

aminoundecoic acid). Some concern which imports grapefruit only to re-export in the same state has lodged a similar application. The Board has been asked to remove the present import duty on dried apple pomace, unground, and on impressed flongs and matrices for the production of completed pages (minimum size 20 x 15 inches).

Each of these applications is in the direction of free trade and should be granted.

In these days of grossly swollen printing costs, which are forcing small circulation newspapers and minority opinion journals to close and compelling many publishers to place their printing orders abroad, it is particularly important that all barriers to the free import of printing materials should be removed.

Even though the plates can be used only on printing presses attended by machine-minders, it is probable that the monopoly-minded printing unions will oppose this application, if they learn of it, because it could cause some redundancy among compositors. Such restrictionism will, in time, throw compositors and machine minders out of work.

The Royal Commission on the Press should consider what part tariff protection has played in the death of newspapers and magazines.

ONE LIBERAL WHO SEES THE COMMON MARKET FOR WHAT IT IS

“THE Common Market is a highly protectionist device, designed to exclude foodstuffs and manufactured goods from Europe. No amount of double talk or ‘double-think’ can deny this. It is the ‘ganging up’ of the relatively developed nations of Europe against all other nations who trade internationally.” Thus Mr. Newton Jones, prospective Liberal parliamentary candidate for St. Albans, writing in the *Liberal News*, March 30. Few people in the Liberal Party said openly that they do not believe in free trade but if their policies made free trade impossible he, for one, could draw his own conclusions. There was no hope that Britain, if she joined, could influence the Common Market on liberal lines. Once a member, Britain would have to impose a penal tariff on goods which now enter duty free from the Commonwealth — 40 per cent. of total imports. No-one had explained how Commonwealth interests could be safeguarded by imposing restrictions on trade with them. And did our duty to our neighbour apply only to Commonwealth countries? What about countries such as Japan and Argentina?

“If Britain or Europe make it more difficult for other nations to earn their living by trading, we must expect them to brand us as hypocrites and enemies. They will not believe the fine sentiments which Liberals express about the brotherhood of man, and it will help Mr. Krushchev considerably to win friends and influence people by offering to buy goods Britain will no longer be in a position to purchase . . .”

“Basically, the reasons given for Britain entering the Common Market are nothing more than a mixture of fear and greed — fear of standing on our own feet, fear of being left out in the cold, fear that industrially we cannot compete with a unified Europe — greed to get into rapidly developing markets. Naturally, we wrap all this up in language which disguises this fear and greed as moral and political sentiment of a high order. It is even argued that Britain entering the Common Market is a step towards Free Trade. It is the last step a British Parliament would be able to take on that road or any other, because after that the power would no longer be in our hands.

“We are told that the economic aspect is only of minor importance and that the political consequences of splitting Europe into two camps must at all costs be avoided. But surely the consequences of antagonising the rest of the free nations of the world must outweigh the advantages allegedly to be gained by sinking our identity with the Six? If we abolish tariffs on our imports from the Six and relax the rules which make it so difficult for people from the Continent to come and work here, this would prove our desire to collaborate . . .”

Mr. Newton Jones confessed his astonishment — no greater than ours — that the Liberal Party is blind to the advantages of its traditional policy of abolishing unilaterally the duties imposed on goods entering this country. “Britain, free to buy her requirements from anywhere in the whole wide world, would have immense advantages over groups of countries entrenched behind unified tariff systems like so many Maginot lines. We could extend an honest hand of friendship to any man, woman or child from whatever part of the world they came. We should not be professing friendship while practising discrimination. In short, our principles and our policies would be both honourable and practical.”

F.T.U. FIGHTS PEAS TAX PLEA

FARMERS’ pleas for a higher import tax on dried peas have angered the Free Trade Union. “With a sense of frustration and despair,” it has opposed this “cunning, specious and selfish application for further protection at the expense of the consuming public.” The Union’s detailed case submitted to the Board of Trade deals in general terms with the political circumstances surrounding the application and specifically refutes one by one the farmers’ arguments.

The reported remarks passed by Mr. R. A. Butler, Home Secretary, when he addressed the Cambridgeshire N.F.U. and, later, the Saffron Waldon Fatstock Show Society late last year are cited as an indication that “where the wider interests of the nation as a whole are in conflict with the narrower interests of farming and agriculture, it is the former that must be sacrificed to the latter.”