

Start 15.15.

Mitterand

Speech of welcome and thanks (incl. to previous Pres?)

Referred to informal personal bilateral.

Limit discussion to main decisions.

Order - arbitrary but logical, since some require new resources until the past has been "épuré". Have to get budget sorted out. If discipline achieved contributors will know where they stand.

1. Discipline
2. Problems causing imbalance
3. CAP
4. Own resources
5. Structural funds
6. New policies, incl. enlargement.

Discipline - Clear, courageous Com. proposals.
Discipline on all - DO + DND
Expenditure acc. to resources + not vv.
Main contributors need a guideline, an indication of how expenditure will develop.

Thom

Distinguish DO + DND

DO must not grow faster than OR. Can we agree "less fast"?

DND more difficult: EP vigilant. Increase has not been excessive.

Need framework - maximum. How concrete can we be in self-discipline.

Mitterand

limits on "cadre de référence"

Papandreu

Fix receipts first. Stay in INT 203 framework on DND. Seem to agree Pitt's approach. So long as we get 2%

Med. products need to be separately dealt with. EC must be more than a customs union.

Mitt. Discipline doesn't exclude new policies. IMPs are in Presⁿ text.

Kohl Presⁿ text remarkable. Work on it.

PM

Discipline essential for health of C¹³
Eng. text less clear than French text (en fonction de -
in the light of.)

Presidency paper excellent basis. But must be binding
on all, without prejudicing method at this stage, incl.
EP + Ag. Council. (Distrib. text of amendments.)
Rules in a regulation or otherwise in budgetary procedures.

Doesn't agree Kohl on rate of growth of ag. spending -
must be "markedly less".

Witter

Thank Pres? - Reasonable solution for all. V. good text.
Can't make it harder - would block & contradict Treaty.
Agree affect DO + DNO. Must subject C¹³ to discipline, but
keep sense of proportion. Only 2% of public spending.

Wiers

Good text. Discipline must be in accord with C¹³ rules.
Amend in sense of original Com. text on institutions.
Add after "cadre de ref" - "en fonction des politiques à mettre en oeuvre"

Gr

wants 5 year moving average on CAP exp. Agrees Belg.
on ref to Art 203. General reserve till with settled.

Woth

Thanks for preparatory work. Everything linked to everything.
Agree Mrs. Thatcher need certainty on discipline not guidelines. ||
But no parallelism C¹³/national budgets. Respect max. rate,
adapting to needs of new policies. Must be pre-budgetary
consultation with EP. Discipline must not prevent us achieving
the goals we set.

We'll talk about new policies later. Link discipline
and new own resources. New policies will be allowed for, but
we need principles. If no agreement on discipline, the
discussion can cease.

(End of discipline discussion).

19 03 1984

16 H 30

AMENDEMENTS DE LA BELGIQUE

(discipline budgétaire)

p. 8 4ème alinéa du point 1

" cela nécessitera un effort conjugué de toutes les Institutions dans le respect de leur pouvoir budgétaire respectif. Dans cet ordre d'idées, le Conseil Européen demande au Conseil de convenir avec le Parlement et la Commission une amélioration de la procédure budgétaire qui pourrait prendre la forme d'une consultation pré-budgétaire telle que prévue dans le document de la Commission relatif à la discipline budgétaire.

p. 8 point 2 1er tiret

" à fixer en début de procédure budgétaire en cadre de référence c'est-à-dire l'évaluation maximale des dépenses qu'ils estiment devoir retenir pour l'exercice suivant en fonction des politiques à mettre en oeuvre.

p.9 para 3

" Le Conseil Européen invite le Conseil des Ministres à prendre des mesures d'application des principes visés au par. 2 dans le respect des "dispositions de l'art. 203."

JN 631

Structural Funds

Andreotti

Text OK.

Genscher

No resources over + above Structural funds

Papandreu

IMPs need extra resources — from 1985

Pangalos

Text must go further than Stuttgart.

Genscher

1.4 new o.v. is enough. From 1.1.86 not before enlargement. So nothing for IMPs before then.

Schlüter

As soon as possible 1:1:85, 1.6% minimum.

Own Resources

Sri G. Howe

How much will enlargement cost?

Thom

We'll consume 0.2% quickly. Figures have all been wrong. 1.4% will be reached before we're satisfied. 1.6% is a minimum.

Coxi

↑ o.r. must be 1.1.85.

Kohl

We must continue Stuttgart neg-
Logical link with enlargement

ATGG

Agree text. But 1.4% too little: foolish
We'll be negotiating again. 1.8%
minimum.

Lubbers

If we have discipline DO will grow
less fast than o.r. Let's stick to that.

Mitt

Discipline fundamental.

Range 1.4 - 2.0%. Suggest 1.6%, with
1.4% to be passed only by unanimity.

Kohl

Agree Lubbers. Discipline must be taken
seriously. Mitt's suggestion not realistic.
I have to go to Bundestag. 1.4% is not
"foolish".

Mitt

Link o.r. / enlargement in text. We need
unanimity - I want 1.4%.

Coxi

This method of working is not right.

Pap

Confusion between discipline + enlargement.
Discipline doesn't mean limiting growth of C⁺.

Crazi

If we use the veto we won't get a solution.

Parlins

We need to decide 1.6% by unanimity.

P. H.

If parliament won't go beyond 1.4%. If we have applied L.H formula we won't need it.
1.4 is the maximum.

Andreotti

Take care of new policies.

H. H.

We've got lots of new policies. But some work nothing. E.g. Social area. Can't put a cost on them.
It's enlargement that matters.

20/3 Morning

(A)

0920

Howe }
Andreotti (p2) change last text - youth unemployment exp.

v.d Broek (p3) Wants something ^{more} on transport.

Andreotti Ask Transport Council to do something.

Fesch (p4) something stronger on EMS

Cheysson This is GLOFIA text.

Howe (pb) Ask AG Ministers to find solution to problems

Genscher Can't accept
Ready to accept AG this cond. Not a
new discussion of CAP

Cheysson Howe's idea not accepted

Andreotti Govt must give AG Ministers a margin of
manoeuvre -
Sugar ^{in wine} important for Italy. Agree Howe's
idea.

Cheysson What are we talking about? Our job is
to agree a text, where we can't - for EC to
take up.

Pampalos Greece hasn't accepted 5847 (170M3); only
5805. So I can't discuss.

Cheysson EC to approve AG Council conclusions.

Andreotti But there were reserves in council.

Cheysson Only agree conclusions & get ministers to continue.

Andreotti Can't play ping-pong like that

Cheysson EC's role is not to replace specialist councils.

Andreotti Important not to claim after EC that any particular point is agreed. Get AG ministers to continue.

Genscher Then we've nothing new to say.

Cheysson Appears not to get back into discussion on MCAs. Here we only confirm what of ministers have agreed.

Genscher agrees (then leaves to talk to Kohl).

Cheysson (p7.) - Interval while some PMs come + go. (Lankenshlager replaces Genscher)

Barron Can't accept with text

Pangalos Wants to be included on p 7.

Andreotti Reserve on 600 000 (?)

Fleisch Yesterday's discussion showed this very difficult. Push to destroy as ministers agreement

Howe If Ireland gets 400 000 tons must have something for N. Ireland

Cheysson (p8) Germans want text on NCAs out: already agreed. ... "member states" for FRG

Cheysson

Oils & fats tax.

Hone

Wants something on cereals prices

Cheysson

Already accepted by ag ministers

Hone

Yes but not as at Athens.

Cheysson

No Annex 5847 p3: all major products

Hone

Need something on cereal prices

Cheysson

Already agreed by ag ministers.

Fusch

Don't reopen agreed points

Cheysson

Doel has assured me these points are covered by COM 500.

Ortoli

Confirms

Cheysson

EC will resume at 11.00.

Ag ministers agreed after Athens: so overtake

Athens texts

Cheysson

(p9) Structural Funds.

Papadopoulos

~~for the Commission~~
wants (b) "coordination des actions"

[OK]

indicate only partially ~~covered by~~ cover Gk memo.

Genscher

- in framework of what can be financed - (p10)

(p9) can't accept 1985 for ITPs

Hone

significant

Cheysson

OK

(p11)

General UK reserve
L)

Add after "throughout budgetary procedure" "in accordance with Article 203"

UK amendment to para 3.

1145

Luttwak reopened transport text.

Belgium + UK support.

Com. proposal Council to decide.

Servot speeches about frontier controls + need to get rid (Kohl, Ditterand) - quite emotional.

Ditterand Space. Refer to Hague speech. We could mention that subject has been raised.

Not in competition with US. Commercial + communication factors NOT military

Greece All must take part. Nothing military

Kohl .
-
Not reserved, just a first discussion
Could have a defence aspect.
Nothing excluded.

Ditt
-
Let's stay exchange of views

Andreotti
-
Let's say v. little. We must be in vanguard of move against militarisation of space. Emphasise purely civilian character.

Ditt
-
Just say we're discussing + will discuss further, so that we aren't left out by USA.

- 9.00 Kohl - Dittmerand breakfast.
- 9.15 Foreign Ministers meet on text
- 11.10
- 10.15 Thabke Dittmerand, followed by James - Butler.
- 11.10 Dittmerand reports EC.

4 subjects to concentrate on:

- New own resources
- Irish milk
- IMPs
- UK problem

I have worked on it in detail this morning
 meeting with UK. Perry/UK approach working
 perhaps we could calculate on a
 figure of 1100. Lack of discussing amount shows
 everyone unable to make progress.

Brief session, then more negotiations outside (from 1145)

Lubbers Transport - see (E)

1145 Lubbers reopened transport text.
Chynoweth - Fri's agreed. Lubbers essential. New text.
Belgium + UK support. Pres

Kohl - For specialists. What people want is border functions.
Com. proposal Council to decide.

Several speeches about frontier controls + need to
get rid (Kohl, Mitterand) - quite emotional.
Mitterand I've advised France must take part in liberating border

Chynoweth * Kohl something on border controls too.
Mitterand Space. Refer to Hague speech. We

could mention that subject has been raised.

Not in competition with US Commercial + communication
factors NOT military

Greece All must take part. Nothing military

Kohl
-
I'm reserved. Just a first discussion
Could have a defence aspect.
Nothing excluded.

Deff Let's say exchange of views

Andreotti
-
Let's say v. little. We must be in
vanguard of move against militarisation
of space. Emphasise purely civilian
character. (difficult if only 1.4% !!)

Deff
-
Just say we're discussing + work from
further, so that we aren't left out by
USA

Budgetary Discipline

Cheyron Can't have rules in Fin Reg^s. : self discipline.
Only outstanding point UK request; procedures

DK IKL GR approx sq. brackets

Marlin Art 203 end of §2.

G.H. insist on UK version of §3 - essential to carry out
Stuttgart agreement.

Papa What is all this about budget discipline? (1)

Cheyron Can we find alternative to "budgetary procedures"
Try "pratiques" (+ other alternatives)
Lang discussion Cheyron / Thakker.

J.H. Lunch 1315. Suspend till 1500. Run conference 1830 or
later.

Kohl Not much time. Don't talk about important things,
not space.

Craxi Don't interrupt meeting.

Mitterand Those who are hard-working win. We work through.

— The 4 problems: OR, milk, IMB, + UK problem.
Start with milk. Kohl why not with something we
can agree. Pitt Increase reserve to 1m. + 40 new
for Ireland. For UK 1 billion - UK want 1.5 bn.

Kohl Can't find sol. Ireland but the

~~12/11~~

need a figure of 99.2 m. tons for 1984.

Thakker Can we have a new paper on budg. imbalances?

Pitt No method agreed yet: several figures on table - 900, 1 m. 1322.

FitzG. Can't accept Puss^y prop. on milk.

Milk

1530 FitzG. Proposal agreed with Pres? went beyond text
—
84 = 84 + 260 000 + conditions (to be reviewed in light of market developments)

NL + UK Rejected.

FitzG. This was a personal suggestion - last effort.

Mitt. Everyone, at the extreme.

- 3 cases - reduced
- maintained (It. Lux)
- slight increase (Ireland)

FitzG Can't accept. Can take a risk for future but can't go lower than I have. Everyone getting something. Vital interest. Involvement for first time. Can't negotiate.
(FitzG left)

1600

Long interruption to study new text.

Imbalances

Discussion on text of 1500

- 1615 Mitt Agreement on system, let's talk figures.
- P.M. Let's talk system ~~fig~~ first.
- Werner (+ later Fusch) Difficult to accept "present formula"
- Andreotti Agreed with Mitt's position at Athens: transitional.
I want a pragmatic solution. Problem with our parliament too. Against Treaty
- Mitt Let's not bandy words. We're talking duration + amount. I agree it's not in spirit of Treaty, but let's not be too purist.
- Papa Agree Andreotti. ~~front~~ ^{Prefer} expenditure side solution, ad hoc.
- Mitt OK but it's now 6 years. We've got the habit.
- P.M. I've fought for 5 years for this. Must have equity, system.
- Mitt Don't concentrate on words.
- Andreotti OK benefits from C⁺. (New agreement on colza) Can't accept permanent.
- Mitt We're correcting: linked to o.r. operation.
- Schäfer Understand difficulties of others.
- Fontenay Difficulties for us, too.

1945

Mitt
 —
 Summarizes proposals

Schmidt
 —
 1 billion today not later

Plank
 —
 agreed

Lubbers
 —
 agree: 5 yrs. 1000.

P.T.
 —
 av. of 4 yrs - 1100 can't have less. must
 have mech.
 1000 84
 1250 '85 on '83 figures.

Werner
 —
 800, no more.

Craxi
 —
 Kohl's idea ok

Hove
 —
 We want a defensible result.
 Greek net benefit 900, Italy 1300/1600.
 Go to 1250
 Cost 1500 is total of all these elements

Pap.
 —
 Contexts Hove's figures

Kohl
 —
 repeats 1000 x 5

Barr
 —
 agrees

Hove
 —
 we're told that 1250
 + 1000 comp. 1650 base would be 77% - not right
 figure. Take 2000. It's in figures of last 4 years
 1000 + 1250 → is lower than 1320 easy for 9 to pay

Lubbers
 —
 Stuttgart was recog. of trip pay but don't
 exaggerate our generosity.

PM
 —
 I accepted 750 because 2/3 over 4 years.
 If we can't go further dramatic - Tim
 87. F.T.s to meet in 10 days

Lubbers
 —
 1000 is real effort. Understand you like 2/3. Take
 1000 1000 = 2/3

Craxi Agree Kohl - Many like it, did not like Pöhl's formula.
How can we make progress by putting to FTAs.
How can we go beyond what I agree?
How can we have another neg. result?
UK to move.

Thatcher 1600 wrong base -
1000/2000 is not enough.
Others than 3 net contributors should make effort.

Schmitter ^{Pöhl} Accept/disincline text if we go to Kohl proposal. A
major concession for us. Complete acceptance

Mitt All to say what their position is.

B Kohl prop.
Thom Think just too tough.

Can we asked to propose
1000 x 2 the new or the system, giving 1000-1200

Mitt That gives durability. 5 years enough. Kohl
model proposal - I'm tied.

Werner Kohl's proposal.

Craxi "
Ireland "
France "

Kohl maintain position.
Schmitter agree Kohl,

P.A.C.S. Explain by text.

M.T. 15 95.8M, incl. when, ok

P.A.C.S. Yes

F172: But excluding Ireland

P.A.C.S. Yes.

GENSEN: We shall accept by this text.

M.T. Shedes 20 with text.

Advs:

If Ireland was to take some other
to the rest they need 335,000 com
extra. If we had also that the
matching process needed for N.I.

Italy + France have some other.
then UK to they have no real choice

Pos. Let us recall FRC proposal: clear
general reserve - by let proposals +
link problem.

LULLAS: when are we?

M.T. " " " what day should we
agree on

LULLAS: major reservation on by let conclusions

- (1) must read conclusions on text
- (2) must conclude in favor of Lullas
proposal a variety of possibilities
- (3) let go beyond general reserves
of the same family

KONL:

Can't be done at this point
+ give a view of the compromise
Use the books - brief, structured - can
be taken later.

CRAXI:

If 2+2 makes 5, don't see how we can
fit all this in Ag. mins agreement.

Beyond that we had various other reservations.
- elimination of 10% bonuses has to
be done gradually.
For the rest, it's a delicate balance: we
don't leave it

PAP:

Already a reasonable compromise
But now it is yet agreed - have
report in N.Y. H.T.: least 2-3 hours
Obviously, that's not for our comfort
But a general point: Northern firms
go on all 10% decrease, yet Ag mins
have proposed extra spending of 608 m ECW
in '85 > 864 m ECW

PRES:

I don't want this problem to be dealt
with now. But I want Ag. mins compromise
to be accepted. They've agreed a good deal
- except for oil & gas rate + this problem
Obviously this will leave a budgetary gap.

MOR:

But that's fine. There was a reserve of 6 m tons,
without allocation. We have to give a price
only to this - not negotiating when the reserves
gone

TUORW.

All these things involve a reduction in savings - gives details a familiar line

Pres:

True. But Ag. has been agreed, with our authority.

Obviously, I retain my general view.

So let's accept their proposals

- subject to the means already stated

AND:

For good reason that we shall go on all this ground again, we'll get minimum satisfaction - we don't have to cut on production. But we're hoping for that about 10.000 tons + price for milk has also been reduced.

So we're making no problem on this:

but N.B. note is made to Ag. has of our view. We're entitled to

- 356,000 tons : year 1

- 400,000 tons : year 2

Pres.

We agree

LUBSON

But 100,000 was fixed. And all that was recorded was under a different condition.

We can't even discuss it from now, + say that this problem will be resolved outside that.

My idea + that 7,200 is that all these problems must be dealt with in .6 m. Those who want > .6 m are

going beyond the agreed 1 Ag. Col. We can

Pres:

Erasmus is right

356 for Italy leaves 250 for rest:
When to go? Lux request. Irish request.
Greek request - at different order.
How fit in?

We've always ~~said~~ said summit
will deal with this

M.7:

We can't go beyond .6M.

Our sample is already larger than others.

Can't go beyond that.

Co. not being want help us out.
What is the money coming from?

We also have more on Bretton
+ that. need: let that's 200 details
for this meeting.

Wom:

We also have more on Bretton

M.7. right is saying no money.

But it's no .8M right little the whole
why not?

LURBEM:

Of .6M, put 50% to Ireland +
50% for the rest

Then a technical discussion as to whether we
need further resources for Ireland, not leading
to > introduction but to within their
guidelines: call at 1 FEBGA

F172

Labour proposal cut reduce on
products by 400,000

Quite unacceptable

Supposing what main other comes from UK.

Mustang or similar with policies

That was cause of our problem

We cannot move away from this
market demand so much like average,
by increasing our output at same rate as
we have grown in recent years

PROS.

I'm not trying to forecast this debate

WEAVER

We're repeating the 1972

On M.7's figures, we're reducing our production
at rate which is better than the others

I'm not asking for any special figures,
just that special handling cases that
to decide all

LURSON

Qn to F172

What's cost? How long for? Product price

In Italy: is it fair to look for
full union, when we're reducing

One country says you cut output by 20
take part, but we haven't grown as much;
the other says we cut out back, but
we haven't grown as much

MARTON

I'm glad to endorse Paddy's case
- slight to the other ~~strong~~ language
points

M.7:

Don't see how we can manage reserves
Cos we're running away from need to cut
money.

Quadruple figures a share of FLOTT money
or more

Don't see how we can solve this in
the way suggested

We must be prepared to discuss a
one quarter package

CRMA:

Index part is unacceptable to us.

What is part in M7's intervention?

Ag. being needed against. How now
impose the

Prog:

We'll have to ask for. This is
the to look this at

Oil + fertilizer?

Kom: No

M.7: No

Exp. fr. It. Italy Lux - Yes

N.L. No.

D.H. No

MCM

Gowson. Agree by. more text

- M.T. (1) How much control to general?
- (2) Phasing out over 3 years

PAOS: Surely agreed by Ag. miss? Why not accept

Sen Luonn.

One major point still outstanding:
 Size of EC control to FRC program
 Attached (1) 3 years: 1/2 depreciation
 Size of EC control to FRC would be
 based on no program not being done

LUBSON:

We agree with MCA proposal.
 Also with 2 basic points
 Important not to get rid of MCA too fast:
 Control to allow loan to make proposal

MARRONS:

Proposal to accept compromise

ORZOW:

No other proposals a MCA will
 command better
 All changes will cost some money.
 But this does allow us to cope
 This allows loan to make a proposal
 It'll have to be a funded proposal;
 + it'll need a qualified majority,
 which will be difficult to reach
 We've the fund in last 2 years.
 Annually used to be automatic.
 No hope. Prop. of funding is
 in early. We still have - or MCM.

On game question

- is FOC bound to demonstrate interest rates?
This case leaves that open. I'd think it
to be irrelevant especially - a decreasing
FOC aid. Bagui share

- that EC finance aid, probably more?
Not amount. left for. But asked to be
repeated. '75 '78 - decrease. '77 by 10%
but this game is not for now

PROS: Less chance to provide this.

Common will examine
Council will decide

CONS: suggest we stick to agreed text.
Will give me no major difficulties in
our country.

This is a sensitive bit to be handled to under.
Suggest we learn the text ~~and~~ unchanged
- without any change to what is said in
game without

PROS: MEM - a basis of Ag. this proposal,
what is at issue is procedure for game.
So will only raise this point with
as whole Ag. proposal the job

Structure funds:

G.M.: states "substantively"

- Kohl:
- ① better agreed. with the contracts imposed by banks in real money
 - ② What was budget cost really means in a narrow sense 1.1.86

- Andreas:
- ① Date has to be as stated
 - ② Challenge meaning of 'substantively' + given address

Consensus: As Kohl

PAP: All this is with. must be in place ahead of budget output

PACT: His comment. What he says is what we have in mind. Even if 1.1.86 stands - in our view, as it had - ed. includes 1MP stat.

PANORAS: Need separate provision for 1MP in structure funds. And for funds memorandum

O/R.

G. E. W. S. C. A.: O/R decision has to come into force
on budget not later. NA > 1.4%

S. C. A. S. C. A.: 1.6% 1-1985

G. U.: Brit: B(84)(5)

§ 10, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

T. H. O. R. N.: To limit on various taxation to 1.1.86,
unless no provision for your overhead.

And budget is not overestimated in
C. A. S. C. A. paper. We got force wrong.

To 200 this time

And think it is taken for any further
increase to be put in there

Perhaps 2% is too much.

C. R. A. M.:

Our various views that to be linked to
budget, that's not true given us.

Can accept Brit. case for understanding
+ that being forward date to 1985

On overall - we in charge with that C. A. S. C. A.
problem: we now will accept a compromise

K. O. N. L.:

Caution apply early date

Role of pass. Country would not leave
Pass out. Budget would not add costs. But
was the act. I don't mind.

But we must expect Pass to add by some
device. One country is asking to reduce
its own deficit from 12 to 7% so we can
expect Pass to do the same.

Note that today we are not trying to
legislate for war.

So we do budget imbalances.

Go through text

"Extensive trade" has been challenged

LUBBERS:

Budget discipline - I don't think a state -
is nice ~~to~~ balance.

Warning on budget imbalances. It's a
symptom of danger in our. No words to
suggest

GENSINGER

We must not have a system that does
in possible decision against. Much to
our credit here.

(1) Do you know the of 2 which had
system so one which state is not right:
perhaps replace "one" with "any" [It's
already in Pres. text: 6d]

② Second budget add - "time & which countries comes into force"

③ Ask him what it means to make detailed proposals for this to be decided by June.

WERNER:

We can agree with next proposals

One exception:

- budget or admin. ext.

Current policy is aimed at lowering burden on various states in various budgets. This is increasingly moving away from old ideas: let new thoughts - meaning impact on public countries & not just public. policies but impact of admin. expenditure.

Obj's We get 950% of our revenue from admin. extend + 2% from other sources

Let us say - admin. extend should not be taken into A/C & d

PACO:

This was just to meet your point that we include this.

but it has work in down outside + but in thinking with great help

WERNER

To show good will, it is no further work to say, I'm ready to withdraw my own & will you say

M.7:

Sheets to cost.

cost: bid for 4-500 or less demand

Pract.

Make P.M. for working to clear.

P.M. train the hard copy in an clear
copy of this book in history & language

Not shall have copies in use a new
the that!

New cost will be produced

AND.

Don't challenge need for a change.

But N.B. under 78 we were not contacts.
to Budget.

We mostly said that those who control more
the to a than in city extent.

We do the better, i.e., to work at new policies

But in discussion, there was the a movement
in the direction - a consolidation of the
law.

I think this cost is not a beginning, but
an end a process.

I think people of equity - many according
to ability - is right. But T wants it.
And do this.

Must also make clear that no state that
get computers for cost or enlargement. Other
that this will be paid by some + not by
others.

Confess this to hand or around VAT
key: no exception

We can look at another side
But seems to me that passing rule is
reasonable embodiment of position that
has been adopted

On duration, we should have those
types by Pres. but as time, let not
institutionally an exception. I believe
it can be done. But in the end
whether this a permanent basis
democracy has not been a problem

PANCIOS.

Letter Andreotti.

This side. Only acceptable if
on temporary basis

For us to agree to cooperation is a
conclusion already.

If we agree to settle properly, we
should also settle the actual the control
made by others

PRES.

And's had taken it by agreement is
an important one

TINDERMANN

I can accept that as it is

On trade price, limits + duties
belong as a right to Italy. Rotterdam
effect, Union standard
value in Italy

Pres:

long term not for the sake of P.O.B.
But we can't let City life depend on 3rd countries

F172:

Buoyancy is not to last, -∴ Crisis + values
grow less fast. Demand strength on likely
to fall as rise. Threat declining in
that sense.

L. VASCOM:

Like without case we're making. If we're
making rules to describe ourselves, why
that expenditure grow so fast: 1.4%

P.O.C.:

3 x 1.4%
Comm - 2
Lone - 1.8%
Suggest. 1.6% : not beyond 1.4% unless
Council unanimously agrees to do so

KOHL:

1 year with Lullus.
Way of what this says.
Why is (F172) "1.4% max"?
If we take on self-describes seriously,
the 1.4% is enough.
If we have budget describes, then we that
take it seriously
I would want 1.6% with safeguard.
Warning is necessary further who go over
we're cheap another kind which budget
+ income in our reserves.
There will not be that budget state yet.
Have to have some regard for my own people

I have no law regard for those in FOC
who regard FOC as hypothesis & Guide
Please note my honest sincerity
Things can get out of hand.
Have to take decisive standing

Pres: If no agreement, I'll have to propose a procedure
- in a minute

think with budget - if you want more flexibility,
what can be done

As no procedure, in light of law. I have no
other lower figure: 1.4%

I'll see if we can go to 1.5%

Not committed from here.

If 3 don't go beyond 1.4, we can't go
beyond that

CRAI: That takes ALL states on par basis

Pres: 1.4 is highest at which we can get unanimity

PAP: Long piece: policies must determine expenditures

CRAI: I certainly understand how it works. But it

will be necessary to look a part of balance.

I think you can find one when FOC will not be
considered upon

To try to look agreement.

Pres: PACE has no ruling this. To a de facto one

MARRONS.

I feel uneasy.

I favour discipline.

But we have Lewis agents, which must be taken seriously.

So lets look again at yr. horizon: 1.4; the 1.6 or uncertainty.

M. 7.

Can't get them any part.

We're going to 1.4 now: business.

I can't get 1.4 the other way on 2 conditions.

Key worry is that 1.4 is strange. Still max.

Pros:

I would give up bond for carbon.

So lets start a re flow, when 3 variables are willing to increase.

But after what I've heard > 1.4 will be difficult.

And:

But we can do one or two things with part.

So lets look at new policies, the above figure.

Pros:

See paper.

No figures emerge from that.

Can't cost them at all.

What will cost money is

- enlarge
- IMF
- few odds + ends in new policies

But no working

Ans.

But then an algorithm over a no. of years.
 Can just take A/C of foreign cost in
 fixing new old costs

CONCL.

We want to advance further.
 But we need to advance the policy.
 But yet what do we see at frontiers?
 Only difficulties for ordinary citizens.
 Why do we have monetary rules.
 All citizens pay taxes; why rules on work?
 But what does the infrastructure mean?
 I think we should have to let business to this.

P.3 (1) economic & technical:

NA "adequately" but

"examined with a view to adopting"

(2) Increase the threshold -- R+D

- only stable if we know what

we're hoping for

(3) What is lacking is "facilities

cross-frontier co-operation"

Kone (m)

[Point missed]

Decreasing incentives to learn foreign languages in the schools. What cost money to do > a shot.

PROS:

I can reduce risk of government.

Other things can reflect that point

- cost to deliver w/ delays
- amount:

This will cost money, but not the cost

And budget

So all will pass at a 1.4%

As to whether this means we going beyond that, I'm not going to comment

should forget date

LUB:

P.Lt. I believe that'll cost nothing

Agreed - certain projects will be done any way over 5 years, according to program to be adopted by the house by ... '84

Wishwar:

Wishwar on 600

PROS:

It takes up to other means available, outside budget: .4%

3 central issues have remain

- ① Income is VAT - not the kind of problem but it is a difficulty
If you have, new business, budget, etc can be adjusted
- ② Comparison to 2 countries or more, UK situation. But it is the theme 'in this is a problem
- ③ Another, all same companies, but will happen.

There can not be a break on way.

M.T. think fin. guidelines.

Res: I think we're agreed in principle

PAP: what are med. products?

Pres: Surely agreed by Ag. mins. med. products
Can only know a basis to new programmes.

PAP: We need agreed e.g. a cotton. etc
There is/was no agreed in Ag. Dec.

Pres: I was convinced there was.
I have not agreed a 1971, when British
products are sold more

AND: We cut down upon in 1964

- or:
 - Colony human
 - Thyphoid human

We're in favor of passing all colony human,
with national auto

We can't do this better weighting
of the books

Post: During conversation at Nagpur, I had first - known
 which amount interest: my proposals or those
 Study proposals for a suitable share schedule
 Based upon proposals for ~~some~~ ~~handbook~~
 in a known share schedule
 But, it is, before funds are gathered, it will take
 10 years

The 2 projects that really capable will cost the
 credit in financial terms

Unfortunate if Bank don't loan the one project
 of this kind. Going into the details.
 Inadequately for the future, need for military purposes
 We did discuss military matters too

PAP. I - think, we don't disagree. But she catches
 that in other to handbook. Non-military:
 pleasurable business also

IND. Absolutely. When I spoke with it in 1962, I had
 that in mind
 10 year is a long time - except for W. comm!
 So we should get on. Answered and found this

WONE: Don't let's bring in ideology of disarmament.
 I'm not prepared to say that disarmament needs
 are right at the question.
 We're all parties to ECSC
 I think we should continue to examine this as
 lets not try to achieve exactly what we
 want

Pres.

We can indicate we've had this
exchange of views. She has at least a
major role indicate that we've discussed this

And:

Agree - tho' I don't know how we're going
to finance these programs in the city

Defense implications w. be important for
E+W; r for EC/US relations

If us can develop its defense ~~budgeting~~
sanctions in this way, EC have to
be adversely affected. So we should be at
least aware of them looking to be making
use of space.

But we should stress the primary civilian
nature of our interest. For it is in EC's
interest

Pres.

This isn't the problem. So I hope
that for sake of public opinion we should
stress that we're discussing this, so that
we're not subjected to their willies

C.C.

Both aspects. Explain our objectives

G.Y.

Explain our attitude.

E.J.

This is broader which is v. different in
nature. We're talking about both. Defense.
That's manifested in our declaration under
Article 3. Its meaning + interest
= 2

F. 72. Introduction.

PAP:

- ① Both a type II in []s in case ambr.
Int. decision - Art. 73 flows - that is to say
- ② Regard form of is substance. Policy varies
from early to early. Shall delete
§ 1 "which" -- to state
- ③ Delete "as a function" in § 2
- ④ § 2, second indent
"and after "of which"
" + thinking case"

MANNING

Justifying 1. Syntact a ambr to
report Art 203

mind at end of last indent
of § 2 "in connection with Art. 203"

F. 1000:

- ① Fully without this after to "body of law"
avoids after to regulation.
But don't meet a point
Regulation requires role for Part.
UK ambr requires us (Col) to which
on with a Part. We can't do that.
We can't change Art 203
- ② We Regu after to Art 203

Prm:

Prm:

- ① ? milk
- ② 1.4 → 1.6 in 88 a main qst
- ③ grub - has 9+10 qst
Now ~~make~~ a new system product product

Boys interview:

UK has proposed new values a draft

Boys interview:

UK has proposed 1322 accus

None

Now u copies u u

- ① links : 98.2 after 2 years
99.2 in first year
- ② 1.4 for 1.i.84; 1.6 for 1.i.88 with unusually, acceptable
- ③ ~~links~~ in UK links
 - embedded in system?
 - how ~~to~~ log to last?

M.7.

Embedded in system

Prm:

Let's deal with milk first

Fizz

Quite unacceptable
 16 ds. have revised a quantity of some products
 Lux got down to own

Prm:

No the same for Lux

We've made plan for last week & hold
or our books.

This was in manuscript

Prog.

Let's discuss our time

VAT in 2 stages

Lubent.

hills

- serious injuries

- let proposal to consider being looked at 83 figure
but that was by lot to consider whether to receive
600,000 to 1 m or last program

I can go back with this letter

I want share - 1.4/1.6 part

then

C.4. ① above > 600,000

② .. 1.6 step

WONL:

Delays in it have just as difficult for us.

But we can justify second step by refer
to enlargement: 1.6 for enlargement; 1.8 for
restructure

Everyone knows they can block any further
mission

What will you get for it? clear

hills: for speakers I'm hoping, what's
hollow is remarkable. Now we can
call a nothing. Can we collect
what we get for 4 m can do with

1000 p.m.

1. Risk program.

- 1.1- Unit = 83 Level + 260,000 tons
for future year will be reviewed in light
of market + production schedule
- The Louis review is not yet available

M.7: So value has gone for '6 to 1.3m

F172: buy production can differ & not have
production a specific added firm for 85

$$\begin{array}{r}
 674 \\
 260 \\
 \hline
 934 = 250m
 \end{array}$$

NL. Check and

DU We must allow for 83 units + 40 million
MO mm

- Pres: 3 parts:
- ① those who are active
 - ② pricing
 - ③ ~~total~~ total which will be more, plus recovery of
- Intend to start and mean solid cross
You will have 100,000 + 50 million

F172

1 in broken water a mistake in by 260,000
 = 5% growth: that is average of last 10 years.
 Last 2 yrs was 8,9%.
 For future 1.44 rate with a rising rate in hands
 of Ag. Colleges
 Look at my share of N2 bills.
 I have depend less on my land
 End of road as far as I'm concerned.

Gowen.

Was a lot of hands to test

PAGE

What is her is what I spend, off
 business with 1000 command, as to system
 0- figures, UK starts from 2000.
 buy on was 1000
 M.7 said like we had to keep job
 We now have 1322 put forward.
 Other don't want.
 Are we going to go back on working you
 or find new begin
 (Sain, last night, what I go with it
 - 900, 1000, 1100
 I am number one, come the other
 system.
 What put?

Defense Committee - 2017

W Spore: Why does funds a education?

PAES: That means we know when we are
This is a funds issue.

FLYSEN: The early impetus was not in the
context of a system. So it had some
objection for the students.

We helped you out. We had been
at the time of the matter.

PAES: "Funds" don't matter
- but "teacher"

AND: I feel I understand what a teacher is
We need to talk about the other side
should be for us at others.

Looking in very pragmatic way the
teaching process. a country was in

V. difficult for us to accept this kind
of funds

Some people have looked for a system that
+ the a system

So we have v. considerable resources that this
this is turning eyes people it really

If we want to accept this course, this
on basis of products. But not to have
the right one. V. want ~~the~~ others

PAES:

you're supposed to be looking for it

Tracy & Rose. I know

If I could kindly inform you, I'd have been

to. Maybe. so just find what you

Today by the way I've been busy to O.R. down

& remind you the

I'm trying to help you.

If really a really, I'd agree with you.

But frequency is much in.

3 years ago I heard. But with that all was said

I'm not being precise, I think we can now

find a way here

GR:

We say it has to be ad hoc.

And a standard, not a measure

PAES:

Ad hoc is right. It addresses the idea

A frequency. That's what we've

done since 1980

M.T

Can't go on with ad hoc, frequency
alone.

Not correct is what we have to do

We must be able to get the

Even with right figs, will still be

not correct

How to have right

PAES

Is the right the correct?

But they don't work

Ans. We've not done a thing yet.
 Can't try it without if we have this
 We have time to make a smaller figure
 We're not as fast as we were But that's
 still not.
 We're willing to make time there for this
 This is different
 This is

PROS. 1. the cost all in fact is
 Consider as definite it is
 And back as by as common factor
 Can we say that? from what
 it's a system or a model
 We have that then

DLK Fundamentals come from broadly speaking to
 And + Pros is one with them
 But we will give no details together
 is based on a unit to have a system,
 to avoid as missing out on the steps

- 2 parts
- ① VAT basis dropped in - a major
 concern to UK home: great
 concern to our union
 - ② "What sort of reform" may be
 relevant by a cutting a budget:
 fundamental principle. Variable
 all principles

MARRONS:

I shall return to test this morning.
The effort in work being asked to make
this ~~way~~ a.m. was a reasonable one

PIB figs 9081 mdu BELG - 100 + 250
• 8052 " " UK - 94

So what's the case?

W.A. is intended to curb a world, by the

- ① Why is UK at 12?
- ② Why return to our previous position & not
to expansion?
- I'd like old position to remain
- ③ What's meant by figures? If official
mechanism, we have arrived at a
figure

PROX:

Refer to UK at 12 after to present a budget

Our previous position is intended: during
supply to countries, we know what has to
And the following paragraph

Why refer to '85? Got in that
know figs for 84 yet

MARRONS:

Refer will be made to the
Conference: should refer. That's
democracy.

ALPH:

But how is not - settled
So talk to figure.

Pras (w)

On the way to find figure

UK said ⁵⁰⁰ £B, which is not valid
We said 1B

Belgium same 2 figures they UK said 1.322

G.M.

Explain 1322

Gen. Summ.

UK can do 500 £B; FRG a bit at 700

We should hope that this mechanism will
allow to other countries

- need some coding or no liability

DK

Get back

Pras

FRG are just pulling down a market

Get report FRG in March, to check
the UK to risk of which they must
be clear.

Kone.

DK can do business by this. We
have to look at all figures. If look
at us here, compare with UK - the
figures are quite astounding.

When we had 250 in 1964,

our contract was cut by 50%.

- from 36 to 18%

UK demand = 486 M £U for us,
on + above what we already pay.

That was more what largest contract
was. In paying almost 1/2 B to
second largest

If you work as no controllable fully, that's answer.

1- the husband is driving the extent of the control.

You can't give more than all the control.

One point is that we're the main contributors

1- FMI working on based various figs. Another date.

Is the firm its last word?

There's still last holder

And: ~~Person~~ + more controlling of when we are.

If take A/C of ~~control~~ + loans + debts,

when we are?

Already including the firm's debt book

We'll need a Marshall plan. Stick to 1 B

Pres: If ~~the~~ we had followed the world,

we would have this domestic book

But they took in ~~the~~ loans + debts

We're looking forward in doing this

Any action on 1 B?

~~ARM~~

CRMX

How can FMI program to help?

Kene

0- loans of 1 B, A/C then is 36%

1- shifted in it in 1870

0- what loans - 1 B debt program have.

1- we go > 1870 but not full 36%

1- we have 60% = 21.6% = 21.6 under
21 B.

● CRMA: I am this ∴ it F&E says that, the
will have to pay more
That will make it harder for us to consider I.R.V.

Scenarios.

■ Thought a probably work, with
lowest normal VAT key

It is a simple F&E system that
for compensation - a new system. Let
think that up. An option.

But when that F&E that is needed
for the system is highly not possible
for domestic cases.

Our intention is that we have no mandate.

We must find a solution - but cannot
move away from normal VAT key.

PRM:

But we have hundreds

We could 500k when it was there.

Which was all 60% now.

M.T.

In view for go. v. voluntary efforts which
1000 is not enough.

Still leaves us with 900/1000: 200 million

When I hear others saying that the
than when others, I'm worried
about how big the burden is

1000 is not enough

LV 11000

There is a problem for UK.

But we can't expect the whole amount.

We need a system around UK

- + that's what we're asking

As to amount, we said 850
was our figure

We wanted to give you more idea
of the problem

We assumed FRC ready to pay the sum.

We now have not 100% , tho' > 50%

More M.T. will also make that as far

As what level can we avoid which
thing becoming bogged down?

If we were to default from 850, perhaps
not very long before insolvent

I suspect M.T.'s remaining but it is
still a real danger, we would like
to get the deposit return FRC + D.H.
So we must be careful.

We must start probably you are doing

Howe: We have no doubt all R.M. time,
not the FRC figure. Can't risk
what looks like a boom.

FRC from what to give ~~the~~
Charles Kings.

P.A.C.: Give the B.W., who's going to
pay what, give from from.
My opinion is R.M. not to be taken
to pay 2/3rd

D11

PROCS.
~~QUESTIONS:~~

You've said I'm not in the group.

But don't forget FR

Let's look

1835

(E1)

KOHL:

Dramatic moment in context


U. informed by developments not to mind a certain
promises. But I'd be v. worried if we failed
for me Burke is v. important. If we were ~~for~~ backwards,
that'd be v. bad.

See Washing + Time. + consider the implications
Laid effort why is devoted in 25 years like other
countries have done in 100 or 200 years

To have another failure not not to go on.

We're all under samples. Why frame is
unavailable

We should be asking ourselves what is possible
for decision with all that to put that
I suggest 10000 for 5 years - perhaps on
ordinary basis. No doubt that that



So, thought, that was the good part for you.

It's the difficult for you + you Paul. But
other have more too.

You're getting security for 5 years period

I'd like to offer 200 for the least, maybe
perhaps we can look for a few months to consider
If we have with you, the company will be
unavailable. We'd be the largest stock to the
world. Europe not be v. little. But for all
help in this

for business of Adam. You at University.

Other of Space, Adam. So I offer

- ① System
- ② Admin - LUB
- ③ VAT train - Concerning both ways
- ④ Refund has been ~~deducted~~ City, but then is a than 7.11
- ⑤ Why City of 12?
- ⑥ Why didn't we see returns down
+ not till exhaustion.
- ⑦ Why is 84 first by 86? Includes 7.11
Anticipate '86

2 meaning a business. They had come about
in mind. I do estimate but about
long time to find a trade offer

M. 7.

1 then Europe about

Forgot to check on it.

Refund to give a good deal

We've done a lot. but with the books,

MCA, co. with. long. Refund to

take on that of costs of interest.

ESpirit.

V. flexible. Taxes another man.

Paid man.

But just check on paper A 1000

We've worked a man on this machine,

will what it says about machine

The overall result of the combine machine

is the part of 2/3: 1/3.

LOU A. , if we have double machine - OLA,

Agree it will be my series - later.

We can make a flat sum. There is to
a mechanism

Included for work and in agreement.

Suggest a track.

PAP: More said in State for the delegation
All agreed to the 1.6% for 5 years.
No. No margin for maneuver

100
PRES.

Zulu

UK - 1322

Boko - 1100

The FAC said they look at by the ~~and a month by the~~
of the 1000 minutes and.

Now?

There's UK broadcast 1300 - 1100 then by the
+ FAC broadcast 1000 x 5 + by the after that
I've not heard of any other

Senecoman

by me is the 1000 is a hour
Morris, I think in that leave after a
table. 11.00 to discuss for us to justify
at home.

I suggest this the copy to write
have been + notable conditions on
the next 5 years

Other available today. Can still see
that next time round.

Can still do that next time + start
moving it.

PRES:

There's one problem. But my whole
discussion but his role the leave

MARRIAGE

1000 for 5 yrs

LUBBERS

We can 850, we can still 1000

M 7

Avge for last 4 yrs

- figures given

Rebonds 2/3 : 1/3

Average spend was 1100

You'll understand why we found volume is declining with spend less this year.

So our whole in the is rather less than previously

Can't tell what the 100 1000 was

- + asking for > our revenue

Wait the 4 yrs

That's my brother

must have considered marketing - this year

Ed. we have

'84 - 1000 m

'85 m - 1250m on '83 figures will happen

WEAVER

Fatig Alc & determine to

Back home @ 1000

We don't know how figures will work at our next 5 years.

This is surely what most all of us are worried

PAP

Maybe 800 was ok.

Revised home's position

perhaps that was fair

There can be argued that as fair

CRAM: This home was v.

G.M.: Our proposal

PANLAW: Challenge on figures

PROS: Substantly in Kone's proposal

1000 m for 5 years + after that
conversion mechanism

1250 and for 77% or 1613

When we were talking of mechanism we
didn't know how it would work.

1000 proposed by them would not
provide for 5 years: the mechanism
and provide

BARR: 1000: Kone

G.M.: Revised. Answer Pros.

LUSCOM: Strategy 750 was cost cost target

Earlier figures were too high

On that basis, 750 was acceptable.

We were not legitimizing the earlier
generosity. Cost cost not into the
average

We think the 750 was agreed to

cost of large amount had later

PLEASE NOTE (K4) IS MISSING

(FS)

P.A.P.

Sick of report to agency i'tain
Report what I said yesterday at the record.
Sketchy detail about a bytles now -
forward to the future

M.7.

Reason why I was able to go as low as
750 was \therefore $2/3 \div 1/3$
No question of big other to sell \leftarrow how
when we're in the process to accept that
large when spending in the direction
Inquiry it fail for to small to count.
Suggest F.M. meet on basis of their needs
in 10 days time

LVA ROM

Carrying agent a little further
What our has said is true
But you $2/3 \div 1/3$ is true: but we
think it was a temporary problem
Logical to have a degree more
We didn't
know to have a bytles.
Not withdrawing that.
We're said to work out values of bytles
in real
M.7 can agree to that
Q: is that figure less than 1622
A: better than $\div 850 = 50\%$
We agree to get as close as possible to
 $2/3$.
1000 is 62% of 1622
When does that figure rise?
Not unusual

Pres:

We're speaking numbers.

Don't know what you're for that.

∴ all trying to make sense.

(R. 1881.)

Agree with you.

Since about all have said I found at home,

that we had considerable numbers

of making together samples

Say this to M.T.: Can you imagine

that's will look better by looking

at the different ones?

It'll look much worse

than just the that?

Time + you've had said not

convinced to this

If you refuse this, what will you

be in future? Only work - future

Get now v. hard. Why you

to think that just, by accident home

M.7

Time got to 1913 + not 1622

Only 3 not calculated.

Other are not done

Suggest the should be further to see
- better then

Pres:

Ask you to say to name to

Conclusions.

Under new program last year

Ask other all to make further

If GR, LAB, NL, DA further

hold one, with hand the other.

What can I buy in hand - choice
with for 5 years & 1000 the rest
or UK program

Clearly UK has made an effort.

Two books on design

Let's just design it like that

Let's go for smaller

Are you - Kone etc - so say if you're
going to stick to that

And M.7: what you?

Kone: I think rest of the program
+ the basis of solution

how from remains reasonable.

I think I do as really a reflection of
what is possible: perhaps on 5 years

Schlesinger: Like to meet colleagues and discuss
on mission, with program to assist
Bodily needs

Fact:

MATHEWS: Kone is right

Thompson:

Not for me to fix things. But let
us try to find total range
if we take today, Paul will have
no extra work - 750m + which
mechanics will include