



A DIGEST OF NEWS AND VIEWS ON BRITAIN'S ECONOMY
AND OUR ROLE IN OVERSEAS TRADE AND PAYMENTS

Vol. 2 No. 1

January/February, 1972

CONTENTS

	Page
1972—A Momentous Year	2
Australia—The Growing Giant	5
Common Market Agricultural Policy under attack	7
The Story of a Cable from New Zealand	8
Common Market—Statements made relating to Fishery Negotiations	13

Published bi-monthly

Editor: Edward Holloway

Published by Commonwealth Industries Association Ltd.,
60 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1.

Subscription rates: U.K. £2 p.a. Australia \$5. Canada \$6. New Zealand \$5.
U.S.A. \$6.

1972—A MOMENTOUS YEAR

If all goes as the Government plans, by 1st January 1973, Britain will have joined the European Economic Community. This is by far the most important issue facing us in the coming year. Much of the time of Parliament will be taken up with the measures necessary to bring this about. Much of the time of those engaged in trade and industry will be taken up with the considerable changes which acceptance of the regulations and directives already issued by the Commission in Brussels, which have only now been translated, will be obligatory once we are in the Community.

The team of translators has been working in Brussels to provide authentic texts of the Treaties of Rome, Euratom and the European Coal and Steel Community as well as over 2,000 regulations. They have not found it an easy task. The official English texts of the thousands of regulations due to come into force after Britain joins the Six became available to M.P.s on 14th January, just over a week before the Treaty of Accession to the European Communities was due for signature. Running into forty-two volumes, they cover a wide variety of subjects—these include Budgetary Policy; Commercial Policy; Transport; Community Institutions; Competition; Customs Questions; Economic and Financial Affairs, Energy Policy; Euratom; Right of Establishment; Social Affairs; Taxation and Technical Standards.

It is questionable whether either in Government circles or in industry sufficient consideration has been given to the scope and extent of all the changes that will be needed to implement our joining the Common Market. All the emphasis has been placed on the need to carry through the negotiations as speedily as possible, now the real crunch comes in facing up to the consequences.

SIGNS OF RECESSION

Meantime, the economies of the Common Market countries continue to show signs of recession. According to the OECD the economy of Western Germany has entered a period of cooling off and the *Financial Times* of January 6th reports a rise in unemployment of nearly 62,000 last month, the highest increase since December 1967 when the economy was in recession. Reports from Holland, Belgium and Italy carry similar warnings, and only France appears to be maintaining its rate of expansion. Even here, the OECD reports "the underlying strength of demand raises some doubts" and "the labour market has eased perceptibly". So far we have not had very much comment on this position from Government spokesmen, but to us it makes the "dynamic growth" theory look a little odd.

A strange silence also surrounds the apparent agreement arrived at between Mr. Heath and M. Pompidou in May 1971 when, according to

M. Pompidou in a subsequent television interview, he said that Britain had agreed to turn from her traditional open seas policy to a purely European role. Many Members of Parliament who support the European initiative do so in the belief that by joining the Community, Britain will be in a better position to assist the future development of the Commonwealth. If M. Pompidou's views prevail, however, and Britain turns from the open seas to Europe, it is difficult to see how this can do other than gravely weaken Commonwealth ties. The dangers of loosening our ties between our kinsfolk overseas in favour of foreigners close at hand is clearly brought out in an article by Sir Alexander Downer on page 5 of this issue, and we echo his warning.

It would certainly appear that if M. Pompidou had not been satisfied with the replies he obtained from Mr. Heath on this issue, the door would not have been opened to British membership. Much greater clarification on this important question will be required in the coming days and it is to be hoped that when, shortly, the British Prime Minister and the French President meet again, Mr. Heath will make it abundantly clear that Britain does not intend to turn from her old friends even if we join the Common Market. Such a declaration is long overdue and Parliament owes it to the British people to obtain this assurance.

CAP—TRAGIC AND UNJUSTIFIED

Divergent views between Paris and Bonn on the subject of monetary policy continue to bedevil progress in the Common Market and criticism of the Common Agricultural Policy continues to grow, particularly from the United States. In a recent 124-page review of the world trade situation, Mr. Peter Paterson, who is President Nixon's assistant for international economic affairs, described the EEC's farm policy as "tragic and unjustified". He said "when other parts of the world could produce and sell far more efficiently, including some of the smaller trading countries like Australia and New Zealand, there is no real justification for continuation of a system like that of Europe's which passes so much of its adjustment costs on to other nations, distorting world production and trade". On all sides there is increasing recognition that the Common Agricultural Policy is in need of radical reform (see also page 7), yet M. Pompidou made the permanence of the agricultural market a prerequisite for the opening of exchanges with Britain on the Common Market issue.

A further complication will arise from the need to introduce a Value Added Tax to replace Purchase Tax and SET. It is obvious that this will profoundly affect the accounting procedures of the vast majority of businesses in the country and great alarm is being expressed on the lack of information on the subject, particularly on what goods and services are to be exempt, and how stocks of merchandise on which Purchase Tax has been paid will be dealt with.

WHERE PUBLIC OPINION COUNTS!

It is reported from Oslo that the Norwegian Minister of Fisheries has rejected the Agreement on fisheries reached between Norway and the Common Market. The Norwegian Government requires a three-quarters majority in the Storting for acceptance of the policy of joining the Common Market. Commenting on the Norwegian situation, *The Times* on January 8th made an interesting admission. They said "Britain has accepted the arrangement whereby at the end of ten years the Commission will report to the Council of Ministers on fisheries, taking into account social as well as economic factors. On the basis of that report the enlarged Council will decide what changes, if any, should be made. The British Government are right to be satisfied with these assurances. But the Norwegian Government are in a different position; it is **Norwegian public opinion that really matters.**" Apparently British public opinion is of no account!

A report from Copenhagen on January 3rd from the Danish Gallup Institute suggests that if present trends of public opinion continue, Denmark's referendum on entry into the Common Market will give a negative result.

The debate in the House of Commons on 20th January on a motion calling on the Government not to sign the Treaty of Accession until the full text has been published resulted in a Government majority of 21, which can hardly be described as demonstrating whole-hearted support. This underlines the difficulties of getting detailed legislation through Parliament during the rest of the session. The final form of this legislation has still to be announced. As Mr. Enoch Powell said recently—"Such a momentous, irrevocable and unprepared move as EEC entry could not be taken if the Commons was deeply and bitterly divided and public opinion predominantly adverse."

THE REAL PROBLEM

These are just some of the issues which confront the British Government and people in the year ahead. Much can happen during the year to alter the situation. One thing is certain, the signing of the Treaty of Accession which took place on January 22nd means nothing unless the British Parliament is ready to will the means by passing the necessary legislation.

In the meantime, the real problems confronting the British economy, continuing inflation, rising unemployment, industrial unrest and many other questions remain to be solved. To the extent that Parliamentary time is taken up with Common Market legislation attention will be turned from these vital matters. There is, moreover, no sign that the Common Market countries themselves have solved these problems and it may be that by the end of 1972 the proposal to join the Market will be seen to be irrelevant to the main issues confronting us.

AUSTRALIA—THE GROWING GIANT

by Sir Alexander Downer—High Commissioner for Australia

In the last twenty-seven years Australia has welcomed £1,800 million of United Kingdom investment, accompanied by one-and-a-half million settlers from Britain and British Colonies. I say welcomed deliberately, because without people and capital from overseas Australia could not have achieved her amazing industrialisation and expansion in this period. We want this to continue, and I hope that the coming trade and political orientation of Britain towards Europe will not interfere with these policies which provide the most enduring links of all.

In the overall national point of view, it has so far proved a profitable investment. Until recently, Australia was your third best customer: she is now your sixth, having imported in 1970 over £346 million worth of British goods. We were only narrowly beaten for our former position of third place by Eire, the Netherlands, and Sweden: there is not much to choose between these figures. Perhaps more significant has been the favourable trade balance you have enjoyed with Australia, which in the year 1970/71 amounted to £186 million in your favour. When you add to that an average annual net invisible trade balance of nearly £150 million, you will agree, I think, that British-Australian trade is a factor of great significance to the British economy.

What I profoundly hope is that with all the intricacies of British entrance into the EEC the Commonwealth is not going to be relegated to second place. You must forgive me if I seem apprehensive about this. There is plenty of evidence that it is. Because if you loosen your old connections between your kinsfolk overseas in favour of foreigners close at hand, then if by mischance the Britain-in-Europe experiment does not fulfil the anticipations of the majority of Parliament, the City of London, of your industrial and commercial leaders, and of most of the national press, it will be impossible to revive the old associations if they are in the meantime allowed to languish. Therefore, the task of statesmanship is whilst marrying Britain to Western Europe to maintain your close relationship with British nations overseas such as Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and all those other Commonwealth countries who share with you the Royal Family, similar institutions of government, and basically the same way of life.

UNTOLD BENEFITS

Australia is a continent which can bring untold benefits to Britain. Although our population is just short of thirteen millions, we should, within the lifetime of those of you in your thirties, accelerate this to thirty million. It is not idle boasting to predict that one hundred years from now Australia will be one of the most prosperous and influential nations in the world. If British people, and British capital, continue to move there; if successive governments continue a close defence and foreign policy alliance with us; then clearly the United Kingdom herself

will be strengthened by maintaining intimate bonds with a growing giant.

It is true that Australia has lately flown into some clouds. In common with other countries we are in the midst of a difficult inflationary surge. Unsound mining ventures have attracted speculators who are now complaining of burnt fingers. Our rural industries—with the exception of cattle—are depressed to a point unknown since the 1930s. The Stock Market is unrealistically low—a golden chance for international investors seeking blue chips. I am horrified to hear of City brokers nowadays advising their clients to sell whatever Australian holdings they possess. Advice more crazy would be difficult to imagine.

THE AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

The fundamentals of the Australian economy are still bright. May I ask you to consider, very briefly, these factors.

- Australia has a broadly based economy with approximately 30% of the Gross National Product derived from manufacturing, and 6% from rural industries.
- G.N.P. in real terms is increasing at an average rate of 5% annually.
- Immigration, half of which comes from Britain, is flowing at 140,000 this year.
- Our highly skilled work force has been growing at nearly 4% every year.
- Unemployment, though occasioning some anxiety and political controversy, is only 1½% of the work force compared with over 4% here, nearly 6% in the United States, and over 6% in Canada.
- Our international reserves are high, amounting at present to £1,200 million.
- And I need not remind you of Australia's vast natural resources, as illustrated by the tremendous mineral discoveries of the last ten years. Minerals alone accounted for £500 million in exports in 1960-70, 26% of Australia's export total. Moreover, thanks to under-sea exploitation we are partly self-sufficient in crude oil.

All these things, I believe, are merely milestones in the saga of Australia's development. What will follow in our own lifetime, and certainly that of our children, will seem like a journey through Aladdin's cave.

STABILITY—A PRICELESS ASSET

Let me add one other factor, of immense significance, in Australia's favour. Whether you like Australians or not—and I admit we can be irritating and over-assertive at times—Australia is one of the most stable countries in the world. If it errs, it is on the side of being too conservative. But as a people who are still nearly 90% British in origin or descent we have inherited the qualities of our forbears here. It is a well administered, orderly land, in which democratic processes flourish, and

in which, though not classless, men and women are valued on their merits of personality.

Stability, I believe, is a priceless asset. Each of the old British Commonwealth nations, such as Canada and New Zealand, is characterised by it. Can we honestly say the same about your neighbours in Europe, your new allies and by 1973 your intimate trading partners, all of whose peoples will enjoy a preferred working and residential position in Britain to everyone of the Crown Commonwealth? After all, it is only three-and-a-half years since the barricades were up in Paris, with that great nation on the verge of periodical revolution. Do you realise that in Italy, that land of enchantment of which I am so fond, more than a quarter of the members of the Chamber of Deputies are Communists? That political crises arise there with the rapidity of Mediterranean storms that lash those lovely coasts? Are you really happy about the political and social future of Belgium, so important to all EEC members since Brussels is the Market headquarters? We are fortunate in the British world not to experience the strains you find between Flemings and Walloons in that otherwise agreeable country. And there is always the gigantic question-mark over Germany: a nation today admirable, friendly, and exemplary, but with a history over the past hundred years which none of us can ever forget.

I am reminding you of these things deliberately because a number of influential leaders and newspapers in Britain give one the impression that in their Euro-excitement the Commonwealth, if not forgotten, is considered unimportant. In international affairs, as in private life, the old friends are the best friends. We in Australia want to stick to you. I hope that in your future with Europe you will realise it is not only good business, but practical sentiment, to stick to us.

COMMON MARKET AGRICULTURAL POLICY UNDER ATTACK

A strong attack on the common agricultural policy of the Common Market was made at yesterday's session of the UNCTAD 3 symposium at The Hague.

The attack came on the second day of the three-day gathering, attended by 600 specialists on development. It followed a defence of the policy by Dr. Sicco Mansholt, vice-president of the EEC Commission. Dr. Mansholt maintained that the agricultural policy could be liberalised in five to ten years when the community had overcome the social problems facing its farmers.

The attack came from a Dutch commodity expert who maintained that the effect of the policy on the developing world would, in the meantime, grow much worse. The self-sufficiency implicit in the policy was increasingly limiting the markets for the agricultural surpluses of the "third world". Dr. Boerman, director-general of the Food Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations, took up the attack, maintaining that it was scandalous that the community was not a member of the International Sugar Agreement.

—From The Times Business News, 21.1.72.

THE STORY OF A CABLE FROM NEW ZEALAND

The following is the text of a telegram from R. B. Reed, President of the New Zealand Returned Services Association, Auckland, N.Z., dated September 20th, 1971.

"At recent annual meeting the Dominion Council of the Returned Services Association of New Zealand the following resolution was carried unanimously. (Quote) that this Dominion Council being under an obligation to loyally uphold and defend the Constitution of New Zealand as member of the British Commonwealth of Nations and being of opinion that the fabric of the British Commonwealth will be undermined by the entry of the United Kingdom into the European Economic Community because the sovereignty of Her Majesty The Queen would be substantially surrendered and recalling the sacrifices of New Zealanders in two World Wars in defence of the British way of life resolves that the deep concern felt by all New Zealand Returned Servicemen be drawn to the attention of the British Commonwealth Ex-Services League and further resolves that the Dominion Executive Committee be requested to take any action necessary to defend and maintain the links which bind the British Commonwealth of Nations together under the Sovereignty of Her Majesty The Queen (unquote) This resolution was transmitted to the British Legion requesting release to Her Majesty the news media and other influential persons but this important and patriotic message was withheld by the Legion Council on grounds the Legion is non-political STOP The Auckland RSA having obtained opinion from leading Queen's Counsel is shocked to learn that sovereignty of Her Majesty will be seriously imperilled and the Royal Prerogative affecting the issue of money abrogated if Britain enters the EEC on terms set out in Treaty of Rome and the Special Arrangement STOP My Association expressed its deep concern by reinforcing the above resolution in a lengthy cable to British Legion of Servicemen through Dr. Bremner our London representative but this message was inexplicably suppressed STOP We have just received confirmation of Conference resolution passed by the *Returned Services League of Australia representing 263,000 Returned Servicemen* who strongly support the views expressed our cables STOP Request you take urgent action as indicated and ask Sir Arthur Bryant to incorporate in his petition."

R. B. REED,
PRESIDENT AUCKLAND RSA.

(The words in italics were unfortunately omitted from the cable as received due to an operator's error in London.)

On receipt of this cable, copies were sent to Members of Parliament and a number of Peers with the following covering memorandum:

" NEW ZEALAND RETURNED SERVICES ASSOCIATION

I have just received an important cable from New Zealand which sets out the views of the Dominion Council of the Returned Services Association of New Zealand on the question of Britain and the Common Market. The membership of the Association is one hundred thousand strong and it seems to me essential that their views, coming from men who have fought to defend the British way of life, should be made known to every Member of Parliament before the coming debates on this vital question.

A disturbing feature is that a previous cable, sent to the New Zealand representative of the British Commonwealth Ex-Services League, has apparently been suppressed.

In view of the large number of New Zealanders who are anxious that their views should be made known to the British Parliament and electorate, I hope you will give the contents of the cable your careful attention."

At the same time, the text of the cable was sent to the Press with a covering Press Release:

" BRITAIN AND THE COMMON MARKET

Deep Concern expressed by New Zealand Returned Servicemen

A copy of a cable received by Edward Holloway from the Dominion Council of the Returned Services Association of New Zealand has today been circulated to every Member of Parliament and to certain Peers. The cable (copy enclosed) giving the text of a resolution carried unanimously at the Association's Annual Meeting, expresses deep concern arising from the proposal that the United Kingdom should join the European Economic Community, and states as their opinion that this action will undermine the fabric of the British Commonwealth because 'The sovereignty of Her Majesty The Queen would be substantially surrendered'. The membership of the RSA is one hundred thousand strong.

In a covering letter sent to MPs with the copy of the cable, Mr. Edward Holloway (Director of the Commonwealth Industries Association, and Editor of *Britain & Overseas*) says: 'It seems essential that these views, coming from men who have fought to defend the British way of life, should be made known to every MP before the coming debates on this vital question.'

A disturbing feature is that a previous cable sent to the New Zealand representative of the British Commonwealth Ex-Services League was 'inexplicably suppressed'."

So far as we have been able to trace, not one word about this important statement of views sent on behalf of a large number of New Zealand Servicemen and supported by the Australian Returned Services League, found its way into the UK Press, although it was mentioned in New

Zealand. Apparently the views of men who fought with us in the last war are not considered of sufficient interest to be given space in our news media.

The question of suppression of the cable was taken up by Sir Robin Turton in his speech in the Common Market Debate on October 21st. In reply on October 25th Mr. Geoffrey Rippon said (Quote from *Hansard*, October 25th):

"I must deal in passing with the reference made on the first day of the debate by my right hon. friend the Member for Thirsk and Malton (Sir R. Turton) to a telegram from New Zealand ex-Service men which, he claimed, had been suppressed. In fact, I understand that a telegram was circulated by the Commonwealth Industries Association to hon. Members, and I have now had an opportunity to make some inquiries about it.

As a result, we have been in touch with the President of the New Zealand Returned Services Association, Sir Hamilton Mitchell, who had informed the British High Commissioner in Wellington that the action of Mr. Reed, of the Auckland Branch, in cabling direct to Mr. Edward Holloway, the Director of the Commonwealth Industries Association, was taken without prior consultation with the Dominion Council—that is, the central body of the RSA—and, therefore, cannot be said to have the full support of the Dominion Council.

As for the allegation of suppression, Sir Hamilton told the High Commissioner he considered that the Dominion Council had discharged its obligation under the original resolution by bringing the matter to the attention of the British Commonwealth Ex-Services League, where it has been dealt with and fully considered. The Dominion Executive Committee of the New Zealand RSA had, thereupon, decided that no further action should be taken in the matter.

Sir Hamilton made it clear to the British High Commissioner that Mr. Reed could speak only for the Auckland branch, which had some 6,200 members, and not for the 90,000 or so members affiliated to the New Zealand RSA. The Dominion Council did not associate itself with Mr. Reed's action, and that should be clearly on the record."

The original cable, however, makes it clear that not only was the resolution quoted passed unanimously at the annual meeting, but also it was supported by the Returned Services League of Australia, and it therefore seems strange that the N.Z. Dominion Council should be so ready to disassociate itself from attempts to give the resolution adequate publicity in the UK.

SOVEREIGNTY

Arising from this activity, Sir Gilbert Longden, Conservative MP for South-west Herts, addressed a letter on 4th October to Mr. Reed in Auckland, setting out his views on the question of sovereignty. He said:

"Her Majesty's personal position as our joint Sovereign will, of course, in no way be affected or impaired if we enter Europe. But, as you know, she is a constitutional Monarch whose sovereignty, in your sense, resides in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Is it wise for that Parliament to cling hopelessly to a wholly illusory concept? There is no country in the world today which can any longer exercise unfettered sovereignty because to do so means unfettered power. As the Lord Chancellor recently put it: 'It is weakness which limits independence, not legal fantasies or pedantry. It is power which creates sovereignty, not doctrine.' As an off-shore island, isolated from the great power blocs, we should be impotent; and as the Foreign Secretary has said: 'Whether or not we join, the Community will grow stronger and stronger, and if we remain outside, our freedom will be less, not more.'

"So if, on 28th October, the House of Commons decides that we should accept the terms negotiated, it will be because a majority of us believe that, in return, we should gain a powerful share in the much wider sovereignty of Western Europe as a whole; and because we believe that to do so would best enable us, in the words of the White Paper, 'to safeguard the security and prosperity of the United Kingdom and its peoples'.

"I have much affection for your country and its people, and a lively recollection of how they helped us in two world wars. But it is just as much in their interest today as it was then that the security and prosperity of the United Kingdom should be safeguarded. The Director-General of the Commonwealth wrote in *Crossbow* for July 1971: 'It is sometimes suggested in this country and elsewhere that, if Britain joins the EEC there will inevitably be a fatal weakening of the Commonwealth. I do not agree . . . British participation in the European Community can strengthen Britain, strengthen Europe, and strengthen Britain's and Europe's co-operation with other parts of the Commonwealth.' And the Director of the Federation of Commonwealth Chambers of Commerce in a letter to *The Times* of 28th June last writes: 'The enlarged EEC is likely to become the most powerful trading bloc in the world and Britain's membership of it should permit Britain herself to play a more dynamic role in the Commonwealth of the future.'

"I do most respectfully beg your Association to take a less parochial and more global view of this great matter."

Mr. Reed replied:

"It would seem from your letter that you labour under a misapprehension concerning the motives which prompted the Returned Services Association of New Zealand to pass the unanimous resolution mentioned in my cable drawing attention to its grave concern that Britain's entry into the Common Market would undermine the fabric of the British Commonwealth, because the sovereignty of Her Majesty the Queen would be substantially surrendered.

"Mention was made in that cable that the Returned Services League of Australia, representing 263,000 ex-Servicemen, had passed a resolution

strongly supporting our resolution, but it transpires that this cable was inexplicably mutilated in transmission and that this important part of the text was unfortunately omitted.

"You say in your letter that Her Majesty's personal position would in no way be impaired by the UK joining the EEC. Her Majesty's Constitutional position has to be borne in mind, however, and we have it in the opinion of an eminent QC here that your contention is definitely contrary to the legal interpretation of the provisions of the Treaty of Rome.

"The basis of our grave concern lies in the Articles of the Treaty of Rome wherein the control of money, trade and movement of labour forces and populations—the basic elements of the British way of life—pass to the executive power of the six European States. The United Kingdom Parliament, the instrument of Her Majesty's sovereignty, would be powerless to contravene the dictates of these bureaucrats. It is singularly significant that in your letter and in the Press, the pro-marketeters have made no reference to implications, monetary and economic, of the Treaty on the way of life of the British peoples.

"Nor are there any safeguards in the Treaty of Rome concerning these overriding factors—the issue of money and the prevention of calamitous inflation or deflation, either of which would inevitably destroy stability in the economy of the United Kingdom, and possibly the rest of the Commonwealth.

"Throughout the centuries, the British people have maintained their sturdy independence, have fought for freedom and refused to bow their necks to the yoke of the foreigner; yet, with a stroke of the pen, all past achievements are to be jettisoned and countless men and women will have sacrificed their lives and efforts in vain.

"It is for these ideals that the ex-Servicemen of the British Commonwealth went overseas to support the people of the United Kingdom in their struggle against aggression, and not for trade advantages.

"In your letter you have enjoined us to be less parochial and more global. Again, with respect, you fail to appreciate that Her Majesty the Queen is head of each of the Commonwealth countries, being the symbolic link binding the members together. We deplore the undermining of her sovereignty, particularly in our Mother country.

"The Treaty of Rome has been described by our learned Counsel as an ambiguous and complicated document not phrased in a way that he who runs may read. Indeed, from the legal standpoint, the document leaves a great deal to be desired, because so much is left to discretionary interpretation by the Community Court. We submit that such a document should be subjected to the closest scrutiny by leading jurists before ratification. Incidentally, English is not one of the official languages of the Court or the Treaty of Rome."

COMMON MARKET

Statements made relating to Fisheries Negotiations

Undertakings given by Mr. Rippon during the course of Negotiations

Statements made by Mr. Rippon subsequent to conclusion of Negotiations

"What we have asked for is a categoric statement that the present common fisheries policy would be modified after enlargement to meet the circumstances and needs of a Community of Ten."

9.6.71

(V.818 c.1045)

"In an attempt to find a permanent solution which would be fair and reasonable for everyone, we proposed that waters within a six mile limit, measured from the usual base lines, should be reserved for vessels genuinely belonging to the ports from which such waters are now being fished. We still consider our proposal is in all the circumstances a reasonable basis for a common settlement that would be sensible and equitable for all the parties concerned."

14.7.71

(V.321 c.493)

"From the outset we have made it perfectly plain that the fisheries policy concluded by the Six in 1970 was utterly unsuitable for a Community of Ten . . . we should not sign a Treaty of Accession which would commit us to the present fisheries policy, nor would we accept any arrangement which did not satisfactorily protect our legitimate interests. The essential objective here is to see that we get the right solution and not a quick

"In substance what we have achieved can fairly be described for the most part as a maintenance of the status quo for a decade . . ."

13.12.71

(V.828 c.52)

"So far as the review is concerned, we have always made it clear, as in other matters, that we do not seek permanent arrangements . . ."

13.12.71

(V.828 c.57)

" . . . I have said time and time again that we have never sought permanent arrangements."

15.12.71

(c.729)

"On fisheries the United Kingdom together with the Republic of Ireland and Denmark have now reached agreement on the outstanding problems. We have persuaded the Community of the need to safeguard the essential fishing interests of the applicant countries in order to ensure conservation of fishing stocks and the protection of the livelihood of our fishermen."

13.12.71

(V.828 c.51)

compromise."

Verbatim Report p.34, Conservative Party Conference, 13.9.71.

"What we have now proposed is that, in the absence of a new regulation satisfactory to all parties, we should agree to maintain the status quo, which for us means the existing state of affairs until agreement could be reached after enlargement on what changes were needed and, most important, were acceptable to all concerned—I repeat, to all concerned . . . There is a clear understanding that we must do one of two things. Either we must have an agreement on a new regulation which is satisfactory to all the members—that is all the applicants as well as the existing members of the Community—or, if we cannot achieve that, we have suggested that the Community will have to accept that we must maintain the status quo. If we do that, any question of a negotiation after enlargement would again be dependent, if the status quo was to be changed, on agreement by all the parties concerned."

25.10.71
(V.823 c.1242-1243)

" . . . however long the initial period there must be arrangements on a continuing basis subject to review."

11.11.71
(V.825 c.1239)

"Perhaps, at the outset, I should make clear that we have never opposed the concept of a common fisheries policy."

15.12.71
(c.725)

"The effect of all this is that there is no change at all in the protection now afforded in areas from which about 95 per cent. by value of the total inshore catch is taken. As far as the remainder is concerned—that is, those areas that I have not mentioned earlier—there will be a generalisation of existing rights between six and twelve miles only . . . We have further agreed that before the end of 1982 the enlarged Community will, after studying a report on the situation then obtaining with particular reference to the economic and social conditions of inshore areas and the state of fish stocks, examine the arrangements which could follow what we have negotiated for the first ten years . . . I am confident that when that review takes place Her Majesty's Government will continue to safeguard this vital national interest."

13.12.71
(V.828 c.52)

"We have accepted the idea of an arrangement for a decade which is virtually the status quo . . ."

15.12.71
(c.729)

" . . . these are not just transitional arrangements which automatically lapse at the end of a fixed period."

13.12.71
(V.828 c.52)

" . . . what we have negotiated is a derogation from the fisheries regulations, which amounts in effect to an amendment in the regulations to meet the needs of the applicants. That is why I think there was, as I said last time, so much theology about the matter, with the use of words like 'continuing subject to review', or 'derogation' or whatever it may be. In practice, whatever the legal position, we will be able in 1982 to assert in the light of the Luxembourg agreement . . . the protection of our vital interests."

13.12.71
(V.828 c.62)

"I cannot prejudge the attitude of this or any other country at that time."

15.12.71
(c.737)

"That means that we would expect to receive comparable treatment to Norway and the other candidate countries."

11.11.71
(V.825 c.1245)

"We have always made clear that we must achieve arrangements on fisheries which are broadly comparable between all the applicants."

1.12.71
(V.827 c.450)

"With regard to Norway, I would have hoped that they would have found these arrangements broadly satisfactory . . . I would hope that Norway will receive treatment as good as the treatment we have received, so far as her own 12 mile limits are concerned. There should be no problem about that."

13.12.71
(V.828 c.56)

"The Norwegian Government will, I hope, go on negotiating with the Community. If any new proposals are put forward, all the applicant countries have an opportunity of commenting and expressing their views at that stage."

13.12.71
(V.828 c.58)

"We do not need to have the same terms as Norway . . ."

15.12.71
(c.733)

"In accordance with the assurances which I have given to the House, I explained that an initial period of 10 years by itself was not sufficient; and I was disappointed that we were not able at this meeting to reach agreement on how to deal with the situation after the 10 years."

1.12.71
(V.827 c.446)

"We said that if we could not reach satisfactory arrangements as between 6 and 12 miles, the Community must offer, in terms of 12 miles only, virtually the whole coast."

1.12.71
(V.827 c.448)

"First, it is clear that we retain full jurisdiction over the whole of our coastal waters up to 12 miles. In other words, we have power to control on a non-discriminatory basis the conservation of stocks by such means as the regulation of size of nets, types of trawl and methods of fishing. Secondly, access to our coastal waters within six miles from our baselines is limited exclusively to British vessels. Next, in areas between 6 and 12 miles, where the baselines are not in themselves a sufficient safeguard or where the stocks are already fully exploited, the fishing will also be limited to British vessels and to those with existing rights to fish there for certain species of fish. The areas covered in this way out to 12 miles are the Orkneys and Shetlands, the North and East Coasts of Scotland, North East England from the river Coquet to Flamborough Head, Devon and Cornwall, including, of course, the Scillies and Lundy Island, and County Down."

13.12.71
(c.51)

The Guardian, 10th November, 1971:

"But Mr. Rippon was firm. Britain could not accept the Community's vague formula for review before the ten-year transitional period of protection for British inshore fisheries was ended. He said there must be provision for "continuing arrangements" beyond a transitional period. He stopped short of calling for permanent arrangements, since he has been aware that the Community will not accept this. But he suggested this was *splitting hairs* and that there was *little difference between permanency and 'continuing arrangements'*."

The Daily Telegraph, 10th November, 1971:

Mr. Rippon: "I expect that everything will be all right at the end of the day, and that as in the case of Commonwealth sugar we shall get not only bankable but *double bankable assurances*."

N.B: The references in brackets refer to Hansard.