PERSONAL
CONFIDENTIAL

(1)

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster

Prime Minister

Yes - but I very much share the Chief Secretary's view on [illegible] amendment. It still [illegible] minute last night (attached). Agree to Patrick Jenkin's proposals, except on deferment on which agree to X?

MLS 22/9

Yes
No

PRIME MINISTER

ABOLITION OF THE GLC AND METROPOLITAN COUNTY COUNCILS: THE 1985 ELECTIONS

The Secretary of State for the Environment minuted you on 20 September on the question of "Substitution" or "Deferment". This is one of the points on which MISC 95, at which I was not present, could not come to an agreed view, although a "small majority" favoured "substitution" (ie nomination to the bodies to be abolished) rather than "deferment" (which would entail existing Councillors continuing in office for a further year if they were willing to do so).

X I would myself take the view that the balance of advantage if anything lay with deferment (with a reserve power to substitute if individuals would not serve). I would think that in terms of public opinion generally this would put us in the more favourable light: we would only have to resort to substitution if our opponents behaved unreasonably. We would not then need to prove our case: our opponents would have done it for us. If we go for substitution ab initio, we place ourselves in the position of having to prove our case: we could only do this by claiming that our opponents were certain to behave unreasonably, a charge we obviously could not substantiate before the event.

A.C.

A C

22 September 1983

PERSONAL
CONFIDENTIAL