

Pöhl → skeleton of new meeting;

Wierzb's ambitious to state that he cannot propose things as a member of the Committee which he considers have to be rejected as President of the BBk

law of not making any changes in law

does not exist, is general design → central bank, the
principle + consequences

but ^{seen by} _{can be} ^{odd} proposals → ERM idea, wanted
put him in a position in which cannot not subscribe

If we want to coordinate policy → ex ante coordination, ^{impossible}
through ERM working → then we need more powers for central bank
as long as no binding decisions no problem; BBk can from
distance

L-P → Gérin would argue the following stages + agreements
→ Pöhl → that is acceptable; L-P also appreciates that!

hypothetical + descriptive approach

Thursberg → different approaches and so different

best result → should be explicit in the treaty

should also prescribe at first stage the Pöhl idea, i.e.
thus being the CoG can make recommendations

if "binding" then we need inst. changes; that
cannot be a next stage; i.e. elements of the ultimate
treaty cannot be specified

de Larosière: the inst. paper should describe the first steps

Pöhl: Report should make clear, what C has proposed so far

our subject matter a fundamentally difficult matter \rightarrow cannot pronounce much about but have to proceed on what you can achieve

Böyer: agreed to discuss the ultimate objective, "no less amendment of the Treaty"

the political aspect will be born from the beginning a first step without legal change is more easily acceptable politically

we should not be hurriedly renominable \rightarrow the C is an absolute maximum; perhaps too little

Pöhl \rightarrow Mr. Pöhl's proposal + Committee with ^{inter}proposal under the ausp. of the Committee of Gov.

how can non-monetary, central banks make recommendations to their governments

means that all central banks should be independent?
but that makes a change in most countries' legislation

Chaliotis \rightarrow Bank of Greece can make recommendations on fiscal policy;
central bank may say that
there is another solution \rightarrow fiscal policies create problems for monetary policy.

Pöhl \rightarrow any German can give advice to his government;
say this to C. of Gov.;

European of central bank system is a proposal; should be linked to heads of states

- start with strengthening the independence of Gov. \rightarrow says in this direction

- ERT is not perhaps necessary for functioning of the banks of money not the ones; operational title can be left to

Banking Central banks, ERT is not a minimum.

Therefore proposed / far-reaching structure of Euro - Central bank system

and if you want that far-reaching changes in other fields

→ take into account of Euro Central bank system

Chair → as far as the sys is concerned
- there will be
- " without "

what is the function of the sys guaranteeing the necessary mechanism holding us in the way to Euro;

The sys should happen off a movement

(the sys not only monetary decisions; what prevents disputes)

Bayer → some of the important powers vested in the Committee of Gov., probably remain not to everybody, decisions - mainly on institution, esp. in area of general capital movements after 1990.

Why not begin by. The other Com. of Gov.

Chair → b. careful arguing in favour of independence of central bank
→ Gov. Com cannot say that they want independence
on its own → within the control of EMU or it
is needed, the Euro could not function because there
will be different managers of Finance

This option is all intermediate stages

Pöhl → There is also a legal argument, EMS based on agreement
of central banks + not governments

lets not give this impression that we can change to EMS by referendum

give back Com. of Gov. the power to introduce? That would be opposed by the central bank council. In Germany because it would be understood as abolition of 1936 independence.

Wants to avoid this; wants to use this Com. to help the Com. of Gov. to make recommendations

de L → have a final offer between him & Pöhl; we have to decide they're to take them together that they're working in France; Pöhl's concept, French legal charges, only to give recommendations we are not clear enough

Pöhl → why can't we say in 1st stage → Com. of Gov. they should → give recommendations → would help Pöhl in central bank council

2nd step → give the Com. powers to decide → then we make the proposal when legal changes are needed.

Merkel → without first change no progress; recommendation is not much; but must say that this does not result in much;

Chair → is there a majority for decisions? 2 committee stages?

- 1) - Pöhl
- 2) - de L

Com → they say the semi-final phase of de L → only recommendation not decision → not sufficient members party in the minister councils
Pöhl's recommendation may even carry more weight

ECU → $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \rightarrow$ short with Marshall of Reserve;
choice of portfolios
this small + feasible

Chair → many countries will have to face up to change
standard behaviour

(announcements)

ECU → without changes from E.M.U. in any way, the
powers of the Com. of Gov. can be
strengthened by changes in the framework.
Legal framework

→ some want to go further → along the
ECU proposal?

Pöhl → but both decisions on institution, central, decisions

...?
These questions have to be addressed when to set up
a central bank system → doesn't need the political for
common institutions for the

more important → common monetary targets

his proposal more ambitious

1st step → strengthen Com. of Gov.
fiscal policy

If goes further raises same questions that apply
when setting up of the complete system

Baier → 2nd step is to say that Com. of Gov. should
make decisions

but have to report to some political authority

Chair → ECU part for a central banker, embryo process that
function is increasing; commitment to achieving interbanking;
Commonwealth of Gov. in charge. Do we want to create
an entity?

Ch L → many things in common with Pöhl proposal:

cell for monetary analysis ... and
ex. market observations

Proponents → making against position of members, but for
practical purposes → common ultimate has
members' synchronization, when small & integrated,²
what is the added value
but if fiscal, very small so not very attractive;
cannot be effective b/c; national channel
of information disappears
of course is conflict between ERT & national
central bank can be taken into account
fiscal function limited

th L → cannot accept in Thompson the ambiguity, the
value of members higher

Lam → for drafting purposes → Thompson's of Gru.
+ then next step final
stage.

|| |
^{negotiations}
most important work out the pros & cons (as
the discussed here
this is important!)

Chair → for Eam take account also of Thyssen paper

Pöhl II → 1st step → Pöhl on one
level to ^{provide} currency, between economies

2nd step → sh. L

~~etc~~

first descriptions of what chemical happens; not a
paraphrase.

The report should not cause trouble to anyone

HCL → Prepared to help to produce answers to the
last question

Chem → have working session with Thygesen