

# LOBBY BRIEFING

time: 4 PM date: 20.4.82

This morning's Lobby was repeated.

We reported on Mr Pym's visit to Brussels where EC Foreign Ministers had shown their full and ready support for the UK over the Falkland Islands issue. Mr Tindemans had been left by the ten to summarise their views which constitute a reaffirmation of EC solidarity, gratitude to Mr Haig for his efforts and an expression of hope for a peaceful settlement.

On this afternoon's Cabinet meeting, we said that the purpose was to bring all those Ministers outside the immediately concerned group up-to-date with the situation. Mr Pym would provide an up-date on the proposals from Argentina and his visit to Brussels before his visit to Washington on Thursday. On the latter point we did not know his departure time but we thought it was a morning flight, agreeing that it could possibly be by commercial Concorde. We had no indication at present that Mr Pym would see President Reagan, nor was there any suggestion at present that the Argentinians would be present in Washington. We could not take events any further than the Washington visit and could not say where Mr Haig might go next if anywhere.

Asked if the Argentinian proposals were endorsed or supported by Mr Haig, we repeated our emphasis on the point that these were Argentinian proposals brought out of Buenos Aires by Mr Haig in his role as intermediary. He had gone to Argentina knowing our views.

We would not be drawn on the detail of the Argentinian proposals nor on the counter proposals Mr Pym would be taking to Washington. On the question of why Mr Pym was not going to Washington until Thursday, we said that the Argentinian proposals had to be considered thoroughly and that proper time had to be given to the formulation of our own proposals. It was Mr Haig who had suggested that Mr Pym should go to Washington. We saw Mr Pym's talks with Mr Haig as a continuation of the negotiations. We acknowledged that this would be the first time British proposals had been set out as opposed to the stating of objectives previously, and our concentration on the implementation of resolution 502. We rejected the idea that these talks represented a drawing back from the principle of no negotiation before withdrawal. We had not turned down the Argentinian proposals out of hand. We wished to continue to talk. However, we did not believe that there was any change from our preliminary reaction of the previous evening.

Asked why the Prime Minister had been firm about no future Statements in the House for the moment despite Opposition pressure, we drew attention to the Prime Minister's answers in Question Time. Previous Statements had brought the House up-to-date but the Prime Minister had asked the House to bear with her while negotiations continued. We commented that Mr Foot appeared to be content.

Asked about the mood in No 10 following the not very optimistic view of the previous night, we said we felt the mood had not changed. No caps were being thrown over windmills.

Asked about Mr Parkinson's presence at the previous evening's meeting we said it was not our practice to reveal details of meetings of small groups of Ministers. Mr Parkinson had been a regular attendee at meetings concerned with the Falklands situation.