CONFIDENTIAL

JS/aw

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE
WHITEHALL, LONDON SW1A 2AT

9 October 1990

Dear Andrew,

DEBATE ON STERLING'S ENTRY INTO THE ERM

Thank you for your letter of 8 October enclosing one that the Prime Minister had received from Mr Kinnock.

The Lord President and the Chief Whip have discussed how best to respond to Mr Kinnock, in the light of the Chancellor's views which John Gieve passed to us yesterday evening.

They recommend that the business for the first half day back, on Monday 15 October, previously announced as a debate on the Adjournment about Financial Services and the Single Market, should be changed to a debate on the Adjournment about ERM entry. The Chancellor is entirely content to open such a debate on that day. His view, with which the Lord President and the Chief Whip entirely agree, is that it would be a pity to cloud the favourable response to our entry into the ERM by appearing at all reluctant to let the House debate the matter at an early opportunity. This will provide for a half day's debate only, (since opposed Private Business is fixed for 7 pm on 15 October). The Business Managers feel it would be difficult to make a full day available, unless the Opposition gave up their allotted day the following week: we judge that most unlikely.

If the Prime Minister is content, I suggest that the second paragraph of a reply to Mr Kinnock should say:

> "Of course it is right that the House should have a chance to debate the matter when Parliament returns. I understand that discussions are already taking place through the usual channels about the timing and length of such a debate."

I am copying this letter to John Gieve and Murdo Maclean.

Yours ever,
T. Sutton

T J SUTTON
Principal Private Secretary

Andrew Turnbull Esq
PS/Prime Minister

CONFIDENTIAL