

Qz.04068

MR POWELL

ANGLO-FRENCH SUMMIT: "STILETTOS"

The Prime Minister said yesterday that she would like some "stilettos" for use in argument about the more high-flown ideas on the future of the Community advanced in the European Community, the Dooge Committee and elsewhere. Here are some, in a form in which they could be used, if necessary, with President Mitterrand.

1. Britain has played a constructive role in the Dooge Committee. We have our own important objectives for a wealth creating European Community: not only the internal market - although we ought now to set a clear timetable for achieving the full internal market - but also for more effective political cooperation and for cooperation in other areas, where this can be shown to be to our mutual advantage. Convinced British and French national positions quite close in substance. But, between now and the March European Council it would be good if Governments - particularly the French, German and United Kingdom Governments - did subject some of the ideas to more rigorous analysis.

For example:

(a) European Parliament seeking powers at expense of national Governments and Parliaments. The European Parliament wants to use the present discussions to achieve real powers over revenue. There is probably no member state which wants this. But, if we are not careful, it will become a point of greater dispute between the Council and the European Parliament. I understand that in France there has been a decision of the Constitutional Council which rules out the transfer of such important powers from the French State to the European Parliament.

/(b)

- (b) decision making. We must not make an already bad situation worse. The Spinelli draft treaty contains some articles which can be guaranteed to bring Community decision making to a complete halt. (An extract from Article 38 is:

"All draft laws shall be submitted to the Parliament. Within a period of six months it may approve the draft with or without amendment . . . The draft law approved by the Parliament, with or without amendment, shall be forwarded to the Council of the Union. Within a period of one month . . . the Commission may deliver an opinion. The Council shall take a decision within a period of six months . . . Where the draft has been put to the vote but has not secured the majorities referred to above or where the draft has been amended, the conciliation procedure laid down in paragraph 4 shall be opened . . . Where, within a period of three months the (Conciliation) Committee reaches agreement on a joint text, the text shall be submitted for approval to the Parliament and the Council. They shall take a decision within a period of three months . . . The Parliament and Council may extend the time limits laid down in this Article")

- (c) majority voting. No objection to looking at possibilities for greater use of majority voting. Plenty of scope under existing Treaty procedures. Luxembourg compromise - a French invention - not a cause of paralysis and a necessary last resort protection. Would France be prepared to subordinate its national decisions on foreign affairs to prior Community decision by majority voting in a more formalised political cooperation arrangement?

I am sending a copy to Sir Robert Armstrong.

*D F Williamson*

D F WILLIAMSON

29 November 1984

Qz.04068

MR POWELL

Stiletto

H'by

Pl. help  
PH

ANGLO-FRENCH SUMMIT: "STILETTOS"

The Prime Minister said yesterday that she would like some "stiletto" for use in argument about the more high-flown ideas on the future of the Community advanced in the European Community, the Dooge Committee and elsewhere. Here are some, in a form in which they could be used, if necessary, with President Mitterrand.

1. Britain has played a constructive role in the Dooge Committee. We have our own important objectives for a wealth creating European Community: not only the internal market - although we ought now to set a clear timetable for achieving the full internal market - but also for more effective political cooperation and for cooperation in other areas, where this can be shown to be to our mutual advantage. Convinced British and French national positions quite close in substance. But, between now and the March European Council it would be good if Governments - particularly the French, German and United Kingdom Governments - did subject some of the ideas to more rigorous analysis.

For example:

- (a) European Parliament seeking powers at expense of national Governments and Parliaments. The European Parliament wants to use the present discussions to achieve real powers over revenue. There is probably no member state which wants this. But, if we are not careful, it will become a point of greater dispute between the Council and the European Parliament. I understand that in France there has been a decision of the Constitutional Council which rules out the transfer of such important powers from the French State to the European Parliament.

/(b)

Asad doesn't want Iran  
to damage Iraq.

Traced off pipe-line (Iraq's)

Asad - doesn't like U.S.

Relations with Western Europe

Syria via relations Pakistan

Israel right to exist - unrounded

Syria of this, ...

No contact between Syria & Jews Israeli Jews

Propaganda - Hussein - disappointed  
that US supports Israel with  
\$3 bn a year

World with concern

World alone Community initiative

Proposition time for Europe to be involved

- (b) decision making. We must not make an already bad situation worse. The Spinelli draft treaty contains some articles which can be guaranteed to bring Community decision making to a complete halt. (An extract from Article 38 is:

"All draft laws shall be submitted to the Parliament. Within a period of six months it may approve the draft with or without amendment . . . The draft law approved by the Parliament, with or without amendment, shall be forwarded to the Council of the Union. Within a period of one month . . . the Commission may deliver an opinion. The Council shall take a decision within a period of six months . . . Where the draft has been put to the vote but has not secured the majorities referred to above or where the draft has been amended, the conciliation procedure laid down in paragraph 4 shall be opened . . . Where, within a period of three months the (Conciliation) Committee reaches agreement on a joint text, the text shall be submitted for approval to the Parliament and the Council. They shall take a decision within a period of three months . . . The Parliament and Council may extend the time limits laid down in this Article")

- (c) majority voting. No objection to looking at possibilities for greater use of majority voting. Plenty of scope under existing Treaty procedures. Luxembourg compromise - a French invention - not a cause of paralysis and a necessary last resort protection. Would France be prepared to subordinate its national decisions on foreign affairs to prior Community decision by majority voting in a more formalised political cooperation arrangement?

I am sending a copy to Sir Robert Armstrong.

D F Williamson

D F WILLIAMSON

29 November 1984

Loose - Rep. Nand  
Revised then how  
to deal with

---

Syria At war with Israel  
Look for own strategic  
interests.

Facts - Israel on Golan

Egypt/Syria agreed not deal with Israel  
Then Egypt did.

If between frontiers withdrawn - you  
promise/ let my express.

United - not on between Syrian frontier  
Only National between them there  
Not joint to happen

Saudi Arab pass for Syria my  
Syria - not opposite Iran/Israel is.