


FROM: D J R HILL

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT TEAM

18 JULY 1996



- B cc: PS/Secretary of State (L&B) PS/Sir John Wheeler (L, B&DFP) B PS/Michael Ancram (L, B&DENI) В PS/Malcolm Moss (L, DOE & DHSS) В PS//Baroness Denton (L,DED&DANI) В В PS/PVS (L&B) B PS/Sir David Fell B Mr Thomas (L&B) - B Mr Bell - B Mr Legge B Mr Leach (L&B) - B Mr Steele - B Mr Watkins В Mr Wood (L&B) В Mr Beeton B Mr Currie В Mr Hill (L&B) - B Mr Lavery B Mr Lindsay - B Mr Maccabe B Mr Perry - B Mr Stephens B Ms Checksfield В Ms Mapstone B Mr Whysall (L&B) Ms Collins, Cab Off (via IPL) В В Mr O'Mahony, TAU B Mr Lamont, RID B HMA Dublin - B Mr Westmacott (via RID) - B Mr Campbell-Bannerman - B Mrs McNally (L&B)

Ms Harrison - B

TALKS: TUESDAY 16 JULY 1996

auterlial

It may be helpful to colleagues to have a small gloss on your comprehensive record of Tuesday's meetings.

2. It emerged during Senator Mitchell's debrief on his meeting with the SDLP that the SDLP had initially proposed that the rules of procedure should simply be put to the assembled delegations and voted through by sufficient consensus: if the UUP parted company from the DUP and UKUP it would demonstrate their good faith, otherwise the process would be over.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3. It was clearly Senator Mitchell who persuaded the SDLP to adopt the more constructive approach of allowing him to try to broker a deal between the UUP and SDLP. He deployed the argument that the rules on sufficient consensus themselves required determined efforts to reach agreement before any "vote" could be called. He had also pointed to earlier SDLP acknowledgements that they and the UUP had been close to agreement before the break.
- 4. The outcome was a constructive proposition which the UUP and the two Governments were able to support. The SDLP's original position was somewhat harder. Senator Mitchell's authority and diplomatic skills have again stood us in good stead.

(Signed)

D J R HILL POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT TEAM CB x22317

CONFIDENTIAL