

PRIME MINISTER

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY: INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE

Michael Butler - who has now retired - is coming in on Tuesday to talk about the Intergovernmental Conference. He has prepared the attached note setting out the points on which he thinks decisions will be required. If you have time, you may also want to glance at his valedictory despatch.

This will be in the nature of a seminar rather than a decision-taking meeting. Points on which you will want to get Michael Butler's views are:

- (i) is it realistic to think of decisions being taken at the European Council in December? Or would it be better to agree now that more time will be needed? Otherwise we risk a premature and damaging row.
- (ii) what are the practical consequences of the limited extension of majority voting under Articles 57(2) and 100 which Michael Butler proposes? [Paragraph 12(a)] [Photocopies in folder]
- (iii) will adding new articles on technology and the environment extend Community competence?
- (iv) Michael Butler proposes [paragraph 15(c)] that officials be given authority to negotiate any arrangements on the European Assembly which leave the last word with the Council. This would be to give officials a very wide remit indeed: the Assembly could be given much greater powers while still leaving the last word to the Council. You will want to keep a tight personal control of negotiations on this point, which could be very sensitive in Westminster.

/On tactics

On tactics, Michael Butler recommends that we should continue to keep the other member states in the dark about our real intentions. But officials should be allowed to negotiate without commitment to see what is the minimum package which can be achieved. I would add a further point: that you should keep officials in the dark about your intentions. They will negotiate the harder if they are uncertain how far you will be ready to go, but suspect it is not very far!

You may want to take the opportunity to thank Michael for his many years - 13 - of hard work on the Community.

e.d.p.

CHARLES POWELL

25 October 1985



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

25 October 1985

*Dear Charles,*European Community

/ Sir Michael Butler is due to call on the Prime Minister on Tuesday 29 October. I attach a copy of Sir Michael Butler's report on the Inter-governmental Conference, which the Prime Minister will wish to see before Sir Michael's call. The Foreign Secretary considers that this report offers us a useful insight into the way in which we should be approaching the Luxembourg European Council.

/ I also enclose a copy of Sir Michael's farewell despatch.

*Yours ever,
Colin Budd*

(C R Budd)
Private Secretary

C D Powell Esq
10 Downing Street



SIR MICHAEL BUTLER'S VALEDICTORY DESPATCH

SUMMARY

1. The Community's maddening ways breed cynicism. But European unity is needed to protect and promote our interests at home and abroad. It has to be made to work (paragraphs 1 and 2).

2. Recently it has worked better than most people think. But there is a feeling of malaise. Various causes; one that the public have no clear picture of what the Community is about (paragraphs 3 and 4).

3. There will be no shortage of problems in next five years: the European Parliament, the internal North/South split, the CAP, the stony road to the "great market", relations with the US. Britain, too, will have its problems, some of our own creation (paragraphs 5 and 6).

4. How to convince people that the venture is worthwhile? No magic answers. We can only slog away. Commission and Governments must improve their presentation. We shall get our way more often if we are seen to be more in favour of European Unity (paragraph 7).

/5.



5. Tribute to your handling of European policy (paragraph 8).

6. Glad to have seen the UK budget problem through to its solution. Equally glad to be going now. But the Community is one of the great issues of our day. Diplomacy in Europe is professionally even more interesting than in the 1950s (paragraphs 9 and 10).

7. UKRep and our Cabinet Office machinery are the envy of the professionals in Brussels (paragraph 11).

8. Permanent Representative needs to know the Community before he comes if he is to get his way. David Hannay meets the bill admirably (paragraph 12).



OFFICE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
ROND-POINT ROBERT SCHUMAN 6
1040 BRUSSELS

TELEPHONE 230 62 05

10 October 1985

The Right Honourable
Sir Geoffrey Howe QC MP
etc etc etc

Sir

1. Long exposure to the European Community tends to breed cynicism. The boredom of hanging around outside European Councils or inside interminable and sometimes unsuccessful Foreign Affairs Council meetings; the hypocrisy of the games Governments play when trying to blame others for lack of progress; the failure of Ministers such as Genscher to learn enough about the subject-matter to negotiate seriously; the monotonous regularity and irrelevance of major exercises about the future of the Community (Tindeman's report, Three Wise Men's report, 30 May Mandate, Dooge Committee, and now Intergovernmental Conference) as a substitute for urgent and difficult action to reform the CAP or to complete the internal market; the mediocrity of the content of Communautaire effusions; it is too easy to begin to think that this is all there is. As we sat in the "Dondelinger group" preparing the Intergovernmental Conference recently one of my colleagues, who is an even older Community hand than I am, turned to me and whispered.- "You are a lucky man to be

/going



going. I've had it - up to there". But the peculiar thing is that he, who is gloomily staying, and I, who am gladly going, both share an absolute conviction that it is all worthwhile.

2. Why? Because the democratic countries of Western Europe need unity if they are to protect and promote their interests in the modern world. They need unity of the European market if their economies are to become sufficiently competitive to provide prosperity and employment. They need it in order collectively to counter Soviet foreign policy with a uniting Western Europe and to tie West Germany indissolubly to France and Britain; to organise Western Europe so that it can bargain on less unequal terms with a United States which seems to be drifting slowly away from us as well as risking being carried off on a wave of protectionism; to create a climate in which European companies co-operate to meet the Japanese and American challenge rather than trying to hang on as "national champions" and gradually going under; and to tackle the innumerable problems which have made progress in these fields too slow for survival so far. The full list of requirements for common action is longer still and there are many things further down it which are not so crucial but are still important. So the Community has to be made to work. For it is the only means that we have to achieve these ends.

3. Even if Community decision-making is painful to the participants, it does work better than most people think. In the last two or three years an enormous range of decisions has

/been



been taken:-

a Common Fisheries Policy established, with a Community inspectorate;

the beginning of action to curb the CAP surpluses, with milk quotas;

agreement on budget discipline, including our long-sought aim of a strict financial guideline for the CAP even if this is as yet not wholly secure;

the settlement of the British budget problem (in a way which will prevent it ever being so tiresome again);

the increase in own resources to 1.4% of VAT, at least for other member states;

the innumerable decisions required to permit the conclusion of the enlargement negotiations with Spain and Portugal;

the revision of the Regional and Social Fund regulations;

a five-year research programme, including Esprit;

decisions on the environment, eg exhaust emissions;

a breakthrough on standards by the adoption of 15 long-blocked directives and agreement on future mutual recognition of standards;

the single administrative document to facilitate the movement of goods across frontiers;

the reasonably successful management of the crisis régime in the steel industry (prices and quotas and closures);

the handling of difficult negotiations with the US on restraint on Community steel exports.

/a



a third Lomé Convention;

the emergency aid programme to Africa; and so on and on.

Those who say that the Community is blocked are either ignorant or are comparing reality with some unrealisable ideal.

4. Yet those who yearn for "qualitative leaps" or push the Community into intergovernmental conferences to revise its constitution reflect a genuine malaise. There is a widespread feeling that the European ideal has lost impetus. Even if it is true, as I believe, that the historians in a 100 years time will find the place of European integration in the 1980s to have been rather rapid, the man or woman in the street does not see it today. My own wife doubts it. This is partly the fault of the European enthusiasts themselves who are always prone to describe the Community glass as nine-tenths empty rather than as it is, half full. It is partly the fault of the media and its obsession with rows rather than their solution. It is partly due to the national champion mentality in Community negotiations, as some Ministers recount them to the public. It is perhaps partly due to the mediocrity of the political leadership in many Member States and its preoccupation with home politics, "European" though it professes itself to be in most countries. But perhaps the most deep-rooted and worrying cause is that so few people in any of our countries have a clear picture of what the Community is now about. If the ordinary intelligent member of the public looks at the list of subjects

/to



to be dealt with in order to complete the internal market (attached), he is bound to ask himself whether all this is really necessary in order to have a united Europe. Alas, the answer is that it is.

5. Though the political pressure to move forward has increased in my time here and though the Delors Commission will certainly give things a push, there will be no shortage of problems in the next five years. The controversies will continue, as it is natural that they should. Even in fully-fledged federations, political and economic controversy is not unknown! Those claiming to be ideologically in front will cry forward and accuse those who do not cry with them of being at the back, crying back. The European Parliament will cause member Governments much trouble because it has a vocation to demand for itself powers that the national Governments and Parliaments are not ready to give it. Enlargement will both create new problems and make them more difficult to solve. The camp of the less rich, including now Spain and Portugal, will try to force the richer camp to disgorge still more funds. Both sides will find it hard to rally a qualified majority. France, Germany and the UK, the net contributors, will resist increased expenditure and will make themselves unpopular if (as I ardently hope that they will) they agree among themselves what should be done. (They may make themselves still more unpopular if they disagree). The CAP will come under increasing strain and will not survive in the form so long lauded as the essence of the

/"Communautaire"



"Communataire". The road leading to the "single great market" will be stony. The Atlantic will be rough and Europe's great American partner will be floundering. Europe will not find it easy to unite to deal with them. It will frequently be in "crisis".

6. Britain will have its problems, some of them of our own creation. To give an example of the latter category, I do not believe that the PESC (EC) method of controlling Community expenditure on research and development is likely to prove consistent with constructive membership of the Research Council. The Community budget as a whole and the European Parliament's role in its adoption will continue to cause us unavoidable problems, though less than those it will cause to the French and the Germans, whose percentage net contribution to expenditure in the Mediterranean countries will be four or five times our own. Others will want to increase own resources again before we are ready - though this will give us an opportunity to improve further the budget discipline arrangements and even, if we wish, the corrective mechanism for the UK. The British Parliament will remain hostile to the European Parliament and this will make relations with British MEPs a problem. The results of the Intergovernmental Conference on revising the Treaty may not be easy to negotiate in a form acceptable to the British Parliament. There will often be something for the Daily Express to complain about.

/7.



7. How then to convince the people that Europe is already uniting fast and must unite faster? How to convince them that the constant clash of views and interests is not a sign of fundamental disunity, but of the breadth of the front on which European integration is moving and the vitality of the process? Only a static Europe would be calm and united. If I had had any magical prescriptions for getting the Community better understood, I would have recommended them to you long since. We can all only slog away at it, as you do tirelessly. The Commission and the other member Governments need to improve their presentation of the facts and we should keep at them to do so. You are also quite right to try to generate some enthusiasm for the cause of European unity. Not only do the anti-free market, anti-Common market, anti-European Union views of the extreme Left need to be exposed and countered, but it is in our interests to convince the other member Governments that the British Government and people are with them on the voyage. We shall get our way more often if we are perceived to be more in favour of the aim of European Union. For in the eyes of our partners, the Community is not just a permanent negotiation about important but boring detailed issues. It is a common enterprise to unite a continent and those who proclaim this aim are forgiven many minor sins and granted considerable favours.

8. In this farewell despatch I should like to pay tribute to the constant and careful thought that you give to every aspect of

/our



our European policy and how to present it; to the good humour with which you approach the endless round of Councils and political co-operation and bilateral meetings with your Community colleagues; and to your hard work, patience and negotiating skill which brings us a higher than average degree of success. My Coreper colleagues make no secret of their envy. For me, it has been a recurring, frequently recurring, pleasure to work for you.

9. I am grateful to you, too, for letting me retire early. Seven and half years in London, as Head of EID, AUS (Community) and DUS (Economic), and six years in Brussels seem a long time. When I came back to London in the summer of 1972 to work again on the Community, I knew that there would be much to be done before we could become ordinary members like the others. It never occurred to me that it would take so long. But I am glad to have stayed with the UK budget problem till it was solved and therefore that your predecessors have kept my nose to the Community grindstone. Equally, I am glad that you are letting me take it off.

10. Nevertheless I expect that, in true Proustian fashion, I shall be sad no longer to be a member of the Service, to give up my pass to the Foreign Office where I have spent about half my working life! Though the old building remains much as it was, the work has changed out of all recognition, at least on the

/European



European Community side. But in my experience it is even more interesting now than it was when I was in the Western Department in the early 1950s. No longer to be part of the policy-making process at home, no longer to know on the inside what the press so inadequately describes from the outside will be strange and possibly disagreeable. However that may be, I shall not lose my interest in the Community being made to work well. It is one of the great issues of our day and I care about it as much now as I did in 1961 or 1973.

11. Though I claim no credit for it, UKRep is, as it has always been, in good shape. It is a major tribute to the British Civil and Diplomatic Services that they post such able men and women to Brussels and that once they get there they weld at once into an effective and united team, to a far greater extent than most other Permanent Representations. Perhaps it is because they are all so busy doing interesting things that team work comes naturally to them. It is the underemployed who try to weld empires or to do down their colleagues. It is nice to be able to report that the UKRep team, together with our superlative Cabinet Office co-ordination machinery at home, are considered by the cynical professionals in Brussels to be major British assets.

12. It will always be essential to send to Brussels a Permanent Representative who already knows the Community, its dreadful "dossiers" and how to get our way in it. I hope the powers that be in the Office will continue to train such officers up to

/standard



standard. You have wisely sent to succeed me just such a man, the only man in the Service who has worked on the Community as long as I have. I can hand over in the certain knowledge that there will not even be a faltering moment as the baton passes.

David Hannay will be in charge within a few hours of my departure and he will find a heavy workload waiting for him. Luckily he has bounce enough to do it all and more.

I am copying this despatch to Her Majesty's Representatives at all European Community posts and Washington and UKDel NATO.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your Obedient Servant

Michael Birtles





INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE

REPORT BY SIR MICHAEL BUTLER

1. The inter-governmental conference met at Ministerial level on 9 September and 21 October. Work on possible treaty changes is being conducted in a preparatory group (Permanent Representatives under the Luxembourg chairman Dondelinger). There will be one or two further discussions at Ministerial level before the European Council.

2. With a plethora of proposals now on the table, the process could drag on beyond December. But the Luxembourg Presidency and the French and Germans will be pressing for at least agreement in principle on key issues at the European Council. The proposals put forward so far in the conference are summarised in the attached annex.

A

3. The Commission have put forward maximalist proposals on (a) extending majority voting, getting more power delegated to themselves and bringing the Parliament into the decision making process; and (b) "cohesion" - a code name for giving the Greeks, Irish, Spaniards and Portuguese a lever to extract more resource transfers. Their proposals have been



criticised by the Germans and, especially, the French,
whose position on the substance is close to our own.
The French would be prepared to agree, however, to
limited treaty amendment, while ensuring that this does
not touch any of their essential interests. The
Germans want to go further on the Parliament (para 6 ⁷
below).

4. There is support for a limited extension of
majority voting related to specific internal market
objectives. If we appeared to be opposing changes in
decision-taking on the removal of direct obstacles to
trade in goods and services, we should risk defeating
our own objectives on the internal market. This will
be one of the key issues.

5. There has been no attempt in the Conference to
undermine the Luxembourg compromise (though neither the
Belgians nor Italians would agree to its inclusion in
the treaty).

6. Since there will be no agreement on any more
radical changes in decision-taking, peoples' minds have
been turning to updating the Treaty by including in it
articles covering subjects such as the Regional Fund,



technology and the environment on which the Community has been working for years. Depending on the wording, draft articles on these lines could be either objectionable (as the Commission's proposals were) or anodyne or even mildly helpful.

7. Though the French and Germans will not accept anything as radical as the Commission have proposed:

a) The Germans, while keeping the last word for the Council, have proposed a cumbersome mediation procedure between Parliament and Council. They are prepared to move to majority voting on the non-taxation aspects of Articles 57(2) and 100.

b) The French have made a modest and sensible proposal on cooperation with the Parliament. But they propose to move to majority voting on Articles 57(2) and 100 when an absolute majority in the Parliament has voted in favour of a Commission proposal.

8. The question of the Parliament remains the most difficult issue. A version of our own pre-Milan proposal is the best solution, ie European Parliament



produces its "opinion", with suggestions for changes on the Commission's proposal before Council gets down to serious legislation, representatives of the Parliament then discuss with Ministers who take account of their views in final negotiation, and Presidency explains to Parliament how far its ideas have been taken on board. Except for the Danes, most other member states are willing to go further and several believe passionately that it is necessary to do so.

9. The Italians have proposed a form of co-decision which would give the Parliament a blocking power. Neither this nor the German proposal for an extremely cumbersome consultation procedure has attracted much support. But there is a desire to improve consultation and to put this in the Treaty. There is interest in the German idea of requiring the assent of the Parliament for new accessions and new association agreements.

10. Work is proceeding on the political cooperation text on the lines we proposed. This will keep political cooperation outside the Treaty of Rome. Other will want this to be coupled with (a) some preambular language on European union and (b) some



limited changes and additions to the Treaty (paras 4-10 above).

11. We have been taking the line that UK Ministers will only be able to decide whether they can approve any amendments to the Treaty when they see the shape of the final package and that they will judge proposals by whether they are necessary in order to achieve desirable results. We have been joining "constructively" in discussion of all the draft proposals with the private aim of arousing as much opposition as possible to all the bits that look unattractive! Others, especially the French and Germans, have been at least as critical of the Commission's contributions. The Greeks seem to be signalling willingness to be bought off. The Danes are determined not to appear completely negative: they have themselves proposed a number of new articles, including the environment and technology.

12. A possible package that might form the basis for an agreed outcome could be:

- a) on decision-taking, agreement on a limited extension of majority voting under Articles 57(2)



and 100 for the removal of direct impediments to the free movement of goods, services, capital, workers and the professions, possibly coupled with agreement that the Council should lay down framework regulations unanimously (in considerable detail) in certain areas, with implementation thereafter by qualified majority voting (an adaption of the UK proposals at Milan);

b) short articles on technology laying emphasis on allowing firms to cooperate and on opening up the internal market. The framework/implementing regulation approach could be applied to technology, with specific research programmes requiring unanimity;

c) an article on the environment (nearly all other member states will want something in this field) which would not change the existing situation and which would spell out the need to balance industrial and regulation costs against environmental advantages;

d) a mention of the regional fund in the Treaty and an article providing for coordination of the

three structural funds to avoid overlapping waste
(this has been proposed by the French to defeat
the Commission proposals on "cohesion");

e) something on the Parliament;

13. The Italians, Commission and Benelux would not think such a package sufficient. But cooperation with the French and Germans so far in the conference has been good. Kohl and Mitterand will want something positive to be decided and may be interested in working for agreement on something like this basis, possibly leaving the detailed drafting to be settled in subsequent discussions.

TACTICS

14. The questioning approach we have adopted has served us well. We have been able to stimulate the French and Germans into firm opposition to the maximalist proposals from the Commission and others. We can continue this line in the Conference. It is in our interests to maintain uncertainty about our intentions. But we need to work with French and German officials and the Presidency in the coming weeks in



order to continue to "shrink" the package which is likely to be on the table in December and get it as close as possible to something we might be able to accept. Otherwise the French and Germans will probably reconcile their differences in a way which is unattractive to us and sell the result to the Presidency before the European Council.

15. I recommend that for some time to come, and probably right up to the European Council, your team should take the line privately with the French, Germans and Presidency that:

a) British Ministers and in particular the Prime Minister will not be able to take a view about a possible package of proposals until something much more modest and practical than is now on the table emerges;

b) the Prime Minister sees the Community's main tasks as getting on with the internal market and creating a climate in which European firms can compete effectively with Japan and the United States and will need to be convinced that any changes will help towards the attainment of those



practical objectives;

c) at official level, and without commitment, we are prepared to work to see whether a package on the lines of para 12 above might be acceptable.

On the Parliament, we should reject any arrangements which would not ensure that the last word remains with the Council.

16. When the Prime Minister sees Mitterrand (18 November) and Kohl (27 November), they will be beginning to focus on what should be done at the European Council. Our assessment is that their preferred option will be to make a "minimalist" deal with us, if they see that this is possible. Otherwise they will work for their own package. The Prime Minister will not need to commit herself about precise proposals, but will need to consider what signal to give to them.

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

Internal Market

1. The Commission's proposals (broadly supported by Italy and the Benelux):

- define the common market as Europe without frontiers
- set 1992 as the deadline for its completion
- introduce majority voting under ten Treaty articles for measures needed to complete it (including taxation)
- give the Commission extensive powers of implementation.

Member states would also "cooperate" over the free movement of persons, though this would not involve majority voting. This is an improvement on the Commission's first draft (largely as a result of pressure from France and Germany) but it remains a maximalist proposal.

2. The French proposals involve:

- a modest definition of the internal market
- an ambiguous reference to tax harmonisation
- a review of progress in 1990
- majority voting under Articles 100 and 57(2) where a majority of the members of the European Parliament vote in favour of a Commission proposal, or do not press amendments to it.

3. The Germans have agreed among themselves, but have not so far tabled, an amendment to Article 100 which would introduce majority voting for directives removing direct impediments to free



movement of goods, services, capital and workers. Unanimity would be maintained in other cases (including all tax measures) and member states would be protected against being outvoted on proposals which would force them to lower their safety, health or environmental standards.

Cohesion

4. The current Commission text:

- commits member states to convergence of living standards
- links this to completion of the internal market
- writes the Regional Fund into the Treaty
- calls for better coordination of the three structural funds in order to promote convergence
- extends the Community's borrowing and lending powers.

5. In addition to the ideas put forward by the Commission, the Irish have proposed that the development of a common policy on regional development should be included among the objectives of the Community, and that the implementation of all common policies should take the regional dimension into account.

6. The French proposals remove some of the worst aspects of the Commission text by confining themselves to providing a Treaty base for the existing structural funds, for greater use of loans, and for the coordination of all the financial instruments at the Community's disposal. The French have also proposed an amendment to Article 235 which would allow a degree of "differentiation" (ie variable geometry) on measures not affecting the internal market.

Commission

7. The Commission have made proposals which would automatically give them extensive implementing powers which the Council could only claw back by unanimity. The Dutch have proposed that while the Commission should as a general rule have delegated powers of



execution, this should require a decision of the Council on each occasion. There is little support for the Commission, but considerable support for the Dutch proposal, and for the Commission's further suggestion that management procedures should be rationalised.

8. The Dutch have proposed that the President of the Commission should be nominated by common accord after consulting the European Parliament, and that he should propose a team of Commissioners to member states. The Dutch have also proposed that the Parliament should hold an "investiture vote" on the membership of each new Commission (Italy has proposed a vote on its programme).

9. The Dutch have proposed that there should be twelve Commissioners instead of seventeen after enlargement - a long-standing proposal of our own.

Powers of the European Parliament

10. The Germans want to extend the existing list of articles under which the European Parliament has to be consulted, to introduce an elaborate consultation and conciliation procedure under selected articles which could take up to sixteen months to complete, and to introduce a new requirement that the Parliament should approve new accessions, agreements with third countries and Treaty amendments before any of these are ratified by national parliaments.

11. As well as majority voting on the internal market (para 1 above) the Commission have proposed a "cooperation" procedure under which the Parliament could approve, amend or reject texts voted on by the Council. Any text approved or amended by the Parliament on which the Commission had subsequently given a favourable opinion could then be adopted by majority voting in the Council; but unanimity would be required to alter the Parliament's amendments, override an unfavourable Commission opinion or adopt a proposal rejected by the Parliament. The



Parliament's agreement would also be required for Council decisions on a uniform electoral procedure, own resources, Treaty amendments and new accessions.

12. Under the Italian proposals the Council would not be able to adopt a text rejected by the Parliament. The Italians have also proposed that the Parliament should have a right of enquiry.

13. Under the French proposals on Article 57(2) and 100 (para 2 above) majority voting would be triggered by the European Parliament's approval of a Commission proposal. The French have also put forward separate proposals on Council/Parliament cooperation which would enable the Parliament to amend a Commission proposal, subject to the Commission's right to insist on its original proposal or to make a new proposal, and would introduce a conciliation procedure where the text adopted by the Council differed substantially from that recommended by the Parliament. In all cases the last word would remain with the Council.

Technology

14. The Commission's text on technology would permit the content and financing of individual R&D programmes to be agreed by qualified majority within a unanimously agreed framework which would include an estimate of the financial resources to be devoted to R&D. It would also enable the Commission to become more involved in national R&D. The French and Germans intend to insist on the maintenance of unanimity for decisions on new programmes. The Danish text concentrates on R&D programmes and exchanges of information, and is designed simply to write current practice into the Treaty.

Environment

15. The Commission have proposed new articles on the environment under which objectives would be decided by unanimity



but implementation would be by qualified majority. Apart from this, the text now reflects elements of the UK approach to environment policy: action should be based inter alia on scientific evidence, cost/benefit analysis of the measures proposed, and an assessment of whether action at a Community level could achieve more than measures taken by member states. The Danish text, which is limited to problems caused by trans-frontier pollution, is unlikely to prove a basis for serious discussion.

Aid and Development

16. The Dutch proposals attempt a definition of development policy and provide for majority voting on aid questions. They would also have the effect of giving the Community competence to represent member states in international development fora. The Danish proposals are more tightly drafted but still provide for majority voting. Neither proposal has aroused much interest.

Culture

17. The Commission's proposals would write cultural activity into the Treaty and envisage cooperation with other European countries. The Italians and Dutch have proposed minor variations.

Fundamental Rights

18. The Belgians have proposed preambular language to entrench fundamental human rights in the Treaty.

Miscellaneous Danish Proposals

19. In addition to their proposals on technology, environment and aid the Danes have put forward proposals on voting in local elections, energy, employment, the working environment, and participation by third countries in EC cooperation.



Structure of Final Act

20. The Commission have proposed that any treaty amendments resulting from the Inter-governmental Conference should be combined with the new agreement on European political cooperation in a single act which, however, would keep political cooperation outside the framework of the Treaty of Rome.

Economic and Monetary questions

21. Belgium and the Commission have said that they will table proposals on economic and monetary questions.