

# Letters

## FAIR FREE TRADE?

SIR, — I am sorry to see that you and some of your friends are lining up with the Russians and Americans in their anti-Common Market attitude which they are adopting because they are not allowed to run it.

I do not fully agree with the Rome Treaty, but the only way to make it acceptable is to be in the Common Market and to work for amending those parts that are not fair to all.

There is no bigger Free Trade area than the Common Market : not only are the nine E.E.C. countries concerned but there are favoured agreements with Norway and Sweden and there is the Rome Convention between the E.E.C. and the African, Caribbean and Pacific States of forty six further countries all developing.

According to *Peking Review* 14 February 1975 the main points are as follows:-

Access (duty & quota free & without reciprocal treatment) to the West European Common Market (9) for all A.C.P. (46) industrial products and 96 per cent of their farm products: establishment of a stabilisation fund by the E.E.C. to compensate the A.C.P. countries for any fall in the market prices of a dozen basic products exported to the Common Market; aid amounting to more than 4,000 million dollars for financial and industrial co-operation to be given by the E.E.C. to A.C.P. in the next five years.

How different is this Free Trading to what has been in the past, pure exploitation, as Russia does today who obtained oil from Egypt dirt cheap and sells to West Germany at great profit, also sells to East Germany, one of her puppets, at a still higher price.

What we want is Free Trade under fair conditions and we are all the better for it, us morally, and the usually exploited economically.

Yours faithfully,

FRANK DOCHERTY

London S.W.19.

## COMMON MARKET— IN WHOSE INTERESTS?

SIR, — Some leaders of big business make no secret of the fact that they support Common Market membership because they see a decline in home demand. They believe they can offset the consequences of over-expansion of plant capacity by seeking larger markets for their mass-produced, standardised products, in part of Europe.

These men live in blinkers. They have little regard for the interests of the British people as a whole.

Many of these monopoly industrialists have achieved their power to influence governments as a result of economic policies thrust upon the British people by successive governments over the past fifty years.

The consequences of special privileges granted to sections of industry has been that hundreds of thousands of smaller traders and producers have been driven out of business. Thus the variety and quality of British productions have been greatly reduced.

Many big businesses have come to be regarded as of national importance. Such claims are seriously open to doubt.

In former times, when there were vast numbers of smaller producers, some failed but the majority succeeded. The failures were not matters of national importance. Today, when the giants make errors they are gigantic errors. They seek to maintain their inefficiencies with help from other taxpayers and from debasement of the currency. It is a trend which leads on to the totalitarian state.

This concentration of power in the hands of a few people is an important element in the Common Market campaign. Widespread ownership makes for political stability. The most valuable form of ownership consists of a large number of units of industry controlled by independent, responsible men and women.

Businesses should be allowed to grow as big as the men in them can make them - subject always to the principle that they are granted no special privileges by government at the expense of the rest of the community - taxpayers and

consumers. Membership of the Common Market buttresses the power of big business and puts burdens on the smaller traders.

Yours faithfully,

S. W. ALEXANDER

London, E.C.4

## DELEGATUS NON POTEST DELEGARE\*

SIR, — Parliament is the trustee of the powers which our democratic system has conferred upon it. At election times the policies and the personalities of the candidates are assessed, and a decision taken. I submit that it is unacceptable that then they, as a parliament, should be able to pass over those powers or any of them to another body of persons without a fresh mandate from the electorate. This would entail a delegation by a trustee of his trust; something which our own domestic law does not permit.

This is not mere legalism, but wise and real. The essence of democracy is that the people can dismiss their rulers. How would we, as Britons, dismiss our European rulers? Clearly, the more remote the rulers the more remote is real democracy.

I suggest our concern should be not about constitutional matters but the substantial question of international trade.

The Common Market area has been surrounded by tariff walls, as a matter of policy, and, as is always the case with tariffs, is designed to support prices. This is evidenced by the butter and beef mountains and other surpluses subsidised by public funds, but withheld from sale to keep up prices.

It is sought to justify its existence by pointing to the advantages of scale of production enjoyed by the Russian and American markets, which advantages it is said could be secured for the nations of Western Europe by joining together in a consortium of about the same size; each serving a population of about 250 million.

But China has a population of 800 million, larger than all three together and the population of the world is 3,782 million. It is said that we cannot afford to remain in isolation and small, but the

\* A trustee cannot delegate his trust.