

*We ought to redraft.*  
*The general tone is restrictive so much so that we are in luck. I suppose to find management of the end of 195 (a) is.*

*cc Cabinet Questions of Procedure (1)*  
Prime Minister

Ref. A07241  
MR SCHOLAR

CONFIDENTIAL

Please see Bernard Ingham's note on this.  
You will shortly be receiving a letter from Francis Pym on the other issues raised at the 20 Jan meeting.  
Agree that Questions of Procedure


Presentation of Economic Policy: Questions of Procedure

*Does not need amendment on this score? Mus 24*

In your letter of 20th January to John Kerr, recording the discussion which the Prime Minister had with a number of her colleagues about the presentation of economic policy, you said that the Prime Minister wished to make sure that the relevant paragraphs in "Questions of Procedure for Ministers" about TV and radio appearances did not discourage such appearances. You subsequently minuted Mr Wright asking for advice on this.

2. I attach a copy of the relevant paragraphs of "Questions of Procedure" (paragraphs 101 to 107). The category of broadcast into which any appearances designed to improve the presentation of Government policy would fall is that described in paragraph 105d, notably interviews for news bulletins and magazine and feature programmes. There is nothing in the instructions given in this paragraph which need discourage Ministers. Indeed, the instructions given both for appearances on news bulletins or on magazine programmes contain sentences encouraging Ministers to take every opportunity that presents itself to appear in such programmes. I do not think that the requirements that Ministers invited to appear on magazine and feature programmes should consult the Chief Press Secretary in No 10 is unreasonable: it gives Mr Ingham a chance both to encourage appearances and to coordinate them.

3. The only other general requirement in Questions of Procedure which affects Ministerial appearances is that which instructs Ministers to take care about how they refer to subjects which are the responsibility of other Ministers. This is particularly relevant to any consideration of improving the presentation of economic policy. But it is a requirement which must remain in order to ensure the proper coordination of Government policy, and it should not be an inhibiting



CONFIDENTIAL

requirement for non-Treasury Ministers who will in any case need guidance from the Treasury on what it is appropriate for them to say. The reactivation of the Lord President's Liaison Committee should provide a method of dealing with this requirement.

RA

ROBERT ARMSTRONG

26th January 1982

CONFIDENTIAL