

RESTRICTED
FM UKREP BRUSSELS
TO IMMEDIATE FCO
TELNO 1218
OF 021710Z MAY 90
INFO PRIORITY EUROPEAN COMMUNITY POSTS

FRAME INSTITUTIONAL

COREPER (AMBASSADORS) 2 MAY: LUNCH: FOLLOW UP TO EUROPEAN COUNCIL

SUMMARY

1. PRESIDENCY OUTLINE TIMETABLE FOR WORK TO FOLLOW UP THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL CONCLUSION ON POLITICAL UNION. FOREIGN MINISTERS TO DISCUSS ON 7 MAY, 19/20 MAY AND 18 JUNE. SIX EXTRA MEETINGS OF COREPER PROPOSED TO PREPARE THE GROUND. THEY PROPOSE THAT BASIS OF WORK SHOULD BE THE THREE SUBJECTS IDENTIFIED IN THE CONCLUSIONS PLUS SUBSIDIARITY. I EMPHASISED THE NEED TO LOOK AT GENERAL ISSUES INCLUDING THE LIMITS TO BE IMPOSED ON THE PROCESS AND THE AREAS REFERRED TO BY THE PRIME MINISTER. DISCUSSION AT 7 MAY FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL TO BE BASED ON ORAL INTRODUCTION BY MR COLLINS.

DETAIL

2. CAMPBELL SAID THE PRESIDENCY HAD NO DEFINITIVE VIEWS. COLLINS WOULD SPEAK ABOUT THIS AT THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL ON 7 MAY. THE DUBLIN CONCLUSIONS HAD IDENTIFIED THREE SUBJECTS FOR ANALYSIS: DEMOCRATIC LEGITIMACY, GREATER EFFICIENCY AND UNITY AND COHERENCE IN INTERNATIONAL ACTION. THE VIEWS OF ALL MEMBER STATES WERE NEEDED. SUBSIDIARITY WAS A BIT SEPARATE BUT TOUCHED ON ALL THESE ISSUES. THERE WAS ALSO THE QUESTION OF WHICH ITEMS REQUIRED TREATY CHANGE AND WHICH DID NOT. THE 7 MAY FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL WOULD SET THE TIMETABLE. THE 19/20 MAY INFORMAL FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL WOULD BE IMPORTANT: MINISTERS WOULD HAVE CLEAR VIEWS BY THEN. THE JUNE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL WAS AVAILABLE TO PREPARE FOR THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL. COREPER WOULD NEED EXTRA MEETINGS. HE PROPOSED THESE SHOULD TAKE PLACE ON: 10 MAY (WITH THE NORMAL COREPER ON 11 MAY), 15 MAY (IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL COREPER), 18 MAY (A.M. ONLY), 30 MAY, 6 JUNE AND 12 JUNE. NIEMAN (NETHERLANDS) PLEADED FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF FRIDAYS. CAMPBELL SAID HE WOULD DO HIS BEST.

3. TRUMPF (GERMANY) SAID CHANCELLOR KOHL WANTED IDEAS TO BE COLLECTED AND PUT ON THE TABLE BUT WITHOUT ADOPTING AGREED NATIONAL POSITIONS. TROJAN (COMMISSION) SAID THE BEST WAY OF PREPARING FOR

THE INFORMAL FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL WAS TO DRAW UP A QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE THREE MAIN SUBJECTS PLUS SUBSIDIARITY. I SUPPORTED THE PRESIDENCY'S WORK PROGRAMME - THERE WAS MUCH TO DO. I ALSO AGREED ON THE THREE MAIN SUBJECT AREAS AS DEFINED IN THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL CONCLUSIONS PLUS SUBSIDIARITY WHICH AFFECTED ALL THE OTHER THREE. BUT THE PROCESS OF PREPARATION AND ANALYSIS NEEDED TO GO WIDER. IT MUST ALSO COVER THE AREAS REFERRED TO BY THE PRIME MINISTER, WITH A VIEW TO DEALING WITH THE CONCERNS OF THOSE WHO SAW EUROPEAN UNION AS AN OPEN-ENDED PROCESS LIKELY TO LEAD TO CENTRALISED INSTITUTIONS TAKING OVER LARGE PARTS OF OUR NATIONAL LIFE. WE MUST THUS GIVE CAREFUL THOUGHT TO THE PARAMETERS OF WORK AND SUCH ISSUES AS DEFENCE, LAW ETC AS WELL AS THE MONARCHY. THE TAOISEACH HAD CONCLUDED BY SAYING THAT NONE OF THE AREAS REFERRED TO BY THE PM WERE BEING CONSIDERED FOR INCLUSION IN EUROPEAN UNION. THIS NEEDED TO BE SET OUT MORE CLEARLY AND EXPLICITLY. I HOPED THIS WOULD NOT BE CARICATURED AS A PURELY NEGATIVE POSITION - WE ALSO HAD POSITIVE IDEAS BUT IT WAS AS IMPORTANT TO SPELL OUT THE LIMITS AS THE REFORMS. ANYONE WHO ATTACHED IMPORTANCE TO A SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME NEEDED TO UNDERSTAND THAT THIS WOULD BE A CRUCIAL COMPONENT FOR US.

4. LYBEROPOULOS (GREECE) SAID THE DOCUMENT FOR JUNE SHOULD GIVE A THOROUGH ANALYSIS BUT WE SHOULD NOT LIMIT IT TO THE THREE SUBJECTS BEFORE EVEN STARTING THE ANALYSIS. VIDAL (FRANCE) SAID FOREIGN MINISTERS NEEDED PRESENT PROPOSALS AS WELL AS ANALYSES TO THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL. THE THREE SUBJECTS LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 7(I) OF THE CONCLUSIONS COVERED THE GROUND PRETTY WELL. IT WAS NOT THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL (NOR COREPER) WHO WERE MANDATED TO DO THIS WORK BUT THE MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS. IT WAS FOR THEM TO DECIDE WHO PREPARED THE WORK FOR THEM (BUT HE WAS NOT OPPOSED TO THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES DOING SO).

5. NIEMAN SAID THE ANALYSIS SHOULD COME FIRST. THE METHOD EMPLOYED BY THE GUIGOU GROUP IE DRAWING UP A QUESTIONNAIRE, WAS USEFUL (THOUGH HE WAS NOT ADVOCATING THE CONSTITUTION OF SUCH A GROUP). THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE WOULD HAVE A ROLE IN RELATION TO EPC QUESTIONS. CAMPBELL CONFIRMED THAT THE PRESIDENCY SAW THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE HAVING A ROLE.

6. TRUMPF SAID IT WAS LOGICAL FOR COREPER TO DEAL WITH ALL THREE ISSUES AND FOR POLITICAL DIRECTORS TO HELP OVER THE THIRD, FOR WHICH A COMBINED FORMULA WAS NEEDED. IT WOULD BE BETTER FOR COREPER TO BE DESCRIBED AS ''REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN MINISTERS''. THIS WOULD REDUCE THE BUREAUCRACY IN BONN. WEYLAND (LUXEMBOURG) THOUGHT ALL SHOULD BE ASKED TO PUT THEIR IDEAS ON THE TABLE. CAMPBELL WANTED

VIEWS ON THE TABLE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. I SAID THAT WE SHOULD NOT TRY TO CLEAR TOO MANY HURDLES AT ONE JUMP. WHAT WAS NEEDED WAS AS MUCH BROAD IDEAS AND CONCEPTS AS DETAILED PROPOSALS FOR TREATY CHANGES. NO DECISION HAD YET BEEN TAKEN TO HOLD AN IGC AND ANY DECISION TO DO SO WOULD HAVE TO BE SET IN THE RIGHT CONTEXT. IT WAS THEREFORE ESSENTIAL TO LOOK AT GENERAL ISSUES SUCH AS THE BALANCE BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS AND THE LIMITATIONS. DI ROBERTO (ITALY) SAID FOREIGN MINISTERS NEEDED TO SEND PROPOSALS TO THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL ON 25/26 JUNE. THERE WAS THEREFORE A NEED TO BE SPECIFIC AND NOT TOO GENERAL.

7. REPLYING TO QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PREPARATION OF THE 7 MAY COUNCIL, CAMPBELL SAID THERE WOULD BE NO DOCUMENT. THE PRESIDENCY WOULD INTRODUCE THE SUBJECT ORALLY ON THE LINES OF HIS OWN EARLIER INTRODUCTION BUT TAKING ACCOUNT OF VIEWS EXPRESSED TODAY. LYBEROPOULOS ASSUMED THAT THE DISCUSSION AT THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL WOULD BE LARGELY PROCEDURAL. THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE SHOULD PRODUCE IDEAS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF EPC. THE GUIGOU GROUP HAD HAD A BASIC DOCUMENT (THE DELORS REPORT). WE WOULD NEED TO CONSTRUCT ONE.

8. NIEMAN THOUGHT THAT MINISTERS' PROPOSALS TO THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL COULD BE PURELY PROCEDURAL. WE SHOULD PRODUCE AN ANALYSIS AND PROCEDURAL PROPOSALS BUT IT WOULD BE BETTER NOT TO GET INTO SUBSTANTIVE PROPOSALS. TROJAN SUGGESTED THAT THE 7 MAY FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL WOULD ONLY DISCUSS PROCEDURE. THE 19/20 MAY INFORMAL FOREIGN MINISTERS MEETING MIGHT CONDUCT AN ANALYSIS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE. THE 18 JUNE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COUNCIL WOULD DISCUSS THE SUBSTANCE AND PROPOSALS. POLITICAL DIRECTORS SHOULD ONLY BE BROUGHT IN WHEN TITLE III OF THE SINGLE EUROPEAN ACT WAS DISCUSSED (AND THEY DID NOT HAVE EXCLUSIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS SUBJECT). CAMPBELL CONCLUDED THAT THIS HAD BEEN A USEFUL DISCUSSION.

HANNAY

YYYY

DISTRIBUTION

143

MAIN

142

FRAME INSTITUTIONAL

ECD(1) [-]

ADDITIONAL

1

PAGE 3
RESTRICTED

FRAME

NNNN