

*Copied to Home Affairs July 1979 Disposal of Nuclear Waste
West Health July 1982 St David's Hospital
Fishing Industry*

PRIME MINISTER

STATEMENTS ON FISH, ST DAVID'S HOSPITAL AND RADIO ACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

These statements caused no surprises, and a considerable amount of boredom.

FISH

On the Agricultural and Fisheries Council, the Opposition, led by Norman Buchan had two main questions. First, if the September Council reached agreement on the CFP, would the Minister reserve his position until the House had a chance to have a debate? Second, if no agreement was reached by the end of the year, would the Government ensure that there would not be a free for all, with fishing up to the beaches? On these points, Mr Walker said that he hoped for agreement at the September Council, and that he would not reserve his position pending a debate; he would come to the House and defend the agreement afterwards; that was the line that John Silkin had taken when in office. If there were no agreement, he would ensure that there was no free for all. He would also ensure that any agreement was acceptable to the majority of the United Kingdom fishing industry.

ST DAVID'S HOSPITAL, DYFED

Mr Edwards got some credit for publishing the report on St David's Hospital, and coming down to the House to make a statement. The Opposition, led by Alec Jones, seemed mainly interested in discovering who was responsible for the sorry state of the hospital, and whose head should therefore roll. They also tried to suggest that the main problem was a lack of funds for the hospital. Mr Edwards pointed out that the Chairman of the Regional Health Authority had only received the report today, and it was much too early to specify who was to blame. Many attempts had been made to correct the relative under-funding in the Dyfed area, but one of the main problems was that the Health Authority had itself accorded very low priority to mental illness services, despite pressure from the Welsh Office.

RADIO ACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

Denis Howell spoke at some length that Gordon Wilson rose on a point of order to complain. In the course of about fifteen minutes, he managed to put only three questions. First, why was there no independent element in the new Nuclear Industry Radio Active Waste Executive; second, would the NII and NRPB still retain their existing

/functions;

functions; and were the Government's intentions over the disposal of highly active waste still the same? Mr King pointed out that it would be quite inappropriate to have an independent element on the Executive, but that the Executive would submit its proposals to the Waste Management Advisory Committee, on which there was a strong independent element. The functions of the NII and the NRPB would be unaffected. The AEA's borehole drilling programme had been stopped because new technical advice suggested that surface storage of highly active waste for 50 years or more was quite sufficient. Most of the subsequent questioning centred on the need for an independent element on the Executive, and ^{as the} a decision to abandon the borehole drilling programme, and on safety of surface storage for highly active waste.

wrk.

22 July, 1982



Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Whitehall Place London SW1A 2HH

From the Minister's Private Office

W Rickett Esq
Prime Minister's Office
10 Downing Street
London SW1

22 July 1982

Dear Willie

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS: 19-21 JULY 1982

--- I attach a copy of the statement which Mr Walker hopes to make in the House today. I would be grateful for immediate clearance.

I am copying this letter to Bernard Ingham; David Heyhoe (Leader of the House's Office); Murdo Maclean (Whip's Office, Commons); Michael Pownall (Whip's Office, Lords); David Wright (Cabinet Office); Keith Long (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster's Office) and to Private Secretaries of the other Agriculture Ministers and members of the OD(E).

Yours sincerely

Robert Lawson

ROBERT LOWSON
Private Secretary

DRAFT STATEMENT ON AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES COUNCILS:

19/21 SEPTEMBER

With permission, Mr Speaker, I should like to make a statement about the meetings of the Agriculture and Fisheries Councils which took place earlier this week.

At the Agriculture Council on 19 - 20 July, at which the United Kingdom was represented by my Rt Hon Friend, the Minister of State, and my Hon Friend, Minister of State at the Northern Ireland Office, agreement was reached upon a package of measures for the wine sector. I am pleased to inform the House that we obtained satisfactory safeguards for our alcohol and spirits industries.

On 20 - 21 July there was a meeting of the Fisheries Council at which I was accompanied by my Rt Hon Friend, the Secretary of State for Scotland, and my Rt Hon Friend, the Minister of State.

The Danish Delegation refused to approve measures involving agreements with Norway. This prevented the Commission from negotiating with the Norwegian Government on Total Allowable Catches in respect of joint stocks which would have considerable impact upon quota allocations.

Nine Member States agreed that until this negotiation could take place there could be no meaningful discussions on Total Allowable Catches, quotas, and access. This was certainly the view of the United Kingdom Government, since important quotas for cod and herring are involved.

/It was, therefore, ...

It was, therefore, agreed that negotiations upon these major aspects would be resumed at a meeting of the Fisheries Council to be held in Luxembourg on 21 September.

Agreement was reached on a number of implementing measures under the Marketing Regulation which will come into operation on 1 January 1983.

Fishing Bill

AMENDMENT TO THE OPPOSITION MOTION

That this House welcomes the further progress achieved by Her Majesty's Government in the search for a satisfactory revised Common Fisheries Policy, particularly in relation to conservation, marketing and control; confirms that such a policy must maintain the need to secure an exclusive 12-mile limit, preference outside 12 miles to protect particularly dependent fishing communities, adequate quotas for the United Kingdom, effective conservation measures and a community-wide system of enforcement as well as improvements in the marketing arrangements hitherto in force; and urges Her Majesty's Government vigorously to continue, in consultation with the fishing industry, the search for a solution on the outstanding issues.

15/7

THURSDAY 15 JULY

COMMON FISHERIES POLICY - OPPOSITION MOTION

That this House reaffirms its commitment to a 12 mile exclusive limit, dominant preference in the 12 to 50 mile zone, effective conservation measures, and catch quotas for the United Kingdom which fully reflect the extent of fishing stocks in United Kingdom waters and the loss of fishing opportunities for the United Kingdom in third country waters as the essential requirements for the United Kingdom in any acceptable common fisheries policy, and accordingly demands that the United Kingdom Government refuse to agree to any common fisheries policy settlement that does not secure these essential requirements.



14 JUL 1982