FROM: Q J THOMAS DUS(L)

2 JULY 1996

02JUL 1996



PS/Secretary of State(L+B) PS/Sir John Wheeler(L+B) -B-B-BPS/Michael Ancram(L+B) -BPS/PUS(L+B) -BPS/Sir David Fell -BMr Steele -BMr Watkins -BMr Bell -BMr Leach -BMr Perry -BMr Hill(L+B) -BMr Lavery -BMr Stephens -BMr Maccabe -BMr Myles

SEFAIF

Mr Legge -B

RELAYING INFORMATION ON PUNISHMENT BEATINGS TO SENATOR MITCHELL

I wonder if we should take pause before passing information to Senator Mitchell about punishment beatings? In particular, what consequences would there be in what action is he intended to take?

We today debated a possible procedural rule, reflecting 2. Ground Rule 17 to this effect:

> "If, during the negotiations, a formal representation is made that a participant is no longer established to participate in the negotiations on the grounds that they have demonstrably dishonoured the principles of democracy and non violence, the Independent Chairman will refer this representation to the two Governments for their consideration and, having due regard to the views of the participants, appropriate action."

In debate it was suggested that action shall be taken only in response to evidence. HMG argued that this did not need to be stated expressly but was implicit in the word "demonstrably".

4. Against that background, I wonder what status and authority the information attached to your minute is intended to have. If and when we seek to initiate action against a party we shall wish to ensure we have good evidence linking it to a particular party. Pending that we may want to take stock. I understand that Michael Ancram has similar concerns.

(Signed)

Q J THOMAS DUS(L)