From: Independent Chairmen Notetakers
26 June 1996

SUMMARY RECORD OF INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS ON PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES AND AGENDA FOR PLENARY SESSION - TUESDAY 25 JUNE 1996 (10.07)

Those present:

Independent Chairmen	Government Teams	Parties
General de Chastelain	British Government	Alliance Party
Mr Holkeri	Irish Government	Labour Party
		Northern Ireland Women's Coalition
		Progressive Unionist Party
		Social Democratic and Labour Party
		Ulster Democratic Party
		Ulster Democratic Unionist Party
		United Kingdom Unionist Party
		Ulster Unionist Party

1. At 10.07, Mr Holkeri, acting as Chairman, called the meeting to order. He stated that, as was decided the previous day, two documents had now been delivered to parties; the first of these was a revised draft of the rules of procedure which had incorporated those amendments as put forward up to 19 June but was now dated 25 June; the second document listed the proposed additions to the draft rules (also dated 25 June) which included all proposed amendments from both Governments and the political parties in alphabetical order.

2. The Chairman indicated that the second document would not be tabled at this stage and suggested that by way of proceeding now, he would ask participants to give introductory remarks covering key issues on the revised draft document beginning with both

Governments and then the parties in a clockwise, round table format. After this had been completed, the Chairman proposed that more detailed comments on both documents could be provided on a paragraph by paragraph, section by section basis, thereby allowing a free and open discussion. He sought agreement from participants to this point.

3. Dr Paisley asked whether everyone around the table believed they had had sufficient time to digest the content of the documents, given the views expressed by the Chairman that he wished to engage in a detailed paragraph by paragraph discussion at some later point that day. Dr Paisley stated that his party had had an hour and he asked was everyone content with this. For his part, Dr Paisley suggested that some more time would be helpful if full consideration of the texts seemed to be what was required.

4. Mr Trimble said that he was inclined to agree with Dr Paisley. He was, however, prepared to proceed on the basis indicated by the Chairman if this was the agreed view of the meeting. That said, he believed some more time for consideration would be helpful as he himself had only had 30-40 minutes to digest the contents. Mr Mallon commented that the previous day had been a long one, as had the previous Thursday. His party were content to proceed, as the Chairman had indicated, on the basis that there was nothing now in the documents which hadn't been raised or dealt with in those previous two days.

5. Mr Wilson stated that he supported Dr Paisley's and Mr Trimble's suggestions of seeking some more time. He continued saying that he didn't take kindly to Mr Mallon's lecturing on the proceedings and his (Mr Mallon's) intent on pushing matters along as he had been doing in the last few days. Mr Wilson stated that

there had been occasions when Unionists had had to suffer indignity and wait while Mr Mallon and his colleagues met with the Irish or listen to the Irish Prime Minister addressing the talks, never mind waiting for them to begin actual meetings when Unionists were often on time. In these circumstances, commented Mr Wilson, Mr Mallon needed to be a little more patient as Unionists didn't want to have to listen continuously to someone whose prime role in life appeared to be to give legitimacy to Sinn Fein/IRA.

6. The Chairman, in view of the remarks made about additional time, sought a formal adjournment from the participants on the basis that no one had yet formally asked for one. Ms Hinds said that she took exception to Mr Wilson's remarks. There was a clear need to acknowledge diversity at these discussions rather than ignore it. She hoped that any adjournment would be limited as her party was keen to spend the day in round table discussions so that everyone had an opportunity to participate and attempt to resolve the issues. The previous day's bilateral proceedings had not been, by definition, conducive to full participation around the table and the process would only suffer more if this format continued.

7. Dr Paisley commented that his party was seeking an adjournment but not for a bilateral to take place. There simply was a need for more time to digest the contents of the documents if the discussion was going to involve a paragraph by paragraph analysis. Dr Paisley stated that he hadn't heard Ms Hinds condemning comments from a previous day when terms such as "village idiots" had been used by some to categorise unionists. He also hadn't heard whether Ms Hinds had studied the documents on a paragraph by paragraph basis before she had commented on a "limited" adjournment.

8. The Chairman stated that since an adjournment had now been sought he suggested that the meeting reconvene at 11.00. The meeting adjourned at 10.18.

[Signed]

Independent Chairmen Notetakers
24 June 1996

OIC/20