



10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

SIR ROBERT ARMSTRONG

London Economic Summit 1984

Thank you for your minute of 27 February about Australian participation in the London Economic Summit.

The Prime Minister agrees that the proposed message from herself to Mr. Hawke should be despatched. I take it that you will arrange for this to be done telegraphically.

I am copying this minute to Roger Bone (Foreign and Commonwealth Office).

29 February 1984

ASZ



10 DOWNING STREET

RTA's office are wondering
whether the PM agreed
to send ~~a~~ ^{the} message to
Mr Hawke attached to
Sir Roberts minute d
27 February (at Clup)

~~I intended to
do today.~~

Mal
29/2

AD $\frac{29.}{2}$



The simple point, if Chancellor Kohl raises this, is that we must stick to the normal rules - otherwise other people e.g. the Japanese will be upset. A.H.C. $\frac{27}{2}$

Ref. A084/642

MR COLES ✓

London Economic Summit: Third Accompanying Minister

The Prime Minister may like to be warned that there is one administrative matter connected with the London Economic Summit which the Federal Chancellor Kohl may raise with her.

2. At the meeting of Personal Representatives on 17 February I explained that we would adopt the traditional rule of allowing only two Ministers per delegation, ie Foreign and Finance Ministers, at sessions and meals. No-one questioned this at the time.
3. Subsequently, however, the three countries primarily concerned gave us more background. The Italians said they would only bring two Ministers, and the Japanese said that they thought they could do the same provided that everyone stuck to the rules. But the German Personal Representative said that he thought the rule about no third Minister would cause his Government immense problems in view of the coalition and the personal position of Count Lambsdorff. We explained that with the best will in the world it would be impossible to allow one Head of State or Government to be accompanied by three Ministers at plenary sessions when others were accompanied by only two, or to allow one country to have two representatives at any function while all the rest had one; but Dr Tietmeyer said the issue was such a sensitive one that the Chancellor might well want to raise it with the Prime Minister.
4. If it is decided in the next four weeks that there is a case against Count Lambsdorff which he has to answer in court, then he will probably resign his Ministerial office and the problem will go away. The problem will remain with us if it is decided that there is no case to answer, or if no decision has been taken by the time of the Summit. Count Lambsdorff will be especially sensitive to any presumed slight.



5. As regards plenary meetings, the rule has been that only two Ministers may accompany each Head of State or Government but it is up to the Head of State or Government to decide by whom he will be accompanied. It will thus be open to the Federal Chancellor to bring Count Lambsdorff to the table with him in place of Herr Genscher or Dr Stoltenberg. The problem is likely to be most acute in the case of occasions (meetings or meals) when Foreign and Finance Ministers meet separately, and apart from Heads of State or Government. Dr Tietmeyer suggested to me that Count Lambsdorff should just be allowed to turn up with the Finance Ministers (or the Foreign Ministers) and a blind eye be turned; but that would upset the Italian and the Japanese Prime Ministers if we had held the line with them.
6. So I hope that, if the Federal Chancellor does raise this with the Prime Minister, she will feel able to stand firm.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, consisting of the letters 'R' and 'A' in a stylized, cursive font.

ROBERT ARMSTRONG

27 February 1984



Prime Minister.

Agree message to Mr. Hawke?

A.F.C. 28.
2

Ref. A084/637

PRIME MINISTER

London Economic Summit 1984

Yes mb

You will remember Mr Hawke's approach to you in New Delhi about Australia participating in the Summit, which was followed by a letter to me from my Australian counterpart, Sir Geoffrey Yeend. You approved my proposal in my minute of 7 February (A084/432) to raise this with the Personal Representatives at our meeting last weekend, non-committally but with the hope of being able to sum up the discussion in a suitably regretful but negative way.

2. That was indeed the outcome of our discussion of the matter. I raised it, non-committally; the Japanese Personal Representative said that his Prime Minister would welcome another participant from the Pacific, if there was a consensus for that; the Europeans all (including the French) took the line that it would be impossible to hold the line at Australia, that there would be equally valid requests from other countries (Brazil, Sweden, India, Belgium and the Netherlands were all mentioned) which could not be resisted if Mr Hawke's request was conceded, and that the resulting increase would change the nature and informality of Summits. The United States representative agreed with this line; and said that they had received a similar approach last year which they had not even thought it necessary to discuss with other Summit partners: they had turned it down, but had offered Mr Hawke a meeting with President Reagan before the Summit and an emissary to tell him about it afterwards.

3. In short, a consensus against inviting Mr Hawke to participate; but unstinted benevolence towards Australia, and a general desire not to be blamed for being the country which stopped Mr Hawke coming.

4. I am afraid that this leaves us with the job of communicating the decision. I imagine that you will want to do this yourself, as Mr Hawke approached you; but, if you do not want to be



directly involved, I can reply to the letter which Sir Geoffrey Yeend sent to me.

5. I do not imagine that you will want to invite Mr Hawke to make a special visit to see you before the Summit, though no doubt you would see him if he was going to be in this part of the world. You could, however, offer to send somebody out after the Summit to tell him about it.

--- 6. I attach a draft of a personal message for you to send to Mr Hawke.

7. I am sending a copy of this minute and the draft message to the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, who has been consulted about and is content with it.

RTA

ROBERT ARMSTRONG

27 February 1984

DRAFT MESSAGE FROM THE PRIME MINISTER TO
THE HON ROBERT HAWKE, AC, MP

I am sorry not to have been in touch before about the suggestion you made to me in New Delhi that you might be invited to participate in the London Economic Summit in June; but I wanted to find out the views of our partners in the Summit before responding.

This I have now done. I think we all feel that, if we could confine such an invitation to Australia, it would be easier to contemplate agreeing to your suggestion. But we do not believe that we could. Once Australia had been invited to participate, it would be impossible to resist requests from quite a number of other countries which would feel that in terms of size and economic development they had no less strong a claim to come. With such an increase in numbers it would be impossible - it is difficult enough as things are - to maintain the informal and wide-ranging freedom of discussion which has characterised these particular meetings since they first started. So the consensus is, I fear, against extending representation of the Summit to include Australia.

I should very much welcome an opportunity of knowing your views, before the Summit, on the world economic prospect and on what impetus you would like

to see the Summit give to the direction of events. I don't know whether you have any plans to be in Europe before then, but if you were to be in these parts I should of course very much like to see you and talk at first hand. Failing that, there are other channels through which your views could be conveyed. And I will make sure that you are given a report on the outcome of the Summit after the event.