

From: John McKervill
 Political Affairs Division
 21 June 1996

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

TALKS: FURTHER MEETING WITH UUP: 20 JUNE

Michael Ancram had a further meeting with Ken Maginnis and Reg Empey of the UUP on 20 June at 2015.

2. The meeting was good humoured with the beginning taken up by a debate between Michael Ancram and Reg Empey on which had suffered the greater wrath of Robert McCartney earlier in the day! In this regard, Reg Empey steered the Minister towards Mervyn Pauley's article in page 8 of that day's News Letter for an accurate description of Robert McCartney's position.

CONFIDENTIAL

3. The Minister showed the UUP representatives the revised Rules of Procedure document, explaining that it was solely for illustrative purposes only and that it had not been agreed with anyone. The document attempted to fill in the procedural gaps by adopting items from the groundrules but in different language. It was certainly not a final text but he asked whether it was the type which the UUP had envisaged. In response, Empey said that if the document attempted to fill in procedural gaps, then it would go some way to meeting their needs. There was still a political problem which might be resolved if included in the new document was a formula which re-stated that there was no predetermined outcome to the negotiations, that the negotiations would not be bound or restricted by the parameters of the earlier documents and that there was no limit to the outcome of what might be achieved. Maginnis then asked if the UUP's formulation, notified to the British Team at the earlier meeting, was included in the document. Michael Ancram said that it was not because it was not a matter of procedure, although there was some language in the document which came close to meeting, he thought, the UUP's concerns. Examining paragraph 17 A of the document, Empey said that it was technically correct but 'politically inadequate'. The UUP needed a catch-all paragraph which made clear that the outcome of the negotiations would be free from any pre-determination.

4. Michael Ancram undertook to take away their comments and consider if their concerns could be met in some other way. On how the new document could be introduced into the negotiations, Empey was concerned that it should not appear as a sort of deal negotiated between the UUP and the British and Irish Governments. Michael Ancram explained how we saw matters progressing on Monday (as had been agreed earlier with the Irish and General de Chastelain). Empey said that the UUP could accept the paper as a joint amendment from the two Governments, reported to the Independent Chairman, provided they were content with the text.

CONFIDENTIAL

6. The meeting ended at 2050.

7. Following the meeting the Minister, with officials, considered a possible amendment to para 17A of the draft Rules of Procedure. The Minister, however, decided not to show the amendment to the Irish until it could be floated with Ken Maginnis and Reg Empey on Monday morning to see if it met UUP's concerns.

(Signed)

- Mr Lavery -B
- Mr Stephens -B
- Miss Harrison -B
- Mr Whysall -B
- Mr Campbell-Bannerman -B
- Mr Lamont, RID -B
- RMA Dublin -B
- Ms Collins, Cabinet Office

J MCKERVILL

SH Ext 27088

PS/Michael Ancram(L+B) -B
PS/Secretary of State(L+B) -B

TALKS: 24 JUNE - HANDLING RULES OF PROCEDURE

The proposed text I circulated at 20.05 on 20 June was cleared by Irish officials and seemed to be acceptable to the UUP (Reg Empey and Ken Maginnis).

2. Michael Ancram subsequently agreed that we should slightly adapt the text of paragraph 17A (new text attached) to address the UUP concern that they should have a convincing political response to Robert McCartney et al's claim that the negotiations would be taking place within the "straightjacket" of the Ground Rules and the "parameters" set by the Framework Documents.

3. To complement the relevant rules of procedure, we have indicated to the Irish that we would be prepared adopt the position set out in the attached speaking note so far as the status of Ground Rules is concerned. (The Irish have an earlier version.) It is drafted for delivery when the rules of procedure are formally adopted, but it may be necessary to make the necessary points as the draft rules are being considered.