

TUES A.M. 1



### New text produced

PAP: I qn: is it registered?

CRAM: Unhelpful & intently basis. favourable.  
Avoid capital & draft

MING: U. with but v. diff qn. ∴  
General framework + legal aspects to handle

Case history: not the UK and  
More time will not assist EC and  
not likely to be decision  
make this point very clear

PAP:

MING:

What has gone  
with: a number of matters in France  
have not been understood so, while a lot  
covered for by other laws.

1) Always allow for no indirect state  
but avoid next days for holding; also  
take the down + in states. Capital cost.  
We've always had states - with very  
mechanical but it is no understatement  
with 430,000 production in this product not from

2) Best year 83-5% with 20% a  
interim holiday means main cause of  
- further not taken, means that those  
with interim holiday will be rewarded,  
small farm households

(ca. approx to Ireland + Italy: but

to with frame to meet but it is not a.

Let meet .6

But no rate 83.5% gives added from

Words 1 in year

Other products 1 in year: this way 500 to 350

MCA: will be met with given ① then

Can be no doubt how to 20- in MCM for  
driving out. to a solution for ② we can  
must be given ~~the~~ given ECU for new MCM

Structural funds + enlarged we can accept

- major incentive for frame.

30. ix. 84 is way too far ahead

I'm hoping to shoulder my responsibility.

If I have to, then (it's not a commitment)  
the loan the better.

Budget discipline: UK

Intensities: Well! Just have to agree  
figures with UK & FDR. But in reality  
with FDR, another (more European system)  
formed a better solution.

But how to know what selling date?  
500 or 1000 Mecu? to wd. has 4800.

But she - back to milk

- wrong date
- index question
- no cut or incentive
- dropping the better solution
- can't go below 26% even
- MCM outside by words

PAP.

Does balance equal income?

KOHL.  
—

Start with enlargement: think income  
reasonable. so say that capital debt that  
to in Paddy or fr.

On rest as a whole, mentions call  
to produce this output, a basis of  
LVB's interests  
Part 1 is asset; also 1 can

Ag: Points out all the ideas. Ask you.  
How do we handle in, fr, fr? 1 year  
with them  
But how do we finance 100 or 200?  
1. or how type of co. not long. What is  
that?

Initial holdings: rather at. You a  
unilateral part of package

If we do 100 or 200 + rather at  
those should be av. body, how to  
finance, it is asset is

See no part in rest of it + facts.

Bodying desirable. Unilateral to be  
what's there at in detail

Intention: without figures it looks like

MCS: clear one for the name

Endsmall question remains: without figures,  
how can we agree? Well figures, we  
might agree. With a carbonic power

MARTENS:

Col. must as basis

M.T.:

many problems for many of us.

- 1) Nil or price + glue shortness
- 2) milk. Real problem is surplus. This  
don't tackle it. Now following shortage  
mandate, moving away from it  
Even with new rates cut to minimum  
100 or 200 units 200 units.  
Co. with buy is a tax to finance  
Oil + fuel tax: Unlike other as  
well as US. Agreement with  
Canada: again enormous problem  
New income: not desired.  
Anxiety that this will let it & that  
through a = funds  
Guidelines: need to include in budgeting process,  
& marketable dev  
Involvement: Shetty said this should be  
integrated part of new revenue procedure.  
Plain contradictions = next.  
Again decision whether it is with  
own resources as to put in place for  
5 years + the dollar  
Debt then found. Canada studies  
.. problems which still identified + which  
this doc. runs away from

MON P.M.

POP:

Budget:

When go?

We've proposed a new rule

If proposed it will need another by  
Parliament. If accepted it will operate  
from 1.1.86.

If so, then there has to be an  
ad hoc estimate for 84 & 85  
What?

Starting in '86, a rule will be  
functioning. This is clear despite  
or point of view between UK & FR  
UK with indefinite duration  
for not proposed for that

but it will be no effect of no horizon  
- 1990 - that seems likely.

Who speaks?

LONG PAVE

Conclusion:

Point to adopt fully guidelines

- 1) Difficulties with shares + flows from  
Cody
- 2) Max limit achieved on share to GDP,  
~~increasing~~ with capital fully as  
not with us
- 3) ~~at~~ budget for VAT target in fully year
- 4) Finance for those who have no share  
no companies + make states who are  
concerned that not to report to  
countries no companies

- 1) VAT get.
- 2) Allowance side by
- 3) max limit 20 to 100

Let sides fix

JEWELL: This is a stat book towards  
 net contribution status  
 Especially ∴ in year to come  
 VAT revenue will grow as proportion of  
 own resources + less than 20 net  
 contrib basis

- M.7:
- ① Has to be own resource get.
  - ② Duration must be as long as own  
 resource income
  - ③ Let have agreed on 84 + 85, as  
 separate exercises. Just not possible  
 mechanism.

LoB: Get. ... mixed a bit  
 Revenue: Probably not not do,  
 with own VAT scale OK.  
 Some better demands on (i).  
 Can be objection of APR 20 (i).

SCHEURER: Return to Paddy paper.  
 ... It's not we have

PAP: No doubt we have an impact but  
 have to return later

Plan for today.

Brain surgery.

Meats & fish & fruits in school room.  
Produce the region focus & stay with in  
household results.

MARTINS:

Presiding text is most likely reproduce  
results.

But how can we go further if results  
not looking promising

How can we discuss this, without  
FMS with us?

PAP:

We'll all be together after dinner

VARRIS:

Geometric problems do well

FDR says VAT base

That amounts a more so fully solution

But FDR says  
not buy more than

Presiding text  
receive not less than

GEORGE

LUBSON

There is a fundamental difference

We're getting lost

We don't hit home with it - it's  
in vain

Co. H:

Explains when we now are (!!!)

All options can be accommodated in Presiding text

Atkinson's Evidence.

AND:

Believe does not imply consent.  
Attain big made no change framework.  
Stuttgart body for some but not for others  
- or - selective basis

Don't deny some justification for this  
business.  
But why becoming v. different from what  
we thought.

PM + I very disappointed  
If this is relevant, lets think re  
Free Trade Area.  
Must believe when all this attaches  
Why it exist, historically, without all this

~~History~~  
Don't know when going. But it 6 years  
is not enough, what is?  
Risks against FDR idea or no content  
by them no reforms. If like this, then  
we can't go along with it

PAP

William And's content -

John H. Paddy had + put on back had

We just recently situation is saying 20 to be as  
just as we can, especially as we've been to  
content of back entry to EC

A very risky thing for country like ours to do,  
-? low productivity etc so low

Road for poor country, so join that state will  
suffer has been missing

Struggle for survival is a Central Union, with  
only CAP + with structural funds despite  
no redistribution, do we belong just to the  
ind. countries or sell goods to us?  
What's the game?



We're under attack

To under attack only or friend side is only part.

Our commercial balance has worsened.

Juste who will destroy the UK.

If you're only going to under attack, what you put in, why bother?

What about a trade - hotel - with US, S. America, Eastern bloc

We're going to live with the rules: how what advantage?

It's thought we understand the UK.

We don't. We're the making real business to stay within.

Presley had back a:

must address ourselves to structure & issues  
Over in whole place dynamite at  
foundations & economy.

All these problems arise: we're in  
depression - g.d.p., investment, unemployment.

When pic is shrinking, it's a zero sum game.

∴ relevance is v. important.

We have no ind. strategy

We're the smallest high int. rates in US,  
+ high deficits so financial arguments.  
And Europe is financing that.

So important things not happening

We're prepared to do all the necessary things

- ind. strategy
- new policies

Why not in the dollar? ∴ Greeks,  
as Presley, have the model

So lets look at middle husband  
what region 20th c is '85 '86.

NOTE:

lets husband this section  
ye husband was from the problem.  
But some other ~~maybe~~ will solve

-AND.

[CAP - FALL!]

We talk more than the rules show  
Others have special case e.g. UK's  
right to purchase from NZ

Conclusion: we need a blended system.  
It has certainly shown up in W. est.  
extension

On that basis it is the least.  
That also looks at degree of proximity.  
Problems of proximity can be solved @  
extent of the problems.

Re. Common modularized VAT program:

A weak point: ~~if this goes to~~  
- CAP

Certainly est. not really hostile  
or countries ∴ similarities being a  
little better than others

F172.

Assess validity of second of AND's  
points.

Your point (i) seems odd ∴ more  
proximity means more receipts (\*)

Orn. doesn't go forward.

VARAT.

This point (\*) has been made well.

It's not true.

Repeal a point for y' day.

We're in by virtue of a contract,  
signed by 6 in Rome.

Others have joined same contract, with  
transitional measures.

Can't ignore that. Or the obliged to  
come up with new treaty.

In any case, T.R. excludes  
justice return

That's at least a one point

Can't show by attacking CAP + arguing  
to him it's not

Can't ignore effect of other countries.

As for net contributions, can that be  
assessed? Or crossing the  
threshold so that. But we refer  
to what that argument

When UK joins, transitional measures  
first. They are now behind us.  
UK can base a fact that those  
measures continue

They do, de facto. In 1980  
agreements. But 1980 agreements that  
have been signed. We should  
simply have extended transit. measures

That's in dist. in a work-upt way.

(29)

Now what is the effort?

To bring out ag. holding, get rid  
a little part of total effort

And UK contribute

Admirable outline of Brit. delivery,  
which I admire

The names are wearing out. "Let us  
agree on the better effort", they say.

And to let us know so water down  
every effort.

Luther points to danger of that.

They don't require S. countries to  
be self-suff. in milk, nor do in wine

Still discussing UK proposal.

Original bid was for 7 years.

We would make the bid.

But proposal to make an intermediate  
period; in this was meeting we were  
proposed to help.

Now is this takes up a day or each  
country, with time to make the in-  
line not proposed to amend the treaty.

We will avoid this debate.

Your proposals were very practical

But they're inevitable

They're algebraic

Unlikely wrong not right

e.g. Common exports from UK

1.3% ECU too much

N/A that!

But we have to say so that there  
mistakes + say so correct the

fatigue causes us to give way.

Not just a yr of planning M.T.

Always glad to take so he

- will - little bit of mistakes, I agree.

But still very pleased.

O - not balances, quite at a  
quarter.

But as for answer. 1. date after

an act of hostility towards

UK + Germany. But not

helped to reach conclusion that  
is contrary to reality

Since my attempt is vague, people

think I'm giving way.

I'm not.

I'm careful to go on

arguing for year to year

The days in a week in ~~the~~ the  
Commonwealth.

We have to have more

It's not fair

I believe this business that rules  
place every year

I recognize this points the system.

But to be it

This has to be brought to a halt

We've scattered the entire population.

But I'm not going to accept any  
lastly death.

If I go any further than I shall  
calculated myself

V. entirely to discuss the system, but  
unless it be logical

Swindle, really? How long?

One year. I'd go as far as 2.

Can't accept any more on a lasting basis

If so, all rules have gone

All this is immediately overdone

with matters that that be left to

others

Regard all problems except  
from one year to the next the  
lengths greater to UK in 1972  
- normal than that

VARAC,

There is a full forward &  
conclusion

- GAP -

Should go to blended system,  
CA in shape one way only  
was better

All the matters and the situation

So we want to all extent, will  
stick to the old for admin work.

It beyond that, we will be able  
to do all the papers: can do

Conclusion:

- ① We can depend on the ... to stay to
- ② Don't want to be the only one who  
understand
- ③ We in ... a 2-level mechanism
- ④ If we in ... a new ...  
we can ... to UK



SCULLY:

Prize Prudon handbook should.

Gene's handbook problem can be dealt with by key

PAP:

Don't Prudon handbook deal with Gene's problem

CONSENT:

No.

LUSBY:

Modulated scale should be rejected.

HDR says they will not limit their control to CE

in control of HDR, I should advise against it.

If it is to be done, then it should be done in full respect for Treaty

M.7:

If to be for an year, then we can save ourselves a lot of work. If not to be done, then we need a system

Deals with one double bundle of Italy + Greece as well as us.

Resolves basic case against or on ~~case~~ bundle: it. 3rd world aid.

Assure we need to take solution for more than one year.

~~the~~ 2nd text

Gewinner:

We know that combine is the  
2 mechanisms

- do not have to sell down the  
plus what come through,  
with modelled VMT

Upper limit based on down the  
limit based on expenditure / GDP growth.  
Perhaps we can take ALC or M.T's terms

LUBRAM:

We can not have M.T. right.  
Question:

Looks quite unjustified  
in capital with rules & why

MARRAS:

Can have flat rate rules.

M.T.

Not flat rate -  
this was just illustration of how  
firm would work out, a basis of  
Paddy, barrels - a model,  
as we suggest