PRIME MINISTER'S TETE-A-TETE WITH THE TAOISEACH

Summary

- Attack consistent pattern of Irish Government leaks/briefing (cuttings attached);
- emphasise the need to carry both sides of the community in Northern Ireland: many turbulent factors and high risk of Hume/Adams contamination;
- reject Dublin briefing line that <u>British version</u> was no good and that it has been contemptuously rejected by the Irish Government;
- we are serious about the pursuit of peace. We have taken much bigger risks than Dublin. Our paper was a serious paper;
- dismiss continued moaning about a "disreputable" deal with the UUP. Molyneaux is a key player and both Governments have agreed on the need to carry the Unionists (and to offset the Loyalist paramilitary reaction);
- explain that progress on the peace initiative is possible. We should be able to reach agreement on a text, but only if it is certain to secure peace;
- complain about the <u>absence of the promised paper on</u>

 <u>Talks</u>. There was a joint commitment at the IGC held on
 10 September on officials to work up a paper. The

 British side tabled a paper on 24 September. There has
 been no proper response (save for the leaked paper in
 the Irish Press on 19 November).

SECRET AND PERSONAL

SC/SIL/22365

bish Told

Points to make

- 1. We agreed in Brussels to carry forward the <u>peace process</u> and the Talks process. They are complementary. We want to press on with both.
- 2. The two Governments must work together, and be seen to be doing so. There have been a number of developments and distractions:
- <u>Hume/Adams</u> and their continued promotion of their "peace plan", despite our agreement in Brussels not to adopt or endorse it;
- the evident groundswell of support for Hume at your Ard Fheis (pronounced Ardesh);
- the <u>Irish Press</u> leak, on 19 November, of the draft Irish Government paper for the Talks Liaison Group;
- my own attempts to push things forward in my <u>Guildhall</u>
 <u>Speech</u> and elsewhere;
- increasingly public misunderstandings between the two of us not helped by,
 - disclosures of our own necessarily confidential indirect contacts with the Provisional Movement.
- All that is in the past, and we need to look ahead.
- 3. We judge it important to keep up momentum on the <u>Talks</u> <u>process</u>, and be seen to be doing so. It is important whether or not peace is secured, and the prospect of political advance is another pressure on the Provisional Movement. We would like to

- the build-up to this meeting, your own briefing, the

 Hume/Adams initiative and the revelations of our own

 contacts with the Provisionals puts strains on what the

 Unionists and, in turn, the Loyalist paramilitaries can

 take
- as you know we have consulted Mr Molyneaux. We have both talked to Archbishop Eames who has told us of his concerns that the idea of a permanent Irish Convention could not be sold in the North. It is a point on which Mr Molyneaux has particularly focussed
 - the trailing of the meeting has come close to giving the appearance that in making a Joint Declaration both of us will be doing what we said in Brussels we would not do: namely offering a price for the cessation of violence
 - your public trailing of the need for us to acknowledge the right of <u>Irish self-determination</u>, given the prominence which Hume/Adams gave to the same concept, has made it particularly difficult for us.
 - 7. We have to recognise too that if any Joint Declaration we make works, in terms of securing peace, it is inevitable that both <u>Hume and Adams will claim that it is the product of their own efforts</u>. None of that will make it easier to sell in Northern Ireland, or indeed in Great Britain.
 - 8. Nonetheless, despite the obvious political risks, and the dangers of a Unionist reaction, we are prepared to press ahead.
 - 9. Despite your reaction to it the <u>British Version</u> which Robin Butler brought to Dublin last week was a serious effort on our part. It includes most of the substantive elements of your Joint Declaration, though not I acknowledge the permanent Irish

Convention. It also contains much of your language, though some of it is organised in a different way. It contains almost all the language of paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9 of your Joint Declaration, as well as most of the elements of the crucial paragraph 4.

- 10. It is relevant that John Hume has told me that the heart of the matter is a few general concepts, most of which are in the British version. He mentioned in particular:
 - acknowledgement that HMG has no selfish strategic or economic interest in retaining Northern Ireland within the UK against the wishes of its people;
 - the right of the people of the island of Ireland to seek agreement on their future without the outcome being subject to veto by the British people, Parliament or Government;
 - a commitment by both Governments to promote that agreement (but not, he emphasised, a promotion of agreement on a particular solution).
 - 11. Our own text includes these ideas but in practice goes much further. It does include a reference to <u>self-determination</u> and a good deal of forward language in respect of stimulating agreement on the island of Ireland.
 - 12. On the other hand, there are points on which we shall need to insist:
 - the constitutional guarantee;
 - some commitment on your side on Articles 2 and 3;

- dropping the idea of the permanent <u>Irish Convention</u>, (we are ready instead to incorporate a reference to our willingness to enter exploratory dialogue with Sinn Fein after a relatively brief <u>quarantine</u> period.)
- 13. The best way of settling the issues is to look at the text. Shall we turn to that now, with the others?