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     Mr Gore-Booth
     Mr Lever
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     Mr Fry, WED
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PRIME MINISTER'S BRUGES SPEECH: 20 SEPTEMBER

1. I attach a draft reply to Mr Powell's letter of
   14 September, covering his latest edition of the Bruges
   speech.

2. This edition buys some 80% of the suggestions set out in
   our 7 September version, which was strongly supported by the
   Chancellor and Lord Young. In the attached draft we are in
   effect trying to secure another 10%. The remaining 10% don't
   really matter (and concern areas where No 10 are probably
   incorrigible).

3. It thus looks as if our damage limitation exercise is
   heading for success. While it isn't going to pick up many
   tricks across the Channel, I don't think that the Bruges
   speech is now likely to cause trouble with Community partners,
   and I see no need for you to trouble the Secretary of State in
   Africa.

4. We have discussed the related issue of No 10 lobby
   briefings on the speech.

J O Kerr

RESTRICTED
PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH IN BRUGES

1. The following are our drafting suggestions on the latest version of the Prime Minister's speech, circulated with your letter of 14 September:

i. Page 7: Delete "King William of Holland", insert "Prince William of Orange". (In the Low Countries he is/was not normally described as King of Holland.)

ii. Page 8: Line 6: Amend the last clause to read: "...and other Europeans have drawn from us". (The present wording could be construed as reviving the
iii. Page 12: In deference to eg Indian/Chinese amour propre, one might perhaps say that Europe "civilised much of the world".

iv. Page 13: We see a case for restoring, as a new first paragraph on this page, the last 2 (1939/1945) paragraphs on page 7 of the previous version. (They fit well with the argument on pp 12/13, and a reference to the 21 September RAF ceremony in Brussels would be appropriate.)

v. Pages 24/25: Delete the last sentence on p 24, and the 2 following paragraphs. (The US analogy seems unnecessary; and in its latest form is not strictly accurate, for throughout the 17th and most of the 18th century the colonists
deliberately saw themselves not as Americans but as citizens of Virginia/Massachusetts/etc. P 25 could be held to conflict with pp 14/15.)

vi. Page 28: To drive home the key argument on this page we recommend re-inserting, as up-to-date examples of the pro-competitive nature of the Single Market programme, references to liberalisation of capital movements, abolition of road haulage quotas, and - perhaps - mutual recognition of professional qualifications. (See p 15 of the previous version.)

vii. Page 32: Line 3: For accuracy, delete the word "over".

viii. Page 41: Revise first sentence to read: ".. has always been read, ..". (This avoids conflict with the
ix. Page 44: The last sentence, in its present form, is open to challenge on factual grounds. You will recall that we suggested that it read: "It should mean not only fewer regulations - replacing a cat's cradle of conflicting national rule-books - but simpler and clearer ones." The phrase in parentheses is in our view necessary: if it has to go it would be prudent to drop the whole sentence - the main point is of course covered in the previous paragraph.

x. Page 49: First sentence: Revise to read: "We must stick to reality, not rhetoric." While the message is the same, de-personalising the target in this way should remove the risk of giving offence to eg Mitterrand/Kohl/Lubbers/Gonzales."
xi. Page 54: For clarity, revise the last sentence to read: "But we shall not succeed in persuading others to reform their agriculture - and discussion at the Toronto Economic Summit revealed that there still is considerable resistance - unless we in Europe are also prepared to go further down that road."

2. The DTI are responding - in terms agreed with us - to your request for an additional Single Market paragraph on financial services etc.

3. Copies of this letter go to the other recipients of yours.
PS
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The DTI are responding - in terms agreed with us - to your request for an additional Single Market paragraph on financial services etc.

Copies of this letter go to Alex Allan (HM Treasury), Neil Thornton (DTI), Brian Hawtin (MOD), Shirley Staagg (MAFF) and Roger Lavelle (Cabinet Office).

Yours ever,

(R N Peirce)
Private Secretary

C D Powell Esq
10 Downing Street