Qz.02522 MR COLES EUROPEAN COUNCIL: 30 MAY MANDATE At her briefing meeting on 24 March the Prime Minister asked for a draft speaking note on the Mandate for use at the European Council. This is attached in a form agreed with the Departments concerned. We believe that it will be most effective if it is confined to the main political points, and in particular to the need to make parallel progress on the three chapters of the Mandate, as agreed at Lancaster House. Also attached to this minute are four Annexes as follows:-Annex A - the text of the "non paper" by the Presidency and the Commission. Annex B - the five essential changes that the Foreign Secretary will be seeking to make in that proposal. Annex C - the text of a message which the Foreign Secretary is sending today to Monsieur Tindemans and Monsieur Thorn. ANNEX D - a supplementary speaking note for the Prime Minister to use if it is suggested that the UK should agree to an agricultural price settlement in advance of an agreement on the budget problem. D.H. D J S HANCOCK 26 March 1982 Sir K Couzens Mr Wright cc: Mr Elliott Mr Littler Mrs Hedley-Miller Mr Wentworth Mr Edwards Mr Rhodes Mr Andrews, MAFF PS/Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary) Lord Bridges Sir M Butler, UKREP Mr Hannay Mr de Fonblanque

SPEAKING NOTE ON THE MANDATE

It is disappointing that the Foreign Ministers have so far been unable to complete the task which we set them last November at Lancaster House despite the series of meetings they have devoted to it. They have been unable to reach agreement on three key problems: a financial guideline on the CAP, milk and the budget problem. It would not be in the Community's interest for this deadlock to continue and it is for us, as Heads of State and Government, to ensure that the necessary instructions are given to enable substantive solutions to be found without further delay.

The Presidents of the Commission and the Council
have now made new suggestions for a method to solve the
budget problem. It is good that the negotiations are
now seriously under way again and that the Foreign Ministers
have set themselves a tight timetable for agreement both
on the method and on the substantive solution of the
problem. It is up to all of us to make sure that our
Foreign Ministers are in a position to find an agreement
both on the method and on the figures at their meeting
on 3 April so as to enable early decisions to be taken
on the three chapters of the Mandate in parallel as we
agreed last year.

Solvedon

/As

As Foreign Ministers are to meet soon, I do not want to press for a discussion here and now about the details of a solution. I would like, however, to make a few general points which I hope Foreign Ministers will bear in mind.

First, we must try to give the Community a period of stability by taking this problem out of the arena of political discussion for a substantial period. A budget solution which involved either negotiations about figures every year, or another major negotiation like this one in two or three years time, would not give the Community the breathing space that it needs if it is to respond effectively to the challenges presented by its internal economic problems and an increasingly dangerous world environment.

Second, the method of correction must deal with the problem in its entirety and must be sufficiently flexible to ensure a fair outcome if circumstances change.

Third, the scale of compensation must be fair. As a less prosperous Member State, the UK could reasonably expect to be a net beneficiary of the Community's financial arrangements, especially in view of the common commitment to the convergence of the economies of the member states. We realise that such a big change

/in

in the present financial pattern would creat problems for our partners and we are ready to take account of this. But we can see no justification for the United Kingdom being more than a very modest net contributor.

These seem to me to be essential political points which Foreign Ministers will need to bear in mind. I hope that we can all agree that it is in the interests of the Community that all aspects of the Mandate should now be resolved with all possible speed and that we should instruct Foreign Ministers accordingly.

NON PAPER

Subject: specific details of items 2 and 3 of the document of 18 January 1982 from the Council General Secretariat

- The Community will grant compensation to the United Kingdom for 5 years, starting in 1982.
- 2. The basic amount of this compensation will be set at a uniform level for 1982, 1983 and 1984 of /-x million ECU_7. This amount represents y % of the objective indicator for 1981. If this ratio between the compensation and the objective indicator varies in 1982, 1983 or 1984 by more than 10 %, a correction will be made on the basis of a Commission proposal, on which the Council will take a decision by a qualified majority.
- 3. A further correction will be made if the United Kingdom's V.A.T. share exceeds its GDP share. This compensation will represent z % of the difference.
- 4. The amount of compensation for 1985 and 1986 will be decided on by the Council before the end of 1984 acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission.

ESSENTIAL CHANGES IN THE "NON-PAPER"

- a. A genuine five-year solution and not one which would involve a fresh negotiation in the third year.
- b. A review at the end of the period of agreement.
- c. A method of dealing with changes in the size of the receipts gap (as measured by the Commission's objective indicator) which is both more flexible and more automatic.
- d. A method of dealing with the whole of the contributions gap and not just part of it.
- e. Figures which produce an acceptable net contribution for the UK after compensation.

Classification and Caveats Precedence/Deskby CONFIDENTIAL IMMEDIATE ZCZC 1 2 GRS 3 CONFIDENTIAL ELONOMIC FRAME ATS BY 5 0 6 FM FCO 261145Z MARCH 82 DD TO IMMEDIATE BRUSSELS 7 (IMMEDIATE URREP 0 TELEGRAM NUMBER 8 BRUSSELS, AND TO PRIORITY ALL EC POSTS 30 MAY MANDATE 10 1. Following is the text of a message from me to M. Tindemans 11 about the Presidency/Commission text (UKREP Telno 1188). 12 13 Please arrange delivery urgently. Please also ensure 14 that M. Thorn receives a copy. Other posts should make these 15 points at a senior level to Foreign and Finance Ministries after the European Council but before 3 April. 16 17 BEGINS 18 I am most grateful to you and Gaston Thorn for the efforts 19 you made at our meeting on 23 March to give an impulse 20 to the search for a settlement of the 30 May Mandate. I 21 particularly welcome your initiative in putting forward 22 your joint ideas for the method of deciding the amount of 23 compensation to be paid to the UK. As I said during the 24 meeting, there are a number of elements in the text which 25 I welcome, but some difficulties. We shall want to examine Catchword NNNN ends /these BLANK telegram File number Dept Distribution ECD(I) FRAME ECONOMIC ECD(I) Drafted by (Block capitals) G H FRY Telephone number 233-5701 Authorised for despatch

Comcen reference

Time of despatch

Classification and Caveats Page CONFIDENTIAL IMMEDIATE 2 <<<< these carefully, but I am sure that your proposals will pro-3 vide a good basis for our discussion on 3 April. Our con-4 sideration of them will naturally be greatly helped by having the illustrative figures which the Commission agreed 6 to provide, and I hope that these will be made availabe in good time. 8 I thought that in making your own preparations for our next 9 meeting you and Gaston Thorn might find it helpful if I gave you an account of our main preoccupations with the method 10 11 which you have put forward. 12 Let me start with the question of duration. I naturally 13 welcome your suggestion that this should be five years. I am 14 sure that it is right to take this issue right out of Com-15 munity politics for a substantial period so that we can con-16 centrate on the other urgent tasks which face us. To achieve 17 this objective, which I am sure that we all share, we must 18 however have an arrangement which genuinely provides a five-year 19 breathing space. I am concerned that the ideas now on the table 20 would not give us that, and in particular I have great doubts 21 about the idea of fixing the method of deciding the amount of 22 compensation for the first three years only, so that we would 23 need to have a completely fresh negotiation to decide on the 24 arrangements for the last two years. 25 As regards the method you proposed for applying the objective 26 indicator, this is rather complicated and I would prefer some-27 thing simpler. I agree with you that it would be insufficient 28 simply to specify fixed sums of compensation. There must be 29 provision for adjusting the amount of compensation in the 30 light of variations in the objective indicator, and I accept 31 that, unlike the 30 May 1980 arrangements, the possibility 32 that the actual gap will turn out lower than expected should 33 be allowed for as well as the possibility of its being higher. Exos 34 CARRINGTON ... NKKIR NNNN ends THE Catchword BLANK telegram

h

Classification and Caveats

CONFIDENTIAL

IMMEDIATE

Page

3

<<<<

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

At the moment I am inclined to think that it may rise, but if, as happened in 1981, CAP expenditure did not grow as expected, the gap could well turn out lower. But I also think that if we are to avoid an annual negotiation over the figures - which I think we all believe would be divisive and damaging to the Community - then we shall need to have a method of adjustment which is clear, precise and of direct application. I fear that the present suggestion of proposals on each occasion from the Commission followed by decisions by the Council would not prove satisfactory in practice, and I do not think it Would be right to leave unadjusted a divergence of as much as 10% in either direction. What I would propose therefore is that on and before 3 April we should all bend our minds to the task of finding an alternative method which would enable us to get away from annual negotiations but at the same time give the certainty that even if there is some unexpected variation in the outturn the result will be equitable for all concerned. I am sure that something of this sort can be devised.

At our meeting on 23 March I explained that the contributions gap was an important element in the UK problem and circulated some figures designed to illustrate this. I am pleased that in paragraph 3 of your non-paper you have put forward a suggestion which is clearly designed to take some account of this problem, but your porposal would not in my view provide an adequate solution. What is needed is an objective indicator which measures the whole of this problem rather than one which measures only a part of it. In saying this, I am not arguing that the UK should receive 100% compensation for the whole gap; I accept that we should receive an agreed percentage less than 100%. But it should be a percentage applied to the whole extent of the problem. Perhaps I should add that I do not understand the feeling sometimes expressed that an

NNNN ends telegram

BLANK

Catchword

/indicator

Classification and Caveats

CONFIDENTIAL

IMMEDIATE

Page

1 <<<<

indicator measuring the whole gap would in some way be contrary to Community principles. Such an indicator is not a new idea; there are precedents both in the Dublin Financial Mechanism and in the agreement of 30 May 1980. And customs duties and agricultural levies collected in the UK, even though they are the Community's own resources, do place a burden on UK taxpayers and consumers in just the same way as do VAT contributions. It is the disproportionate amount paid under both headings which constitutes an important part of the UK's budget problem.

Finally, as I said on 23 March, I attach importance to including provision for a review of the operation of the arrangement towards the end of the 5 year period. This need not of course prejudge whether the arrangement or something on similar lines will continue after the period. That would depend on the situation at the time. No-one would be more delighted than the British Government if by then the problem had ceased to exist and there were no need for any corrective arrangements. But unfortunately experience suggests that we cannot afford to make that assumption. It is inconceivable that if the problem continued the Community should simply turn its back on it and leave it unresolved, and I therefore think that we must find some language about a review, perhaps on the lines of the text of 18 January.

I hope that you will find it useful to have these comments in advance of our meeting on 3 April. I am particularly glad that your proposals will provide a basis on which we can on 3 April try to agree not only on a method but on a full settlement including the figures. I think that we are all increasingly aware of the need to find an early solution of these problems and of the risks if we do not. I shall be approaching our next meeting in a spirit of determintation to find a basis for agreement.

NNNN ends telegram

BLANK

Catchword

/ENDS

SPEAKING NOTE FOR USE IF IT IS SUGGESTED THAT THE UK SHOULD AGREE TO AN AGRICULTURAL PRICE SETTLEMENT IN ADVANCE OF AN AGREEMENT ON THE BUDGET PROBLEM

We all agreed last November that progress on the three Chapters of the Mandate should be made in parallel. The measures which are being considered in the context of the price fixing are organically linked with the proposals for CAP reform which have been discussed in the context of the Mandate. For example, the price proposals cover the treatment of Mediterranean products, help for small milk producers, modulation of guarantees for surplus products and the regime for cereals. They also have implications for the proposed guideline on the rate of growth of agricultural expenditure. We should not envisage decisions being taken on the CAP when comparable decisions on the implementation of the other Chapters have yet to be taken. Moreover, decisions taken now on the level of CAP prices will be a crucial determinant of the level of the UK net contribution in this and future years, and some of the current proposals, such as aid for small milk producers, and Mediterranean agriculture, would significantly add to the UK's budget burden. It would not be right to take decisions of this kind when we have still not agreed how that burden is to be alleviated.

(Telhod and Figures To be discussed Port apre with bani of discussion suggested by T. + T. Do not recognise or auxulta Uni To. Mach impolence to foreign This tes doing every they possible to supe rubbe rapidly