

FROM: PUS
21 DECEMBER 1993

- cc. PS/Secretary of State (L&B) - B
- PS/Mr Fell - B
- Mr Thomas - B
- Mr Williams - B
- Mr Wood (L&B) - B
- Mr Daniell - B
- Mr Maccabe - B
- Mr Beeton - B
- Ms Jude - B

MICHAEL ANCRAM (L,B&DENI) - B

PHONE CALL FROM JOHN HUME

I saw your Private Secretary's minute of 20 December following my conversation with John Hume on 16 December, regarding referendums. I doubt if there is more to what he was saying than that while a change to the Irish constitution will technically require referendum in the South, securing the agreement of people North and South respectively to the outcome of the talks process need not necessarily imply a referendum (or simultaneous pair of referendums) technically so described.

2. You could conceivably have, for example, a full house of by-elections to Westminster seats in Northern Ireland (as happened in protest mode by the Unionists after Hillsborough) with the Irish conducting a referendum on the constitution against the background of a talks outcome. But I think this is pretty theoretical - I do not detect any change in John Hume's approach and underlying it is of course the dual referendum concept however it might be conducted or described.

Signed:

J A CHILCOT

21 DECEMBER 1993

JEN/B/12/11/42203