

Quack Remedies For Lame Ducks

WITH romping inflation, everyone is watching the steady fall in the value of the £. Not unnaturally many are seeking compensation by way of increased wages and incomes. Among these can be listed members of the Country Landowners' Association who are calling for an increase in the government (taxpayers') grant to assist the amalgamation of "small uneconomic farms" into larger ones.

Whether they are merely adopting trades union tactics, (asking for more than they hope to get) or are just plain greedy, they are calling for 100 per cent increases.

These grants are currently running at the rate of £1,000 to £2,000 or annuities of £200 to £275, unaltered since 1967.

They should be told to stuff their own feather beds. And they could also be told that such an increase (or any increase at all) would cause inflation. It wouldn't of course, but everyone else has to put up with this answer and often for far less increases and with far more justification.

Inflation Red Herrings

THE erroneous idea that any price increase whatever its cause or any kind of spending is "inflation," continues to receive support among politicians and journalists. The latest culprits to be dragged in are the recipients of supplementary benefits and unemployment pay! These, says the industrial editor of *The Daily Mail* 23 Sept. are now being recognised for the first time by ministers as inflationary. "Too many people are getting money to spend without producing goods."

But since these benefits come out of taxpayers' pockets, they, the taxpayers must be demanding less goods. Transferring purchasing power from the Peters to the Pauls cannot possibly cause inflation!

Then we have demands on the Government to "take anti-inflationary measures by retaining the 6d as a 2½p coin" because of overcharging and marking up of prices (*Daily Telegraph* Sept. 29). Whatever the advantages of a 2½p coin, its connection with inflation is ludicrous.

LETTERS

"NATURE HATH DONE HER PART . . ."

SIR,—Man is so puny and imperfect that it is only logical that those who have nature working for them will be winners, while those who attempt through imperfect reasoning to work against nature will be losers.

Thoughtful people concerned with many areas of knowledge are becoming convinced of this truth. We hear knowledgeable individuals advocate the breast feeding of babies after decades of slavery to formulas. Slowly the idea is gaining ground that large unbroken areas under cultivation with one particular crop, are detrimental to the well-being of the land and its people. My avocation besides beekeeping is economics where the same principle of working in harmony with the forces of nature is found to apply.

The 18th century became known as the Age of Reason, and it was then that Adam Smith pointed out that freedom was an essential part of the natural order, that each person when left to his own devices, and acting in a way that would appear to benefit himself personally, would automatically promote the welfare of all.

Since the days of Smith, governments have not proceeded further in the direction of individual liberty. On the contrary, for every injustice that could have been corrected by an extension of the principle of freedom, governments have enacted palliative measures which created further injustice, and continuing to apply the same treatment to secondary results, have built up a plethora of laws which take from Peter to give to Paul what is not missed on the way, or which threaten dire consequences for the most innocent and natural actions so that pressure-groups may have privilege such as being shielded from competition, or being able to dictate more or less what wages they will work for.

We have reached the stage where wealth and services are no longer distributed nature's way, according to skill and hard work, but according to who can make the most fuss in the right place.

Yours faithfully,

E. A. BRYAN

Aldergrove, B.C.
Canada.

VALID POINT

SIR,—At the risk of boring Mr. Harker (*Letters*, Sept./Oct. issue) still further, I should like to make, some, what I consider, valid points. The national press, radio and television have given massive coverage to pro-Common Market arguments. The air of national pageantry given to the recent Conservative Party Conference decision on the Market is frankly more than I can stomach.

In contrast, the views of those against have had little airing. The decisive anti-Market vote given in a referendum held in the Prime Minister's own constituency might have had the significance of a vicarage tea party for all the coverage it was given by the press.

And when a chance is given on television or radio to put the case of the "anti's," the choice of speaker is such that the case is rarely properly put.

I therefore consider it imperative that your paper continue to supply us with information and arguments against our joining the EEC—the case *for* is more than adequately publicised.

The onus lies with the pro-marketeers to prove that Britain's entry into the EEC would be beneficial and so far the case is "not proven." Therefore, if in doubt, keep out!

Yours faithfully,

PHILIP L. RUDD

London, N.21.