

DYKES, I.R.




10 DOWNING STREET

Prime Minister

E.E.C.

1. Herewith copy letter dated 14th February from Hugh Dykes to Ian Gilmour, together with a copy of Ian's reply dated 27th February.
2. As you know, Hugh is a Euro-fanatic.
3. Peter Lloyd (Fareham), who is a Member of the European Movement, and who was Chairman of the Bow Group and of C.U.C.U.A., and others, are becoming increasingly concerned about our contribution to the E.E.C. Budget.
4. Herewith alternative draft Early Day Motions which Peter Lloyd has in mind to put down on the Order Paper.
5. Peter asked my advice last evening as to whether Motion "A" or "B" would be helpful to you, if tabled with the maximum Tory backbench support before the Brussels Summit.
6. Of the two I prefer "A". Do you think that would be helpful to our cause if Motion "A" was to be placed on the Order Paper, with the maximum Conservative backbench support?

5th March, 1980

  
Ian Gow





from HUGH DYKES, M.P. 9,

14th February, 1980

The Rt. Hon. Sir Ian Gilmour, Bt., MP.,  
Lord Privy Seal,  
The Foreign and Commonwealth Office,  
Whitehall,  
London SW1

Following EEC Question Time yesterday a number of colleagues and I are getting really seriously perturbed about the insidious development of a general anti-Community line on our side of the House.

People can easily do this unwittingly in the current climate and the whole process develops a self-feeding characteristic.

A number of individuals, including myself, were also upset by Neil Marten's comments. The anti-Marketeters cannot have it both ways. On the one hand they say, how dare the EEC develop a Community foreign policy and interfere with national sovereignty; but on the other they grumble that the Community does not speak with one voice.

I am sure that we are running a grave risk of playing into the hands of the Opposition with this careless stance and thereby allowing the UK to be increasingly isolated at Brussels.

I hope very much that it will be possible for the Government to make every effort to counteract this tendency with a more enthusiastic attitude to the fundamentals of our Membership. There is surely no contradiction between this and pressing for just treatment on our national Budget contribution.

c.c.

The Rt. Hon. Michael Jopling, MP.,  
Nigel Forman, Esq., MP.,  
Anthony Newton, Esq., MP.,  
Ian Gow, Esq., MP.,





Foreign and Commonwealth Office  
London SW1

27 February 1980

*Hugh,*

Thank you for your letter of 14 February about the attitude of our side of the House to the European Community.

I agree with you that it is important for us to balance our criticism of certain Community policies, particularly on the budget, with reminders about the fundamental arguments for membership and references to policy areas in which the Community is already helpful to us and can be made more so in the longer term. Members of the Government certainly do this whenever opportunity offers and I know that you and many of your colleagues do too.

But I think we will have much more impact in encouraging more positive attitudes to the Community when we can begin to demonstrate success in securing solutions to the most serious problems. Progress on the budget will enable us to shew that the Government's positive attitude is paying off and that outstanding major problems related to our membership are on the way to solution. Meanwhile I agree that we must counteract what you describe as a self-feeding process of criticism of the Community and stress the positive side. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the generally disturbed state of international affairs are vivid illustrations of the need for a European response to world affairs - and our neutrality proposal endorsed

/by

Hugh Dykes Esq MP  
House of Commons  
London SW1A 0AA



by the Nine is a step in that direction.

For the Government's part, we will continue to stress our commitment to membership of the Community as being best for Britain. Once the budget problem is solved, it will be easier to persuade the doubtful that they need not doubt.

I am copying this letter to the recipients of yours.

Yours  
Law





A. That in the opinion of this House in the event of an unsatisfactory outcome to the E.E.C. budget negotiations, the interests of both the U.K. and European co-operation would be better served if the UK were to establish a new and looser association with the Community

or

B. That in the opinion of this House in the event of an unsatisfactory outcome to the E.E.C. budget negotiations, the interests of both the U.K. and European co-operation would be better served by the re-establishment of U.K. sovereignty whilst at the same time seeking to work together with the Community in areas of mutual benefit