

# INDEPENDENT NEWS

No. 1

Price 2p.

1975

## EEC PAYS £21,000,000 TO DESTROY FRUIT

MILLIONS of pounds are paid out under the E.E.C.'s crazy Common Agricultural Policy to destroy food to keep the price up.

Last year, because prices dropped too low (yes too low!) £21m was

spent in buying up fruit and vegetables and burning or burying them.

£7,391,000 was spent in destroying pears in Italy and £6,956,000 to France for apples.

Peaches, tangerines, oranges, cauliflowers,

and tomatoes were also destroyed at the taxpayers' expense to keep the prices up, and depriving the population, and more especially children, of valuable sources of Vitamin C and other nutriment.

# GET BRITAIN

## WARNING!

THE SCAREMONGERS are at work. Be ready for them. Unable to show any benefits from forcing us into the E.E.C., they have changed their tactics.

They now say that, although the E.E.C. is unsatisfactory in British terms, it would be even more disastrous to leave. In an effort to stampede public opinion, they raise fearsome bogies. We would be all alone, they say, cut off, isolated and insecure. Our trade with

the Continent, they suggest, would collapse; mass unemployment would stalk the land. We must huddle together with the E.E.C. to survive at all.

This is pure eyewash, an insult to our mature British democracy.

The truth is that there will be nothing to stop us trading with Continental countries. Tariffs, already low, are being abolished between the E.E.C. and the European Free Trade Area coun-

tries. It would be virtually impossible to raise them against Britain alone.

Moreover it is greatly in the interests of the E.E.C. countries that they should trade with us—they gain far more from this than we do. Last year the other E.E.C. countries sent over £2,000 millions of goods more to us than we sent to them. This "great home market" of pro-Market propaganda myth inflicted an enormous trade deficit on us.

## Remember Norway...

The same scare stories were spread in Norway during their referendum. Norwegians were told they would be ruined if they remained free. What happened? Exactly the reverse. Since Norway had the good sense to say "No" its economy has prospered as never before. In the past year currency has twice been revalued upwards, whilst the £ has plummeted.

## THE ALTERNATIVE

An independent Britain would negotiate a similar arrangement with the E.E.C. as Norway, Sweden and the majority of the E.F.T.A. countries which did not apply for entry. This is based on free trade in industrial goods. Consider the advantages for Britain of this course.

- We would get what benefit arises from the removal of residual tariffs on industrial goods in trade with the E.E.C.

- We would be relieved of the burden of disproportionately penal contributions from Britain to the Community Budget

for which we get little in return.

- Freed from the Common Agricultural Policy with its butter mountains, beef and sugar crises, we would recover our right to buy our food wherever we wished including the E.E.C. if need be.

- We would regain full control of the movement of capital and investment in and out of Britain, and also freedom to trade wherever we wished around the world.

- Above all we would not transfer from our own

Parliament to E.E.C. institutions, power to make laws governing our internal affairs. We would regain the powers of self-government and control over our domestic affairs. Is anything more vital than that?

Thus we would establish the closest, friendly relations with the E.E.C. countries, as indeed with countries in all the Continents, on the basis of national independence.

This is the future for Britain out of the Common Market. It is something to strive for and to welcome.

# OUT!

AN ALL-OUT effort has been launched to free Britain from the Common Market. Trade unionist Mr. Jack Jones and Tory Member of Parliament Mr. Richard Body are joint Chairmen, underlining the all-Party nature of the new Get Britain Out Referendum Campaign.

This campaign will work for the largest possible 'No' vote in the Referendum coming in 1975.

The Campaign will voice the views and mobilise, the large and growing majority of our people, of all parties and in walks of life, who want to regain their self-government. They are insisting upon your right to decide your own affairs free of interference from Brussels.

The approaching referendum will be a momentous event in our history. The British public have won the right to speak directly on an issue of supreme importance to the country's future: whether Britain should withdraw from the Common Market.

The handful of top people, out of touch with the public, who forced us in without our consent, still squeal with rage that the people should have won the right to be consulted; but they cannot prevent us using it now.

The present Government agreed at the last General Election to allow the people to decide through the ballot box within twelve months. A referendum is likely by June of this year — by October at the latest.

The British people never wanted to be swallowed by the E.E.C. They do not want to be ruled from Brussels, with its bureaucracy, rigid regulations, constant wrangling, butter mountains, sugar and beef crises.

Of course we want co-operation and trade with the E.E.C. countries, as with countries all over the world.

But we want friendly relations with them in same way as Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Austria have, i.e. on the basis of independence, domestic self-government and remaining British. Indeed, we can be friends on no other basis.

We do not want to be sub-merged into a new political unit. We do not want to be governed by laws we did not make and cannot change. We will not be taxed by people we did not elect and cannot remove. We do not want to be locked into economic policies which would damage and weaken us, and suck us into a monster bureaucratically-run continental super-state.

The people of this country can never be bulldozed. They will reject any effort to force us into the Common Market, as they will show in the coming referendum. They know Britain has not gained any advantages but is being run into an economic blind alley. The horrific trade deficit with the rest of the E.E.C. shows this. The quack propaganda about "larger markets," "higher investments," "higher living standards" rings hollow now. We were told that in some mysterious way E.E.C. membership would solve our economic difficulties. We now know the opposite. If we stay in, we pay more than we draw out for as far ahead as can be seen. This is the road to bankruptcy. The referendum gives us the chance to do something about it.

The voters of Britain can take their future back into their own hands by voting to GET BRITAIN OUT of the Common Market.

### YOUR HELP IS NEEDED

Join the fight for a massive vote to free Britain from the E.E.C. Businessmen, trade unionists, academics, Members of Parliament and housewives are rallying to the campaign. A national office has been set up at 67, Upper Berkeley St., London W.1. Regional Committees have been set up throughout the country and organisation is being set up in each constituency.

Offer your help now to the Get Britain Out Referendum Campaign by writing to the above address, or to:

**NORTH EAST:** Mrs. D. Starkey, 17, Glastonbury Road, Newcastle, NE2 2HB.

**NORTH WEST:** Mr. Charles Starkey, 188, Heywood Road, Prestwich, Manchester M25 5LO.

**YORKSHIRE:** Cllr. Norman Free, Denwood Hill Hall, Horseforth, Leeds.

**EAST ANGLIA:** Mr. Derek Page, The Old Vicarage, Whaddon, Royston, Herts.

**LONDON and Home Counties:** Mr. D. Cox, 67, Upper Berkeley Street, London, W.1.

**WEST:** Mrs. W. Rowlands, 3, Orchard Road, Blackwell, West Town, Bristol.

**SCOTLAND:** Cllr. Mrs. Elizabeth Johnson, J.P. C/o Union of Insurance Staffs, South Chambers, 45, Queen Street, Edinburgh and 63, Bath Street, Glasgow.

# The Referendum

Your Questions Answered

**Q. Would not the holding of a referendum be incompatible with, and damage, parliamentary democracy?**

A. It is not for pro-Marketees to suggest that a referendum is anti-parliamentarian when they want a draconian curtailment of our parliament and its subordination to the unelected apparatus in Brussels. They openly reject the sovereignty of Parliament as an outmoded idea to be sacrificed to E.E.C. political union. In terms of parliamentary sovereignty, holding a referendum would be like a scratch on the hand — joining the E.E.C. is cutting its throat. Some 20 democratic countries use referenda at either national or state level. These include Switzerland, and most of the States in the U.S.A. And of course Norway, Denmark and the Republic of Ireland all had referenda on E.E.C. entry. Even France had one on whether the E.E.C. should be enlarged.

**GROWTH EXPLODED MYTH**

THE BRUSSELS Commission itself has exposed the myth that E.E.C. membership would transform Britain's economic growth rate. They forecast we shall be bottom of the league. Remember the rosy pre-entry propaganda? How our lower growth rate was unfavourably compared with the E.E.C. countries, and the implication that, if only we joined, our rate would automatically rise to theirs?

This was always misleading. The E.E.C. countries' growth rate was higher before the formation of the Common Market, thereafter it declined. And the growth rates of the other European countries outside the E.E.C. were as high or higher than those inside.

Now the negotiations (although expected to pay 24 per cent of the Budget), into the E.E.C. Budget have given the game away and revealed the truth about Britain's growth prospects in the E.E.C.

Mr. Callaghan, in arguing Britain's case, stressed that while the U.K.'s share of the Budget would rise, her proportion of the E.E.C.'s wealth would decline, i.e. that we should become relatively poorer vis-a-vis our Common Market associates.

The Commission was asked to report on this. They did at the end of October. The Brussels officials forecast Britain would have appreciably the lowest growth rate of the Nine between 1973 and 1978 — of between 2.5 and 3.5 per cent against the average of 4 to 4.5 per cent, with France, for example at 5.3 per cent.

In 1973, the Commission reported, the U.K. accounted for 16.4 per cent of the E.E.C.'s gross product, but that one year later in 1974 it had declined to 15.9. The Treasury estimates that by 1980 Britain's share will have declined to 14 per cent

**Q. Would it be exceptional in Britain?**

A. Mr. Heath's Government, and the 1970 Parliament, held a referendum in Northern Ireland on whether that part of the United Kingdom should remain within the U.K. The British Parliament incorporated provisions for referenda in the constitutions of various ex-colonies. Britain held a referendum in Gibraltar to see if the people there wanted to remain associated with Britain or join Spain. Even when a constitutional change was proposed in Rhodesia, the Government held it necessary to send the Pearce Commission to ascertain whether these changes were acceptable to the Rhodesian people as a whole. But although local referenda have been held in various parts of Britain on issues like licencing laws, the referendum has not formed part of our pattern of Government and it would require exceptional circumstances to introduce it.

**Q. Why is the Common Market issue exceptional?**

A. Because permanent membership of the E.E.C. would mean: 1) a drastic change in our Constitution, restricting the rights of Parliament and people, and 2) is meant to be irrevocable. It is not just a change in the law, but of the law making process itself. It means transferring the power to legislate for the British people to bodies outside this country, not elected by, or responsible to, us. We should be bound and covered by laws passed by

people not elected by us and whom we could not ourselves remove. Our present M.P.s are the trustees and custodians of our present rights and liberties, responsible for handing them on to future generations. They have no mandate to destroy our self-government in this way. The basic principle of the British constitution is that no Parliament can bind its successors. It follows that only the electorate, the sovereign people, can take the decision — and they will soon, through the ballot box in a referendum.

**Q. Isn't the Common Market too complicated an issue for ordinary people to decide and, surely it cannot be answered by a simple 'Yes' or 'No'.**

A. The argument that ordinary voters are too stupid or ignorant has been the argument of the tyrant through the ages and of those who opposed the development of democracy and the suffrage. This issue is no more complicated than those which are decided at General Elections. It is for those politicians who favour E.E.C. entry to persuade and convince their fellow countrymen of the benefits of entry. If they cannot, and so far they have signally failed, they have no right to force it down our throats. In the end, after all the arguments have been made, one has to say Yes, or Nay, a decision has to be taken. There is nothing novel about this. It is

the way the House of Commons takes all its decisions. The real reason why pro-Marketees do not want a referendum is simply that they do not believe in democracy, they do not want the people to decide because they fear the people's verdict.

The issue to be decided is relatively straightforward. Do we wish to retain our Parliamentary self-government, and co-operate with other states as an independent nation, or do we want instead to merge into another and larger political unit, a Continental super state run by the E.E.C. apparatus in Brussels? There can be little doubt how the British people will decide this question.

**4 MILLION JOBLESS**

THE NUMBER of wholly unemployed in the Common Market could reach 4 million next April, according to tentative projections made by the E.E.C. Commission. This estimate concerned only the wholly unemployed. If partial unemployment was also taken into account the figures would be much higher.

**DESPITE THE inspired press ballyhoo, nothing real was gained by Britain at the recent Common Market Summit held in Paris at the end of last year. The so-called Regional Fund is a mouse. No tangible agreement was made to ease the burden of Britain's payments into the E.E.C. Budget. Most important, the issue of our self-government, retaining the control over our domestic affairs, was not dealt with at all.**

The system of financing the E.E.C. Budget, so disproportionately penal to Britain, was devised by the French. They vetoed Britain's membership until this was agreed. It means that, by 1980, although Britain would account for only 14 per cent of the E.E.C.'s wealth, we should be paying 24 per cent of the Budget.

E.E.C. rules provide that the Budget be financed, not according to wealth or ability to pay, but by three taxes, the so-called "own resources" viz: (1) levies on foodstuffs imported from outside the E.E.C. (2) duties on industrial goods imported from outside and (3) a proportion of Value Added Tax. This system penalises countries which trade with the rest of the world. And this is why it hits Britain hard!

We are the world's largest food importer. We do more of our trade in industrial goods with the wider world than any of the other E.E.C. states. This system penalises countries which trade with the rest of the world. And this is why it hits Britain hard!

France, on the other hand, draws more out from the budget than she pays in, and so contributes nothing at all in real terms. She makes a profit out of the system. But what was agreed? Nothing precise at all. The French President, Giscard d'Estaing, described it as "hypothetical". In fact, it was shelved for the future in a cosmetic form of words.

The French were adamant that there could be no alterations in the sacred writ of the E.E.C.'s finance rules, i.e. the levies on trade with the rest of the world, so damaging to Britain. The one thing they grudgingly conceded was that there could, possibly, be variations of the proportions of VAT paid to the Budget by a

country in difficulties.

Even this was not spelled out. A formula was devised to postpone the issue. The final communiqué wrapped it up in a remarkable example of E.E.C. gobbledygook as follows: "They invite the institutions of the Community (the Council and the Commission) to set up as soon as possible a correcting mechanism of a general application which, in the framework of the system of "own resources" and in harmony with its normal functioning, based on objective criteria and taking into consideration in particular the suggestions made to this effect by the British Government, could prevent during the period of convergence of the economies of the member states, the possible development of situations unacceptable for a member state and incompatible with the smooth working of the Community."

What this adds up to is anyone's guess; in reality it means that no agreement was made.

### REGIONAL FUND

The so-called Regional

## PARLIAMENT SWAMPED BY EEC DIRECTIVES

PARLIAMENT HAS been overwhelmed by the flood of directives pouring out from Brussels. These laws now bind British citizens, and our courts, without Parliament ever having seen or discussed them.

No one can explain how Parliament can possibly examine this mass of Common Market orders and regulations. Last year a Committee was set up under Sir John Foster, Q.C., M.P., to consider this problem. As a result of this committee's report a Scrutiny Committee was

appointed to monitor this legislation. Parliament is tying itself in knots trying to deal with this nightmare — it is impossible to examine this mass of Common Market orders and regulations. Resulting from the Foster Committee's report, the House of Commons set up a scrutiny committee to sift through the hundreds of documents issued out of the E.E.C. sausage machine to select the areas which are of special importance to Britain. They were very emphatic that these key

proposals should be looked at by the whole House, not just by a committee. But of the 20 important matters earmarked in this way, Parliament has found time only to give a perfunctory 1½ hours' debate, late at night. The rest are piling up in a growing backlog. M.P.s have pointed out that even these despatch notes were on motions to "take note" or the "adjournment" precluding any amendments.

The Leader of the House, Edward Short, replied on 19/12/74. "The basic difficulty is that Parliament has lost its sovereignty over the whole area of legislation which applies to this country and the most we can do is discuss it."

The Government is supposed to hold up the progress of these important proposals in Brussels until the House has had a chance to debate them. But by mid-January time ran out on this backlog, they were rubber stamped by the E.E.C. undebated in Britain. The whole procedure has clogged up and broken down. Dissatisfaction culminated in an extraordinary debate on E.E.C. legislation on collective dismissals late on the night of December 11. It was discovered that the document being debated had been withdrawn in Brussels and superseded by another which was not available to the House. This graphically underlines the loss of democratic self-government. E.E.C. membership involves. Various ineffective expedients are being canvassed. One is that an additional Committee be set up, another is that there could be morning sessions of the House. The truth is that the job cannot be done. The E.E.C. produces as much legislation, binding every British citizen, as our own Parliament, and Westminster could not possibly find time to deal with it.

Remaining in the E.E.C. means that many of our laws will be made by people not elected by us and whom we cannot remove. We should thereby lose much of our freedom and cut away the moral basis of the rule of law.

## SUGAR CRISIS CONTINUES

THE CRISIS over sugar continues. The notion that the Common Market was going to assure us of adequate supplies of cheap sugar has vanished. Two facts are clear: the price of sugar in the shops will rocket in 1975, and supplies are in doubt. The trouble began with Mr. Heath's determination to get into the Common Market. Part of the price we had to pay was a weakening of Britain's sugar arrangements with the Commonwealth. Faced with a threat to their sales in Britain, and the lure of currently higher prices elsewhere, the Commonwealth countries looked for other markets, and higher prices if they could get them. Sugar is a long-term crop, taking 5-7 years to give a return on investment. Commonwealth countries had been willing to accept moderate prices in return for long-term guaranteed sales. The E.E.C. disrupted this. Britain was about to conclude a long-term agreement with Australia when the E.E.C. intervened and prevented this by telling the British Government it was no longer free to sign such an agreement. Soon the British people will have the chance in a referendum to vote to regain our freedom to trade with whichever countries we wish, and obtain our food from the soils and climates of the whole world.

budget, i.e. well over £2,000 million a year with the lion's share coming to Britain in the same way as France benefits from the C.A.P. The Conservative delegates to Strasbourg said anything less than a Fund of £500 million per annum was unacceptable.

## NO JOY AT THE SUMMIT

What is proposed now? Only a fund of half what Heath rejected as inadequate—£542 million over three years. Britain would get 28 per cent i.e. £170 million, something over £50 million a year. But we shall also be contributing to the fund, so in reality will get out hardly more than we pay in. The Foreign Secretary told the House of Commons on 19 December, 1974, it would be only between £20 million and £30 million a year. How puny and ineffectual these sums are can be judged by the comparison with the £1,000 million of assistance given to British industry by the Conservative Government in its last year of office. It is not even a drop in the bucket. Britain spends twice as much in one year on her national policy as the E.E.C. is to spend for all nine countries over three years!

### WHY A REGIONAL FUND?

It is instructive to ask why a Common Market needs a Regional Fund. It is because of the "free movement of

capital" the natural pull of larger market will be to its centre, sucking capital and labour away from the periphery. E.E.C. integration does not bring uniform prosperity, its natural tendency is to intensify regional disparities, the wealthy areas getting wealthier

devaluation as a means of re-dressing economic imbalance within a single currency area. If devaluation were precluded, consider what would be needed in the way of a Regional Employment Premium, the equivalent to a 15 per cent devaluation, supposing that became necessary to restore the U.K.'s competitive balance with the rest of the Common Market. The cost to the E.E.C. would be about \$10,000 million! Can anyone suppose such astronomical sums will be forthcoming? The proposition only has to be stated for its unreasonability to be apparent.

It is because we are expected to give up national control of our economies to a Common Market that a common regional policy is needed, and it is when measured against this requirement that the so-called Regional Fund set up for the next three years cannot even be described as a drop in the bucket. Whilst we give up domestic control over our own economy, and our industrial life blood drains out, we would get the merest trickle of E.E.C. charity in return. The Regional Fund is a propaganda myth.

### SELF-GOVERNMENT

These money questions, however, are not the most important issues involved. After they have become footnotes in history books, the crucial matter will still remain: whether we are to keep our democratic self-government. This has not yet even been discussed in Brussels. It is, however, the issue on which we shall want satisfaction in the coming referendum, for we shall never acquiesce in being governed by laws we did not make and cannot change, and by alien institutions outside the country not elected by us.

No economic gain could compensate us for the loss of self-government. To pay a heavy, damaging economic price to give up our freedom, as some would have us do, would be both senseless and suicidal.

### DISASTROUS OUTLOOK

The E.E.C. aim of economic and monetary union would make the outlook for Britain's development areas like Scotland, the North, Wales and Northern Ireland disastrous, and would threaten the whole of our economy. For monetary union, with a common currency, would preclude

## EEC MAKES MANY FOODS DEARER

THE BRITISH housewife would be buying much cheaper beef were it not for our membership of the Common Market.

Prices are so much lower in the world outside that the E.E.C. has imposed a total ban on all imports of beef.

This was described originally as temporary, but has continued indefinitely, and is legally enforceable in Britain although it was never discussed by Parliament.

Countries as varied as Australia, New Zealand, the Argentine, Brazil and Yugoslavia are all able to send us beef more cheaply than the prices reigning in the E.E.C.

Under traditional pre-E.E.C. British policy, these cheaper prices would not have injured our own farmers, for they would have received guaranteed prices and deficiency payments.

What is true of beef is equally true of butter, cheese, mutton and lamb, on which we are now obliged by the E.E.C. to

The following figures show how wide the gap is still between the price of their food and ours. They are taken from Hansard, in a written Answer given by the Minister of Agriculture, November 19th, 1974:

	West German Price	U.K. Price
1 lb. rumpsteak	£1.87 pence	83.00 pence
1 lb. white bread	17.89 pence	7.94 pence
1 pint milk	9.16 pence	4.50 pence
1 lb. potatoes	3.49 pence	3.10 pence
1 lb. butter	57.31 pence	24.20 pence
		(home produced)
		22.90 pence
		(New Zealand)
		33.80 pence
1 doz eggs	44.94 pence	6.45 pence
1 lb sugar	10.19 pence	6.45 pence
		(in September)

impose heavy import levies or duties and which could be bought much more cheaply outside the Common Market, if we were allowed to do so.

### PRICES TO RISE AGAIN IN 1975

Big price increases on butter and cheese — the first of a series of rises in the cost of basic foods expected this year—were due on Feb. 1. 5½p lb. on butter and 3½p on cheese.

The increases arise from two further steps to bring British dairy pro-

duct prices up to the Common Market levels.

Further measures of 2p lb. on butter and .75p lb. on cheese are expected during the year.

As food is still much cheaper in the U.K. than the rest of the E.E.C., the full force of the import duties, variable levies and the other parts of the Common agricultural policy has yet to be felt by us if our prices are to reach their level by the end of the transitional period. It is probable that they will then be similar to those of West Germany.

## COLOSSAL TRADE DEFICIT WITH EEC

BRITAIN HAS piled up a colossal trade deficit with the previous E.E.C. Six.

The staggering figures were given in the House of Commons on November 18th, 1974, by Mr. Peter Shore, the Secretary of State for Trade.

He said:—"The crude trade deficit (that is the difference between exports valued f.o.b. and imports valued c.i.f.) in the first 10 months of his year was £2,075m expressed at an annual rate compared with £69m in 1970. In the six months ended October the deficit was £1,076m compared with £246m for the corresponding period in 1972".

Trading benefits from the "Market of 300m" would compensate us for the burdens of the farm policy and our disproportionate payments into the budget, have been cruelly disappointed.

Britain's trade policy needs to be re-thought. Developments in the last two years have transformed the prospect. The explosion in oil prices and the steep rise in the prices of other commodities has dramatically shifted the pattern of world purchasing power.

While the changes have cast a shadow over the growth prospects of our E.E.C. associates, it has given a boost to the buying power of the commodity producing countries, with many of whom

Britain has good relations, and who can now provide promising markets for Britain's goods.

The balance of advantage between the E.E.C., and the open world "alternative" has dramatically altered.

Coupled with this, the high cost of energy is going to be an increasing problem for industrialised economies. But Britain with her deposits of coal, investments in nuclear energy and the oil and gas in the North Sea, will be self-sufficient as from 1980, and the most energy-rich country in Western Europe, greatly to the relief of our balance of payments.

If we were to remain in the E.E.C. it is likely that Britain's sovereignty over the North Sea oilfields would be increasingly called into question. M. Spaak, the E.E.C. Director-General for energy, has been claiming that North Sea Oil should be regarded as a "Community resource".

All the arguments are in favour of Britain regaining her economic freedom. Norway did and has prospered noticeably since.

# INDEPENDENT NEWS

## CONTINENTALS DO NOT CARE



Pro - Market propagandists constantly insist that our brothers in the Common Market are clamouring for Britain to remain in the E.E.C., and that we owe it to them to stay there. Not so. That's the fairy tale, what are the

facts? A poll published on December 17th, sponsored by the Brussels Commission itself, reveals that they are completely indifferent.

Asked if they thought Britain's withdrawal would have serious consequences for the E.E.C. only 2 per cent of the French, 6 per cent of the Germans and 8 per cent of the Dutch said yes.

Clearly, they could not care less. The Common Market is the invention of bureaucrats and has no roots among the people.

## FISHERMEN ATTACK EEC POLICY

Mr. Austin Laing, Director-General of the British Trawlers' Federation, has attacked the E.E.C. fisheries policy and called for radical changes in it. He forecasts that nations would soon extend their fishing limits to 200 miles, but without an amendment of the E.E.C. Common Fishing Policy the British fishing industry would stand to lose by this extension, because within that 200 mile limit Britain could not discriminate against other E.E.C. countries.

Britain accounts for almost half the total of the E.E.C. fish catch and her 200 mile limit contains the most prolific fishing grounds.

The other E.E.C. nations have already largely fished out their coastal waters by greedy fishing methods. The British fishermen want an inner limit exclusively for British vessels and are very critical of the way the E.E.C. fishing policy was rushed through.

Mr. Laing said: "When the Six saw pens poised for new entrants to sign the Treaty of Accession they got together to devise a common fisheries policy that would suit themselves. There was no consultation with new members. It is not surprising that the British industry has from the word 'go' found the policy unacceptable. If there is to be a referendum then this issue must be cleared up first," he said.



**Tony Benn explains how—**

# COMMON MARKET HITS DEMOCRACY

TONY BENN, M.P., in a letter addressed to his constituents, written on December 29, 1974, said in part: In 1975 you will each have the responsibility of deciding by vote whether the United Kingdom should remain a member of the European Common Market; or whether we should withdraw completely, and remain an independent, self-governing nation. That decision, once taken, will almost certainly be irreversible.

But we must recognise that the European Community has now set itself the objectives of developing a common foreign policy, a form of common nationality expressed through a common passport, a directly elected assembly and an economic and monetary union which, taken together, would in effect make the United Kingdom into one Province of a Western European State. The commune issued after the recent Paris summit makes these objectives clear.

Britain's continuing membership of the community would mean the end of Britain as a completely self-governing nation and the end of our democratically elected Parliament as the supreme law-making body in the United Kingdom.

**The five basic democratic rights changed by Community membership.**

The Parliamentary democracy we have developed and established in Britain is based, not upon the sovereignty of Parliament, but upon the sovereignty of the people, who, by exercising their vote lend their sovereign powers to Members of Parliament, to use on their behalf, for the duration of a single Parliament

only: powers that must be returned intact to the electorate to whom they belong, to lend again to the Members of Parliament they elect in each subsequent General Election. Five basic democratic rights derive from this relationship, and each of them is fundamentally altered by Britain's membership of the European Community.

### FIRST

**Parliamentary Democracy** means that every man and woman over 18 is entitled to vote to elect his or her Member of Parliament to serve in the House of Commons; and the consent of the House of Commons is necessary before Parliament can pass any Act laying down new laws or imposing new taxation on the people.

**British Membership of the Community** subjects us all to laws and taxes which your members of Parliament do not enact, such laws and taxes being enacted by Authorities you do not directly elect, and cannot dismiss through the Ballot Box.

### SECOND

**Parliamentary Democracy** means that Members of Parliament who derive their power directly from the British people, can

change any law and any tax by majority vote.

**British Membership of the Community** means that Community laws and taxes cannot be changed or repealed by the British Parliament, but only by Community Authorities not directly elected by the British people.

### THIRD

**Parliamentary Democracy** means that British Courts and Judges must uphold all laws passed by Parliament; and if Parliament changes any law the Courts must enforce the new law because it has been passed by Parliament which has been directly elected by the people.

**British Membership of the Community** requires the British Courts to uphold and enforce Community laws that have not been passed by Parliament, and that Parliament cannot change or amend, even when such laws conflict with laws passed by Parliament since Community law overrides British law.

### FOURTH

**Parliamentary Democracy** means that all British Governments, Ministers and the Civil Servants under their control can only act within the laws of Britain and are accountable to Parlia-

ment for everything they do, and hence, through Parliament to the electors as a whole.

**British Membership of the Community** imposes duties and constraints upon British Governments not deriving from the British Parliament; and thus, in discharging those duties Ministers are not accountable to Parliament or to the British people who elect them.

### FIFTH

**Parliamentary Democracy** because it entrenches the rights of the people to elect and dismiss Members of Parliament, also secures the continuing accountability of Members of Parliament to the electorate, obliging Members of Parliament to listen to the expression of the British people's views at all times, between, as well as during, General Elections, and thus offers a continuing possibility of peaceful change through Parliament to meet the people's needs.

**British Membership of the Community** by permanently transferring sovereign legislative and financial powers to Community Authorities, who are not directly elected by the British people, also permanently insulates those Authorities from direct control by the British electors who cannot dismiss them and whose views, therefore, need carry no weight with them and whose grievances they cannot be compelled to remedy.

In short, the power of the electors of Britain, through their direct representatives in Parliament to make laws, levy taxes, change laws which the Courts must uphold, and control the conduct of public affairs has been substantially ceded to the European Community whose Council of Ministers and Commission are neither collectively elected, nor collectively dismissed by the British people, nor even by the peoples of all the Community countries put together.

### What Parliamentary Democracy has achieved

These five rights have protected us in Britain from the worst abuse of power by Government; safeguarded us against the excesses of bureaucracy; defended our basic liberties; offered us the prospect of peaceful change; reduced the risk of civil strife and bound us together by creating a national framework of consent for all the laws under which we were governed.

We have promised a Ballot Box decision because all these rights are important, and none should be abandoned without the explicit consent of the people.

But no one who votes in the Ballot Box should be in any doubt as to the effect British membership has had, and will increasingly continue to have, in removing the power the British people once enjoyed to govern themselves.

## EEC RULING

### HALTS HOUSING

THE Sunday Telegraph recently reported that "a council housing scheme has been held up for months because a Common Market directive insists that the Council must advertise the building contract throughout the E.E.C. The council contends the Environment Department forgot to tell it."

"Bedford Council says the new houses are needed desperately by waiting families. Delays are lengthening the waiting list for homes." Councillor Victor Storrow, chairman of the Housing Committee said yesterday: "We all know it will be a waste of time, and we will not have any replies from the Continent because it is not worth their while to come all this way for the job."

"The Department of the Environment forgot to tell us about the Common Market regulation until now. It is disgusting that our homeless will have to suffer because someone has boobed."

## INDEPENDENT NEWS

Comments and contributions to INDEPENDENT NEWS should be sent to the Editor, Mr. Ron Leighton, G.B.O.R.C., 67, Upper Berkeley Street, London W1. Terms for further supplies of this broadsheet may be obtained on application to the above address, or by telephoning 01-402 7059.