

MADRID SUMMIT POSSIBLE QUESTIONS

1. Does my RHF agree that if the party opposite had had its way in 1983 we would not be in the Community at all, and if it had had its wish in 1986, there would have been no Single European Act, and that therefore it is the height of hypocrisy to hear talk of isolation in Europe from them?
2. Will my RHF accept that once again, as at Brussels last month, her Government has secured all its major objectives at a summit, and is this not a major tribute to the skill of herself and her colleagues and to the new standing for Britain they have created?
3. Would my RHF agree that any progress towards economic and monetary union in Europe is wholly dependent upon the completion of the Single European Market and the comprehensive Europe-wide abolition of exchange controls, and that in this area deeds matter far more than fine sounding words?
4. Does my RHF concur with the statement 'the European Council would be better engaged producing jobs than discussing ... gimmicks'? Does she recall that those were the words employed by the Right Hon Member for Islwyn in April 1985? Does she agree that it is curious that the party opposite no longer talk about jobs now that this country has created more of them than the whole of the rest of the Community since 1983?
5. Does my RHF recall the Right Hon Member for Islwyn telling her after the Milan European Council in July 1985 that it would have been 'fitting for the British Prime Minister ... to take the initiative at the summit to try to bring down unemployment'? Is this not what she has done? Would not the social charter supported by the party opposite slow, halt and reverse the record fall in unemployment in this country?
6. Does my RHF accept that the vast majority of people in this House and in this country agree with her statement that we would not accept transfer of decisions over our budget and our taxes to Brussels? Is it not time the front bench opposite made its position on this issue clear?
7. Can my RHF confirm that the European Council agreed that the Delors Report was a contribution to the debate about economic and monetary union and not the end of the debate?
8. Will my RHF agree that progress towards completion of the Single European Market under the Spanish Presidency of the council has been excellent, and that we look to the incoming French Presidency to concentrate upon this rather than upon other matters as its first priority?
9. Will my RHF confirm that over the last ten years the policy of her government - that we would join the EMS when the time was right - has remained clear and consistent throughout? Does she recall that over the same period the party opposite has changed its mind on membership of the Community at least twice and vehemently opposed the abolition of exchange controls?

10. Does my RHF agree that the essential precondition for sterling's membership of the EMS is a reduction in the rate of inflation, and that therefore the party opposite - which sent inflation up to 26 per cent - could never ever join the EMS? Are comments from them on the EMS not therefore wholly worthless?