact on the environment.

Similarly - for the sake of both fairness and efficiency, savings must also be aimed at the costs of the EU bureaucracy. European Union personnel and officials should see a marked reduction in benefits, pensions and tax-free 'extras.'

STOPPING UNCONTROLLED IMMIGRATION

Over one million asylum seekers illegally crossed the borders of the European Union in 2015 - there must not be a repeat of this. The inability of the European Union to effectively act resulted in a severe strain on the member nations' social security systems, a deterioration of social cohesion and a significant weakening of their internal security.

Between the years 2015 and 2018, several attacks by Islamic terrorists occurred in various EU countries. These were 'facilitated' by insecure EU external borders, 'free movement' within the Schengen area as well as the general chaos generated in the various member nations by the immigration crisis.

Following this immigration crisis of autumn 2015, many EU nations have instituted stricter temporary border controls. From this experience of recent years, it can be seen that the Schengen Borders Code is in need of amending - there should be no time limits on internal border controls and that controls, in general, can be initiated with the sole discretion and authority of the member state.

The significant natural growth of the African popu-

lation in the last few decades and the continuation and escalation of political unrest in the Middle East mean that the immigration pressure into the European Union from these regions will not be subsiding. Nevertheless, the solution to the demographic pressures in Africa and to the political problems in the Middle East cannot be, and will not be, to transfer the populations of those regions into Europe. Rather, EU countries must invest in the construction and maintenance of refugee camps - especially in the neighbouring areas to the conflicts in Syria. This would enable refugees to live in human conditions and to be able to quickly and inexpensively return to their countries of origin when conditions improve. Aid investments to Sub-Saharan Africa must again be oriented towards sustainable development and feasible commercial conditions.

All aid projects should be monitored and evaluated regarding desired goals. Pouring money into superficially 'good sounding' projects must stop. Countries receiving aid should measure up to expected results.

With respect to immigration legislation, the European Union has no choice but to look towards extremely stringent laws and regulations. A number of EU countries, quite unlike Finland, have already - through effective national measures - tightened up the awarding of residence permits, family reunification possibilities and social benefits to be at the minimum thresholds in accord with European Union legislation and international refugee agreements. The European Union, itself, is presently working on drafting and amending a number of directives as well as looking again at the definitions of 'refugee,' 'asylum procedure,' 'social benefits' and 'liability.' It is hoped that these changes will ameliorate the situation so another crisis can be avoided. But, so far, there has been no basic agreement among the member nations, the European Parliament and the European Commission on an immigration and asylum policy that would meet present and foreseeable future challenges.

The Finns Party believes the European Union needs to move the focus from the fruitless debate about the handling of asylum seekers to an effective control of the EU's external borders. Thus - all persons crossing the European Union's land and sea boundaries illegally will be returned to their place of origin by the EU Border and Coast Guards. The Border and Coast Guards will be furnished with adequate material and human personnel needed to perform this function.

European Union nations must now be ready to take their place in the front line of the international field and

begin diplomatic negotiations to amend or even negate the Geneva Refugee Convention with its additional protocol. At the time this Convention was made, World War II was ending and the purpose of the Convention was to provide temporary protection for individuals who were being persecuted on the basis of race, religion or other person-related characteristics. It was not intended as a device for international 'travel.'

In order to preserve and protect the European social model, there is a clear need to reach a common understanding regarding the removal of a right to personal asylum when there is a crossing of a nation's land or water boundaries.

LOBBYING AND TAX EVASION CONTROL

The Finns Party believes that Finland should energetically promote the principle of transparency in its policy towards the European Union. Brussels is jam-packed with lobbyists; the result is that the ordinary citizen has no way of knowing who is 'paying for the music' and who is really responsible for decisions and actions of the European Union. There has long been an attempt to establish an effective 'lobbyist register' - but without success. True transparency requires that people know - and set conditions for - the lobbyists that are influencing the European Parliament, the European Council and the European Commission!

Certain EU member states have made efforts towards the creation of a lobbyist register quite difficult. This is happening in the European Council as well as with negotiators in the European Parliament. (The European Parliament has noticeably eased up on proposed increased 'transparency.') These attempts are not related to lowering administrative costs that would be required for increased control of lobbying but are simply attempts to put obstacles in the way of setting up an effective registry. It's quite clear that influential lobbyists do not want their 'cooperation' with members of the European Parliament publicised!

The definition of a 'lobbyist' should be those people that are meeting with decision-making personnel and/or elected representatives - and dealing with EU-legislation (directives, statutes, etc.). European Union officials and MEPS should be obliged to only have meetings with those people in the so-called 'Lobbying Transparency Register' - and the existence of these meetings should be made public, whether in or outside EU premises. The Eu-

ropean Union and the European Parliament already have the technical capability to publish these meetings in the profile of all MEPS, for example.

Finland can also be influential in requiring that official delegations to the EU publish the occurrence of their personnel's meetings with registered lobbyists. Hosting of events in Parliament should only be allowed for those in the 'Lobbyist Register.'

The publication of the 'Panama Papers' and 'Luxembourg Leaks' has shown how large economic organisations are trying - and succeeding - to evade taxation at the national level. Finland must demand that financial information exchanges among member nations be increased and made more effective. It's known that nations such as Malta, Portugal (via Madeira), and Luxembourg are areas where various 'tax arrangements and schemes' can be used to avoid tax obligations.

'Business' must accept social responsibility. The small Finnish entrepreneur - and the usual taxpayer - cannot comprehend how it is 'permitted' that aggressive 'tax planning' can attack the very fabric of society - while, at the same time, they are paying their own taxes conscientiously!

FINLAND'S DEFENCE - PRIORITY

The Finns Party believes Finland has chosen wisely to make the combination of 'area defence' and general conscription to be the backbone of Finnish defence strategy. Experience has shown this to be an effective and sustainable policy and should be retained for the future.

The defence of one's own country must always be the priority - expensive and unnecessary European Union military exercises around the world should be avoided. In principle, Finland is the last 'frontier' of the West against the East and presents a real force with its universal military service. The Finns Party believes Finland should cooperate on an international basis when such serves Finnish interests - but it should not participate in a European Union army or be part of 'EU troops.'

The highest priority for Finland in defence issues is to maintain Finland's system of 'area defence.' Finland should also avoid getting involved in any 'big power political disputes and conflicts.' It should rather act as a facilitator of discussion and negotiation - and, at the same time, maintain that the territory of Finland is not to be used against a third country.

THE FINNS PARTY BELIEVES -

- Finland is justified in withdrawing from the Ottawa convention prohibiting anti-personnel land mines.
- Guerrilla-type warfare is still an intimidating 'weapon' and sets an increased threat-level for what kind of territorial or cyber intrusion might occur.
- The capabilities and weaponisation of the Finnish armed forces must be upgraded and their mobility improved.

To the degree that co-operation with the EU in the acquisition of defence materials would improve the overall performance of the Finnish army then such cooperation should go ahead. But this should not be at the expense of making Finland dependent on others. Finland must keep possibilities for supplies from the entire world and must not be limited by the EU.

The present situation in the European Union with regard to defence issues is that various nations are trying to take advantage by favouring the establishment of a European army. Finland has nothing to gain by this - only costs.

In spite of grandiose speeches, the foreign and security policies of the European Union are mainly discussions that could be termed as 'cocktail party talk;' each country promotes its own interests while purporting and espousing the idea of there being a 'common interest.' One example is the crisis in Ukraine and the EU sanctions imposed on Russia - German cars are exported to Russia as before but Finnish cheese not! A similar situation exists for discussions regarding the natural gas pipeline of the 'Nordstream 2' project. Finland must oppose all EU-level regulations that limit Finland's political options.

Germany, especially, is trying to get closer to Russia in the wider scene and getting its own economic advantage - but, at the same time, it is talking about 'European Unity' from the other side of its mouth. It is unfortunate that the main media organisations in Finland - along with many politicians - continually speaks and writes about a 'united European Union' and an EU 'security policy solution.' The public seldom hears or reads about the geo-strategic and geo-political interests that Germany and France, for example, have been furthering.

FINLAND'S AGRICULTURE IS A MATTER OF SECURITY

The common agricultural policy of the European Union is presently experiencing a transformation as the European Commission has plans for major cuts in the agriculture support programs and cohesion funding - all in the name of 'reform.' The Finns Party has already stated in this policy paper that Finland must resolutely strive for major cuts in, inter alia, EU administration and personnel costs - thereby reducing pressure for reducing agricultural support. Domestic subsidies must be permitted to augment the Finnish agricultural sector if needed. A temporary withdrawal from the European agricultural policy must not be ruled out as an alternative.

Finland must be able to store seed potatoes and cereal grains in Finland and there should be no question of a European Union storage solution. Additionally, agricultural production should be maintained in all areas of Finland.

It's not acceptable that Finland, which is a net 'payer' of the EU, must continually fight at the EU negotiating sessions for its own agricultural industry year after year - and still often gets cut short. The special geographic conditions of Finland must be recognised! At the same time, Finland must take a critical stand towards French and Italian wine-growing subsidies.

Finland must not have to bend to the European Commission's solutions often used for Central Europe's forest industry. The operating conditions for the Finnish forest industry must be maintained and safeguarded - and outside 'solutions' which endanger the health of Finnish forests and the Finnish forest industry must be rejected. Finland must take a strong position in the European Council on these issues. Forests are Finland's 'green gold' and decisions relevant to forestry must be made in Helsinki - not Brussels.

Finland must forcefully defend its food industry while, at the same time, opposing the import of food products into the EU. When negotiating 'free trade agreements' in the European Council, Finland must not adopt arrangements that lead to damage to Finnish agricultural production. Finnish EU representation must also 'keep on their toes' with respect to fisheries policy - it has become apparent that Poland and the Baltic countries are possibly interpreting fishing quotas that contravene present rules.

THE FINNISH 'INDUSTRIAL CHIMNEY' IS CLIMATE CHANGE CONTROL

The Finns Party believes that Finland must pursue a sensible climate change policy at both the national and European Union level. The existence of a factory in Finland is already an environmentally-favourable act because if it isn't in Finland, it will be someplace else. And that 'someplace else' will more than likely have environmental standards and monitoring levels which will not be as good as Finland. The result is that the global climate and Finland both suffer.

A completely new way of thinking is needed so that that the harmful effects of globalisation and the 'China syndrome' are avoided. This globalisation and free movement of goods must be stopped; this can be done by imposing a 'climate tax' on imported goods, in general, and an additional tax on products from the worst polluters. These measures would improve both Finland's competitiveness and employment picture.

With regard to European Union climate change policy, the Finns Party believes Finland must make its voice heard and correct the misconception which has the situ-

ation turned on its head. As it stands now, the countries implementing the cleanest solutions are actually subsidising the countries which are doing the most polluting. In the internal burden-sharing program of the European Union, Finland must demand that these 'most polluting' countries carry their responsibility - and, if necessary, part of the billions of Euros 'EU Structural and Investment Funds' which are directed to these countries must be earmarked for the realisation of lower emission targets.

Unfair competitive advantage coming from outside the EU can be offset by imposing a 'climate duty' on those countries which is, at least, equal to the estimated cost of the 'carbon footprint' of those imports. Such a mechanism would move consumers towards more climate-friendly choices as they would have to pay more for 'climate-damage producing' products. There would thus be incentive for countries facing there 'pollution tariffs' to improve their production methods. Finland should also be involved in the support of placing 'climate costs' as part of the pricing of the use of coal - and this should be a general EU requirement.



THE FINNS PARTY