

CONFIDENTIAL

I want to keep a  
full file of this for  
reference.

From: D A Lavery  
Central Secretariat  
13 June 1996

PS/Secretary of State (B&L) -B  
PS/Sir John Wheeler (B&L) -B  
PS/Michael Ancram (B&L) -B  
PS/Baroness Denton (B&L) -B  
PS/Mr Moss (B&L) -B  
PS/PUS (B&L) -B  
PS/Sir David Fell -B  
Mr Legge -B  
Mr Thomas (B&L) -B  
Mr Bell -B  
Mr Leach -B  
Mr Steele -B  
Mr Watkins -B  
Mr Beeton -B  
Mr Hill (B&L) -B  
Mr Maccabe -B  
Mr Stephens -B  
Ms Checksfield -B  
Ms Harrison (B&L) -B  
Ms Mapstone -B  
Mr Whysall (B&L) -B  
Mrs McNally (B&L) -B  
HMA Dublin -B  
Mr Lamont, RID/FCO -B  
Mr Campbell-Bannerman -B

SJS

I don't intend to  
put all these records

to you, but I thought

you might like to see

what happened on Wednesday

virtually Mitchell's masterly  
handling of Pankaj

McCartney.

NOTE FOR THE RECORD

NON-PLenary MEETING, 11.45AM, 12 JUNE 1996: INT/4

I attach the internal record of Wednesday morning's non-plenary session.

The first part of the session began at 11.45am and adjourned at 11.58am. The second part of the session began at 12.29pm and adjourned at 12.54pm. The final part of the session began at 1.03pm and ended at 1.10pm.

1. Mr Mitchell (in the Chair) welcomed the delegates to the meeting which had been convened in order to determine how the work identified in paragraphs 2 and 5 of the paper 'A possible approach to resolving procedural difficulties' (tabled at 09.01am on 12 June 1996) might be taken forward.

LM/DL/307

CONFIDENTIAL



**SUMMARY RECORD OF A NON-PLenary SESSION HELD AT CASTLE BUILDINGS  
ON 11 JUNE 1996**

<u>Chairmen</u>	<u>Government Team</u>	<u>Irish Government</u>
Senator Mitchell Gen.de Chastelain Mr Holkeri	Secretary of State Michael Ancram PUS Sir D Fell	Mrs Owen Mr Teahon Mr O'Higgins
<u>Alliance Party</u>	<u>Labour</u>	<u>Women's Coalition</u>
Mr Close Mr Neeson Mr McBride	Mr Casey Mr Curran	Ms McWilliams Ms Sagar
<u>PUP</u>	<u>SDLP</u>	<u>UDP</u>
Mr Ervine	Mr Hume Mr Mallon	Mr McMichael Mr White
<u>DUP</u>	<u>UKUP</u>	<u>UUP</u>
Dr Paisely* Mr Robinson*	Mr McCartney# Mr Wilson#	Mr Trimble Mr Taylor Mr Empey Mr Donaldson

\* In attendance for the second part of the session only.

# In attendance for the final part of the session only.

The first part of the session began at 11.45am and adjourned at 11.58am. The second part of the session began at 12.29pm and adjourned at 12.54pm. The final part of the session began at 1.03pm and ended at 1.10pm.

1. Mr Mitchell (in the Chair) welcomed the delegates to the meeting which had been convened in order to determine how the work identified in paragraphs 2 and 5 of the paper 'A possible approach to resolving procedural difficulties' (tabled at 00.01am on 12 June 1996) might be taken forward.



CONFIDENTIAL

2. Mr McMichael sought guidance from the Chair regarding the presence of members of parties which had yet to place on record their total and absolute commitment to the six principles of democracy and non-violence specified in paragraph 20 of the report of the International Body. He pointed out that this could have a bearing on other parties who were not present that morning. He suggested that parties who had yet to subscribe to the six principles should do so before being able to attend or participate in the proceedings. Mr Curran also drew attention to the importance of the issue of confidentiality within the Talks process.

3. The Chairman invited views from the other delegates. Mr Hume said that Mr McMichael had raised an important point the answer to which could set an important precedent so far as other parties were concerned. Similar points were made by Ms McWilliams and Mr McBride. Mr Trimble referred to the suggestion that there had been some attempts to contact Dr Paisley and Mr McCartney, and he requested an up-date on these efforts. The Chairman said he understood that there had been some contact between representatives of HMG and Dr Paisley in an effort to try to find a formula which would resolve matters. For his part, the Chairman said that he had had a brief conversation with a staff member of the UKUP delegation. Although he did not as yet have an answer regarding either party's position, he would hope that matters might become clearer reasonably soon.

4. At that point Dr Paisley and Mr Robinson entered the room and took their seats. The Chairman welcomed Dr Paisley and Mr Robinson to the meeting and indicated that the other parties present had the previous evening confirmed their total and absolute commitment to the six principles of democracy and non-violence specified in paragraph 20 of the report of the International Body (which the Chairman then read out). He invited Dr Paisley's party to join the proceedings by giving a similar commitment.

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

5 Dr Dr Paisley referred to the statement in the House of Commons by Mr Robinson on behalf of the DUP confirming that party's support for the principles of democracy and non-violence specified in paragraph 20 of the report of the International Body. Dr Paisley preceded this statement with a general criticism to the effect that some aspects of the current proceedings were a "charade" in view of the conduct of some of the parties who had purported to subscribe to the principles of democracy and non-violence. He concluded his remarks by expressing a wish to see the Government of the Republic of Ireland endorsing the constitutional position of Northern Ireland as part of the United Kingdom. Interestingly, although for the most part he referred to Senator Mitchell as "Sir", on at least one occasion Dr Paisley did address him as "Chairman".

6. The Chairman said that he took Dr Paisley's remarks as amounting to a sufficient subscription to the principles of democracy and non-violence specified in paragraph 20 of the report of the International Body. He indicated that at the reconvened plenary session (on Wednesday 19 June) he would have a statement to that effect read into the record.

7. The Chairman then announced a short adjournment (at 11.58am) in order to ascertain the position of the UKUP delegation.

8. The second part of the session began at 12.29pm.

9. The Chairman began the reconvened session by stating that the record should reflect that no representative of the UKUP was present. He said that he hoped that further discussions might help to resolve matters.

10. The Chairman then proceeded to initiate a discussion of the manner of conducting the business identified in paragraphs 2 and 5 of the paper of 12 June 1996. He said that these paragraphs called upon the participants to proceed to consider the procedural guidelines and also the agenda for the opening Plenary session.

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

HD reminded the delegates that the opening Plenary session had been adjourned until 12 noon on Wednesday 19 June. This left relatively little time for this work to be transacted in view of the commitments others had at Parliament and at the Forum. He therefore suggested for discussion the following possible way of proceeding:

- (a) each participating delegation to nominate up to 2 persons to represent their delegation in this work. The persons nominated should have sufficient authority to be able to take decisions on behalf of their delegation;
- (b) although no single set of rules was currently before the session, two papers had been referred to: the procedural guidelines circulated by the two Governments on 6 June 1996, and also the Strand 2 rules from the 1992 Talks;
- (c) the parties should provide a written submission of their views on the matters to be considered. These submissions to be available by 5.00pm on Friday 14 June. The staff would prepare a package of submission papers for distribution on Monday 17 June when the meeting would reconvene at 10.00am, in smaller numbers as proposed, in order to prepare a report for consideration at the resumed Plenary session.

11. The Chairman invited comments on this proposed way of proceeding.

12 Mr Mallon sought clarification of the Chairman's reference to "Strand 2" rules. He further sought clarification whether the relevant aspects of the 1992 rules had been incorporated in the procedural guidelines issued by the two Governments on 6 June 1996. The Chairman confirmed that it was his understanding that there was a degree of overlap, but said he had noted some differences between the version of the 1992 rules which had been

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

in circulation the previous day and the procedural guidelines issued by the two Governments on 6 June 1996. Mr Empey explained that the UUP had circulated draft rules which incorporated some features of the 1992 rules. Michael Ancram said that for ease of reference copies of the 1992 rules could be circulated to the delegates. The Chairman agreed with this suggestion.

13. Mr Donaldson referred to the fact that paragraphs 2 and 5 of the paper of 12 June 1996 referred to the agenda for the opening Plenary session and sought clarification as to whether the parties would be expected to make submissions in relation to the agenda as well as the procedural guidelines. The Chairman confirmed that this was the intention. Mr Mallon sought clarification that the agenda referred to was the agenda for the opening Plenary session. The Chairman confirmed this.

14. There followed a discussion regarding the mechanics of circulating the parties' papers prior to the reconvened session on Monday 17 June. Several delegates, including Mr Close and Mr Mallon suggested that it would be helpful if the package of papers could be available for consideration during the weekend. In response, the Chairman suggested that the parties should have their written submissions available by 3.00pm on Friday in order to be available for collection at 5.00pm that day.

15. Mrs Owen referred to the fact that the drafts jointly issued by the two Governments on 6 June 1996 had resulted from extensive joint work. It was the Irish Government's intention that this would be the material which they would wish to submit for consideration.

16. Mr Donaldson sought confirmation that the work beginning on Monday was not confined to making suggestions regarding the drafts issued by the two Governments. Each party would be free to make its own submissions both for procedural guidelines and the

CONFIDENTIAL

fasting in  
clean sheet  
of paper  
Yes!



CONFIDENTIAL

agenda. The Chairman confirmed this approach and stated that the parties would be free both to make their own proposals and also to comment on the proposals made by other parties.

17. There followed a discussion regarding the practicability of confining the parties to 2 representatives for purposes of the discussions beginning on Monday. Mr Ervine said that requiring the parties to submit the names of 2 representatives would effectively use up all of his party's resources. He suggested that the parties might be allowed to nominate 3 persons of whom 2 might be present at any one time to participate in the discussions. This suggestion was supported by Mr Mallon and by Mr Donaldson. The Chairman indicated that this proposal was accepted.

18. As efforts were still being made to resolve the position of the UKUP, the Chairman called for a short adjournment at 12.54pm.

19. The final part of the session began at 1.03pm with both Mr McCartney and Mr Wilson in their seats.

20. The Chairman welcomed Mr McCartney and Mr Wilson and explained that each of the parties, including the DUP, had confirmed their total and absolute commitment to the principles of democracy and non-violence specified in paragraph 20 of the report of the International Body (which the Chairman proceeded to read out). He then asked whether the UKUP also wished to do so.

21. Mr McCartney (at all times addressing Senator Mitchell as "Sir") stated that he had no difficulty in personally subscribing to these principles. He said that he also asked the Chairman to accept that there was an even more fundamental right - that of a majority of a community to determine the constitutional status of their own state. It was his understanding that both Governments had accepted this principle. Mr McCartney continued by expressing surprise that some of the parties who had sought to raise as a

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

annicality the ability of other parties to subscribe to the principles of democracy and non-violence were themselves fronting organisations which were a byword for graft and corruption.

22. The Chairman said that his colleague, General de Chastelain, had noted Mr McCartney's use of the word "personally" when confirming that he had no difficulty in subscribing to the principles of democracy and non-violence. The Chairman asked for confirmation that this commitment extended also to his party. Mr McCartney confirmed that this was his intention.

23. The Chairman thanked Mr McCartney for his contribution and stated that this represented the requisite commitment to the principles of democracy and non-violence. It was his intention that at the reconvened Plenary session on Wednesday 19 June a formal statement would be read into the record to the effect that the UKUP had made a total and absolute commitment to these principles. Mr McCartney then sought permission to withdraw from the session in view of other commitments. The Chairman indicated that he was content, and Mr McCartney and Mr Wilson withdrew.

24. The Chairman concluded the session by asking the parties to ensure that their written submissions on the procedural guidelines and the agenda for the opening Plenary session should be with his staff (in Room B5.07) by 3.000pm on Friday. The packages of papers submitted by the parties would be available for collection at 5.00pm on Friday. The Chairman also reminded the parties that they should now submit the names of up to 3 representatives any 2 of whom would be able to attend the discussions which would commence at 10.00am on Monday 17 June.

25. The Chairman formally adjourned the session at 1.10pm.

[Signed DAL]

D A LAVERY

13 June 1996

SC Ext 28196

CONFIDENTIAL