

ANNEX C4

POSSIBLE SAFEGUARD MECHANISMS UUP SUBMISSION

6 June 1992

1 In our submissions to the present Talks, we have indicated a desire to consider and negotiate upon any reasonable mechanism consistent with the 'Common Themes' and 'Common Principles' documents, which would protect individuals and groups, within the proposed Assembly.

2 At present the main mechanism put forward has been a weighted majority of say 70% being required under certain circumstances. This could also mean that if 30% of the Assembly indicated dissatisfaction, under certain circumstances, the proposal may be referred outside the Assembly, or delayed.

3 Another suggestion has been made, ie that the SOS could have administrative or legislative decisions referred to him for examination, perhaps with an appropriate trigger mechanism to bring this about.

4 We have already indicated that the proposed 'Panel' may have a role to play in determining the outcome of some matters which are referred to it.

5 On top of these issues is the question of the Legislation already in place, together with any additional provisions which may be included in a new or amended Act.

6 It is already clear, that as well as any of the above, access to the courts will always be a safeguard mechanism. There is a risk that we will have such a wide variety of well intentioned measures that a virtual 'veto' is created which will work against the ideas of workability and durability already agreed.

7 We have to find the right balance between all of the possible means of protection.