



10 DOWNING STREET

*From the Private Secretary*

30 October 1984

Ad Hoc Committee on Institutions

BF / The Prime Minister has read UKREP telegram no. 3484 reporting the general discussion at the last meeting of the DOOGE committee. She is alarmed by some of the ideas which are being aired in this committee - for instance, giving the European Parliament responsibilities on the revenue side, Central Bank powers for the EMF, restrictions on the Luxembourg compromise, a new treaty. She recognises that Mr. Rifkind has spoken out against the most unacceptable ones. But she would welcome an assessment of the work of this committee hitherto and of the prospects for ensuring that it does not report in entirely unrealistic terms to the European Council.

I am sending a copy of this letter to David Williamson (Cabinet Office).

Charles Powell

Colin Budd Esq  
Foreign and Commonwealth Office.



RESTRICTED  
FRAME INSTITUTION  
DESKBY 261700Z  
FM UKREP BRUSSELS 261420Z OCT 84  
TO IMMEDIATE FCO  
TELEGRAM NUMBER 3484 OF 26 OCTOBER  
INFO ROUTINE COPENHAGEN, THE HAGUE, ROME, DUBLIN, PARIS, BONN, ATHENS  
LUXEMBOURG, LISBON, MADRID  
INFO SAVING BRUSSELS, STRASBOURG

*Prime Minister*  
*There is some pretty good lunacy here.*  
*Agree to ask FCO for an interim report and assessment*

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONS : DOOGE COMMITTEE, 24/25 OCTOBER  
GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Yes please Mr. D. where this exercise leading?*

*COP 29/11.*

SUMMARY

1. STRONG SUPPORT FOR CONTENT OF DRAFT REPORT TO DUBLIN EUROPEAN COUNCIL TABLED BY FAURE (FRANCE) AS REFLECTING MAJORITY VIEW THAT ANY SUCH REPORT SHOULD GO INTO SUBSTANCE RATHER THAN SIMPLY DESCRIBE WHAT THE COMMITTEE HAS DONE SO FAR. MR RIFKIND AMONG THOSE RESISTING PREMATURE REPORT ON SUBSTANCE TO NEXT EUROPEAN COUNCIL. SOME DISPOSITION AMONG MAJORITY, THOUGH STILL MAINLY IN PRIVATE, TO CONCEDE THE POINT, AT LEAST AS REGARDS SECTIONS ON INSTITUTIONS AND THE NEED FOR NEW TREATY/INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE. SOME DISCUSSION OF FAURE'S SUGGESTION THAT INCREASED USE OF MAJORITY VOTING BE BALANCED BY INSTITUTIONALISING A VERSION OF THE LUXEMBOURG COMPROMISE, THOUGH THE MAJORITY ADD THE RIDER THAT DEFINITION OF RELEVANT VITAL INTEREST SHOULD BE OBJECTIVE, NOT LEFT TO MEMBER STATE CONCERNED. MR RIFKIND AND OTHERS MADE CLEAR THAT THIS WOULD NOT DO. MUCH TALK ALSO OF THE LEGISLATIVE POWERS FOR THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT. CONSIDERABLE SUPPORT FOR IDEA OF A COMMISSION OF 10 (LATER 12) MEMBERS.

DETAIL

A. NATURE OF REPORT TO DUBLIN EUROPEAN COUNCIL  
2. IN SPITE OF THE FACT THAT FAURE (FRANCE) HAD ONLY TABLED HIS DRAFT OF A REPORT TO THE DUBLIN EUROPEAN COUNCIL THE PREVIOUS EVENING AND THAT THE ENGLISH VERSION HAD ONLY BEEN MADE AVAILABLE BEFORE LUNCH ON 25 OCTOBER, HE WAS INVITED TO INTRODUCE IT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE AFTERNOON SESSION. THE DISCUSSION TOOK PLACE AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF A PRELIMINARY EXCHANGE OF VIEWS, MAINLY OVER LUNCH, ON THE NATURE OF THE REPORT THE COMMITTEE SHOULD MAKE TO THE DUBLIN EUROPEAN COUNCIL. PAPANTONIOU (GREECE) AND MOLLER (DENMARK) ARGUED STRONGLY THAT THEY COULD NOT AGREE TO ANYTHING MORE THAN A PROGRESS REPORT AND THAT IT WAS PREMATURE TO TRY TO SYNTHESISE DISCUSSIONS WHICH HAD NOT EVEN TAKEN PLACE. THEY EVEN SUGGESTED THAT THE INTERIM REPORT SHOULD BE MADE ORALLY ON DOOGE'S OWN AUTHORITY. MR RIFKIND ALSO ARGUED THAT IT WAS PREMATURE TO TRY TO MAKE A SUBSTANTIVE REPORT TO THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL WHEN A GREAT DEAL OF THE SUBJECT MATTER IT SEEMED INTENDED TO COVER HAD NOT EVEN BEEN DISCUSSED ONCE. ALTHOUGH MANY OTHER SPEAKERS SUPPORTED FAURE'S APPROACH, FERRI (ITALY) RATHER SURPRISINGLY INTERVENED TO SAY THAT HAVING HEARD THE DISCUSSION HE TENDED TO THE VIEW THAT THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL WOULD VIRTUALLY IGNORE A REPORT IF IT WAS A BLAND PROGRESS REPORT, WHILE SOMETHING MORE SUBSTANTIVE MIGHT AROUSE UNWELCOME NEGATIVE REACTIONS. IT MIGHT



BE BETTER TO WAIT UNTIL NEXT TIME. THE QUESTION WAS HOWEVER LEFT OPEN FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION AT THE NEXT MEETING, THOUGH SEVERAL SPEAKERS MADE REFERENCE TO THE QUESTION IN COMMENTING ON FAURE'S PAPER. THE PRESIDENCY ASKED THAT VIEWS ON THIS QUESTION SHOULD BE TRANSMITTED ORALLY BY ASSISTANTS TO THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING, PREFERABLY NEXT WEEK.

### 3. FAURE'S DRAFT

3. FAURE CLAIMED THAT HIS PAPER DID NOT GO AS FAR AS HE WOULD HAVE LIKED: IT WAS AN ATTEMPT TO REFLECT THE DISCUSSION AT THE TWO PREVIOUS MEETINGS. IT DID NOT (AND NOR DID HE) EXPRESS THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT'S VIEWS, BUT HE WAS CONFIDENT THAT THEY WERE CLOSE. TREATMENT OF THE VARIOUS ISSUES WAS SUMMARY, BUT THE COMMITTEE'S MANDATE WAS GENERAL NOT TECHNICAL. IT CONCENTRATED ON THE METHODS BY WHICH THE COMMUNITY SHOULD MAKE PROGRESS: THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL HAD REACHED IMPORTANT CONCLUSIONS ON MANY OCCASIONS BUT VERY OFTEN THEY HAD NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED. COMMENTING ON THE OBJECTIVES SECTION HE NOTED THAT ON EMS HE HAD NOT SUGGESTED ANYTHING AS FAR-REACHING AS A COMMON CURRENCY, AND ON THE BUDGET HE HAD SOUGHT TO SHOW CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE NEED FOR DISCIPLINE. ON THE 'COMMON VALUES' SECTION HE HAD TWO PERSONAL SUGGESTIONS: THAT EVERY GRADUATE SHOULD HAVE DONE ONE YEAR OF HIS STUDIES IN ANOTHER MEMBER STATE AND THAT ALL FOREIGN (COMMUNITY) LANGUAGE TEACHERS SHOULD BE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF THAT LANGUAGE. HE AND RHFUS WOULD REVISE THE EXTERNAL SECTION IN THE LIGHT OF THE EARLIER DISCUSSION ON POLITICAL COOPERATION. THE DEFENCE/SECURITY ASPECT COULD NOT BE LEFT OUT OF THE CONCEPT OF EUROPEAN UNION, BUT NOR COULD IT BE FULLY INCORPORATED IMMEDIATELY. HE WOULD HOWEVER ENVISAGE DEFENCE MINISTERS MEETING OCCASIONALLY IN POLITICAL COOPERATION.

4. MAJORITY VOTING WAS THE CENTRAL ELEMENT ON THE INSTITUTIONAL SIDE. HE POINTED OUT THAT FOR A DECISION TO BE TAKEN BY QUALIFIED MAJORITY COMMISSION AGREEMENT WAS NEEDED AND THAT PROVIDED A GUARANTEE FOR THE MINORITY. DECISIONS OF PRINCIPLE WOULD STILL BE TAKEN BY UNANIMITY. THE CONCEPT OF VITAL INTEREST SHOULD BE INSTITUTIONALISED, BUT IT MUST BE OBJECTIVELY JUSTIFIABLE. MAJORITY VOTING SHOULD BE THE RULE FOR ALL IMPLEMENTATION DECISIONS. THE COMMISSION SHOULD BE GIVEN BACK THE POWERS IT ALWAYS SHOULD HAVE HAD UNDER THE TREATIES. THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE GIVEN RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE REVENUE CONSEQUENCES OF INCREASED EXPENDITURE, AND THEY SHOULD HAVE MORE SUPERVISORY POWERS OVER EXECUTION OF POLICIES. A NEW TREATY WAS NECESSARY TO BRING ALL THE VARIOUS ACTIVITIES UNDER ONE ROOF. FERRI (ITALY) BEGAN A LONG SPEECH BY EXPRESSING TOTAL SUPPORT BUT LATER SAID THAT HE WOULD HAVE WISHED TO GO FURTHER ON INSTITUTIONS. HE THOUGHT THAT IT WAS WRONG TO CONFINE THE REFERENCE TO THE SPINELLI DRAFT TREATY TO THE WORDS 'SPIRIT AND METHOD'. THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT NEEDED A REAL EXECUTIVE AS INTERLOCUTOR. IT MUST HAVE LEGISLATIVE POWER AND A POLITICAL POSITION. THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS MUST TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE FACT THAT THE SPINELLI DRAFT TREATY WAS A POLITICAL REALITY WIDELY ENDORSED.

5. DONDELINGER (LUXEMBOURG) ACCEPTED THE DRAFT AND RECALLED THE ULTIMATE GOAL OF PROGRESSIVE UNIFICATION WHICH WAS INHIBITED



BY THE WISH OF NEW MEMBER STATES NOT TO MAKE ANY CHANGES. THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT SHOULD NOT DEAL WITH DETAILS SUCH AS THE ENVIRONMENT BUT WITH ESSENTIAL REFORMS. HE AGREED THAT THE CONCLUSIONS SHOULD BE THE SUMMONING OF AN INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE BUT DOUBTED WHETHER THE DECEMBER EUROPEAN COUNCIL WAS THE MOMENT TO SAY SO. IN CONCLUSION HE MADE IT CLEAR THAT THE SPINELLI DRAFT WAS NOT AT ALL WHAT THE COMMUNITY NEEDED.

6. VAN EEKELEN (NETHERLANDS) ENDORSED THE GENERAL DRIFT OF FAURE'S DOCUMENT AND ASSERTED THAT IT WAS POSSIBLE TO SAY SOMETHING SUBSTANTIAL ALONG THOSE LINES BY THE TIME OF THE DUBLIN EUROPEAN COUNCIL. THE TEXT WOULD NEED A REFERENCE TO THE FREEDOM OF CAPITAL MOVEMENTS. SOME OF IT WAS TOO VAGUE. HE COULD ENDORSE THE REFERENCE TO COMMUNITY PREFERENCE IN THE SECTION ON DEFENCE SO LONG AS IT REFERRED TO COMMUNITY PRODUCTS AND NOT THE PRODUCTS OF A SINGLE MEMBER STATE (PRESUMABLY A DIG AT FRANCE). ANY INSTITUTIONALISATION OF VITAL INTEREST IN THE CONTEXT OF MAJORITY VOTING MUST ALLOW ALSO FOR THE VITAL INTEREST OF THE COMMUNITY TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. THE FINAL SECTION ON A NEW TREATY AND AN INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE SHOULD BE LEFT IN ABEYANCE AT THE MOMENT. AT THE END A MIDDLE WAY MIGHT BE NEEDED, FOR INSTANCE AN INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS IMPROVEMENTS TO THE EXISTING TREATIES.

7. MR RIFKIND SAID HE COULD AGREE WITH MUCH OF FAURE'S PAPER BUT WOULD CONCENTRATE ON THE AREAS OF DIFFICULTY. WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING THAT DECISION-MAKING WAS MORE DIFFICULT IN A LARGER COMMUNITY HE THOUGHT IT WRONG TO SUGGEST THAT PAST ENLARGEMENTS HAD CAUSED PARALYSIS: THINGS HAD NOT BEEN ALL THAT EASY BEFORE THE FIRST ENLARGEMENT. THE REFERENCE WAS UNFORTUNATE IN THE CONTEXT OF SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE ACCESSION. HE WELCOMED THE SECTION ON THE INTERNAL MARKET BUT STRESSED THE NEED FOR A PRIORITY TIMETABLE: THE WORDS 'GRADUAL' AND 'LONG-TERM' IN THE REFERENCES TO TRANSPORT AND SERVICES HARDLY SUGGESTED A SENSE OF URGENCY. THE SECTION ON EMS WOULD NEED MORE DISCUSSION PARTICULARLY THE IDEA OF GIVING VIRTUAL CENTRAL BANK POWERS TO THE EMF. THE PRESENTATION ON NEW RESOURCES WAS ATTRACTIVE, BUT THE SUBJECT HAD NOT YET BEEN DISCUSSED, NOR HAD IDEAS FOR A SOCIAL AREA OR LEGAL AREA. HE VERY MUCH AGREED WITH THE PASSAGE ON EXTERNAL POLICY THOUGH WAS NOT YET CONVINCED THAT THE CODIFICATION OF POLITICAL COOPERATION COMMITMENTS ETC REQUIRED A TREATY. ON MAJORITY VOTING HE ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE IDEA OF OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION: WHO WOULD HAVE THE LAST WORD? HE ENTIRELY ACCEPTED THAT THE SPURIOUS CLAIMS OF VITAL INTEREST SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED, BUT ONLY A NATIONAL GOVERNMENT WAS IN A POSITION TO ASSESS WHAT CONSTITUTED SUCH AN INTEREST. IT SHOULD NONETHELESS BE REQUIRED TO EXPLAIN ITS REASONS IN ORDER TO MINIMISE USE OF THE MECHANISM. THE CONCEPT OF DIFFERENTIATION WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE ONLY AS AN EXCEPTIONAL MEASURE. HE WELCOMED THE REFERENCE TO A SMALL COMMISSION AND WAS PREPARED TO LOOK AT THE SUGGESTION THAT ITS MEMBERS SHOULD BE CHOSEN BY THE PRESIDENT. THE SECTION ON THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD GIVE FAR GREATER PROMINENCE TO THE NEED TO IMPROVE THE CONCILIATION PROCEDURE. HE WOULD NEED A LOT OF PERSUADING THAT SOME OF THE OTHER VERY CONTROVERSIAL SUGGESTIONS, WHICH HAD NOT EVEN BEEN DISCUSSED, WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE. AN INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE MIGHT IN THE END PROVE THE BEST WAY FORWARD, BUT IT WAS FAR TOO EARLY



TO REACH THAT CONCLUSION.

8. IN CONCLUSION MR RIFKIND CIRCULATED HIS OWN PAPER ON INSTITUTIONS AND SUMMARISED IT BRIEFLY (TEXT IN MIFT).

9. ANDRIESSEN AGREED THAT A SUBSTANTIAL REPORT SHOULD BE PREPARED FOR DUBLIN, BUT DETAILED COMMENTS SHOULD WAIT UNTIL THE SECOND ROUND OF DISCUSSIONS HAD BEEN COMPLETED. EMS IMPROVEMENT MUST BE A CENTRAL ELEMENT. UK PARTICIPATION IN THE EXCHANGE RATE MECHANISM WAS NECESSARY. HE AGREED TO REFLECT ON INSTITUTIONALISING THE CONCEPT OF A VITAL INTEREST, WHICH HE HAD HITHERTO OPPOSED. THE COMMISSION COULD PLAY A ROLE IN IDENTIFYING SUCH AN INTEREST. HE AGREED THAT THE NUMBER OF COMMISSIONERS SHOULD BE REDUCED ASSUMING THAT FAURE INTENDED THE NUMBER TO BE 12, IE ONE FOR EACH MEMBER STATE, AFTER ENLARGEMENT. (FAURE NODDED ASSENT.) IT WAS NOT POLITICALLY REALISTIC TO THINK THAT THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT WOULD BE SATISFIED BY IMPROVED CONCILIATION. THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT HAD BEEN PROMISED MORE POWERS: THEY SHOULD HAVE A LEGISLATIVE POWER, NOT ON DIRECTIVES (WHICH INVOLVED SUBSEQUENT NATIONAL LEGISLATION) BUT ON REGULATIONS. HE TOO THOUGHT IT MIGHT BE EARLY TO PROPOSE AN INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE BY THE DUBLIN EUROPEAN COUNCIL.

10. HERMAN (BELGIUM) SUPPORTED FAURE'S DRAFT AS A BASIS FOR A REPORT AND MADE A NUMBER OF DETAILED COMMENTS. ON THE INSTITUTIONAL CHAPTER HE ASSERTED THAT THE DECISION WHAT CONSTITUTED A VITAL INTEREST COULD NOT BE LEFT TO THE MEMBER STATE IN QUESTION. THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT HAD RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD DECIDE. SOME SUBJECTS COULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THE PROVISION ALTOGETHER. HE AGREED THAT THE NUMBER OF COMMISSIONERS SHOULD BE REDUCED, THE PRESIDENT SHOULD CHOOSE THEM AND THEN OBTAIN EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT APPROVAL. THE PRESENT CONCILIATION PROCEDURE WAS INEFFECTIVE, BUT A LEGISLATIVE POWER RATHER THAN SOME IMPROVEMENTS WAS WHAT WAS REQUIRED.

11. MOLLER (DENMARK) COULD AGREE MUCH OF THE DETAIL IN FAURE'S DRAFT BUT DOUBTED WHETHER IT WAS WISE TO DEFINE IN DETAIL THE NOTION OF EUROPEAN UNION. IT WOULD BE BETTER TO ESTABLISH CONDITIONS FOR PROGRESS STEP BY STEP AND AVOID MEANINGLESS DISCUSSIONS OF INSTITUTIONS. DEFENCE WAS OUTSIDE THE FRAMEWORK OF THE EXERCISE. THE TREATIES PROVIDED A SUFFICIENTLY EFFICIENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE COUNCIL: NO CHANGE WAS NEEDED. LIKEWISE WITH THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT THOUGH HE DID NOT OPPOSE MORE INFORMAL CONTACTS SO LONG AS EVERYONE ENSURED THAT THEY DID NOT TAKE PLACE IN AN ATMOSPHERE OF CONFRONTATION. NO NEW TREATY WAS NEEDED. IT WOULD BE VERY DAMAGING IF FAURE'S DRAFT WERE LEAKED TO THE PRESS. IF ANY PROGRESS REPORT WAS TO BE MADE TO DUBLIN IT SHOULD BE ORAL.

12. RUHFUS CONGRATULATED FAURE ON THE DRAFT BUT AGREED WITH MOLLER ABOUT THE DANGER OF PREMATURE LEAKS. IN HIS DETAILED COMMENTS HE ASKED FOR A REFERENCE TO FREEDOM OF CAPITAL MOVEMENTS AND A PASSAGE ON HIGH TECHNOLOGY. HE UNDERTOOK TO REVISE THE EXTERNAL POLICY SECTION AND INCLUDE LANGUAGE ON TRADE AND AID POLICIES. HE WAS ENCOURAGED BY FAURE'S APPROACH



TO MAJORITY VOTING AND THE NEED TO STRENGTHEN THE COMMISSION (THOUGH HE INDICATED THAT REDUCING THE NUMBER WAS NOT AN IMMEDIATE PROSPECT). THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD CERTAINLY BE GIVEN A LEGISLATIVE ROLE, BUT HE WAS LESS SURE ABOUT POWERS OVER REVENUE. HE COULD ACCEPT THE FINAL SECTION BUT RECOGNISED THAT OTHERS HAD DIFFERENT VIEWS.

13. PAPANTONIOU (GREECE) GAVE A LECTURE ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF FREE TRADE AREAS FOR BACKWARD REGIONS AND ASKED FOR THE INCLUSION OF PASSAGES ON AN INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY, INCLUDING RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY, AN EXPANDED SECTION ON THE BUDGET AFTER PROPER DISCUSSION, MORE DEVELOPED REFERENCES TO ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL POLICIES. HE REPEATED WHAT HE HAD SAID IN THE POLITICAL COOPERATION DISCUSSION AND ADDED THAT HE HAD BEEN TOLD THAT DEFENCE WAS NOT PART OF THE COMMITTEE'S BRIEF: HE WOULD NEED INSTRUCTIONS FROM PAPANDREOU. ON MAJORITY VOTING THE CONCEPT OF VITAL INTEREST WOULD BE UNDERMINED IF THE MEMBER STATE ITSELF WAS NOT ABLE TO MAKE THE JUDGMENT. DIFFERENTIATION WAS ACCEPTABLE IN EXTREME CASES BUT NOT AS A BACKDOOR TO A TWO OR THREE-SPEED EUROPE. HE AGREED THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD BE SMALLER, BUT THE IDEA THAT ITS MEMBERS SHOULD BE CHOSEN BY THE PRESIDENT WOULD GIVE THE LATTER FAR-REACHING POWER. SOME FORM OF CONSULTATION MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE. THE PRESIDENT SHOULD HAVE A FREE HAND IN THE ALLOCATION OF PORTFOLIOS. AS AN EX-MEP HE THOUGHT THAT THE UNNATURAL ALLIANCES WHICH WERE FORMED IN THE EP COULD HAVE CURIOUS RESULTS IF THE EP HAD LEGISLATIVE POWERS. IT WAS TOO EARLY TO COMMENT ON THE IDEAS OF A NEW TREATY AND AN INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE, AND HE AGREED WITH MOLLER THAT THE REPORT TO DUBLIN SHOULD BE ORAL.

14. DOOGE (SPEAKING FOR IRELAND) THOUGHT THAT FAURE'S PAPER MIGHT BE BETTER IF THE SECTIONS ON SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES WERE PUT INTO A SEPARATE SECOND PART. THE IDEA OF A LEGAL AREA HAD ALREADY BEEN EXHAUSTIVELY DISCUSSED AND IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO SHOW WHY IT WAS NOW THOUGHT TO BE REALISABLE. HE RECALLED HIS SCEPTICISM ON RUFUS' POLITICAL COOPERATION PAPER. HE RECOGNISED THAT THE SECTION ON DEFENCE HAD BEEN CAREFULLY DRAFTED THOUGH WOULD PREFER TO SEE SECURITY. IRELAND WOULD NOT RENEGE ON THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF DEFENDING A POLITICAL UNION WHEN IT WAS FINALLY ACHIEVED. HE AGREED BROADLY WITH THE APPROACH ON INSTITUTIONS. BUT HE WAS NOT PREPARED TO ENDORSE THE IDEA OF AN INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE TO NEGOTIATE A DRAFT TREATY: MUCH MORE DETAILED DISCUSSION WOULD BE NEEDED. HE DID NOT TRY TO SUM UP AS PRESIDENT.

FCO ADVANCE TO:

FCO - PS, PS/MR RIFKIND, RENWICK, FAIRWEATHER, ROBBINS ECD(1).  
CAB - WILLIAMSON, STAPLETON, LAMBERT.  
NO. 10 - POWELL.

FCO PLEASE PASS SAVING TO STRASBOURG.

BUTLER  
FRAME INSTITUTIONS  
ECD(1)

5  
RESTRICTED

COPIES TO:  
ADVANCE ADDRESSEES  
[REPEATED SAVING AS REQUESTED]