CONFIDENTIAL

BY FAX - HARD COPY TO FOLLOW

The Honourable Dermott Gleeson SC Office of the Attorney General Government Buildings DUBLIN 2

20 September 1996

525/96

ALLIANCE PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

As requested during our telephone conversation this morning, I have now worked-up the Skeleton Judgment into a fuller text of what might become the Governments' Conclusions for delivery next week.

I have, as you suggested, adhered to the format of the Conclusions issued on 11 September in respect of the DUP case against the PUP/UDP. This sets a very useful precedent.

In addressing the Alliance Party's allegations, and the responses to this, I have adopted a minimalist approach and have not sought to paraphrase or amplify matters already covered in the documentation (which will be appended to the 'judgment') or in the Plenary Session of 18 September.

I have slightly reordered some of the material in the Skeleton Judgment in relation to the Drumcree allegations. I have, at your suggestion, dealt with the alleged breach of principle(a) before the allegation in relation principle (d). I have also, at your suggestion, deleted the sentence condemning the events at Drumcree - you felt that we might be better to avoid a debate about the 'lexicon' of condemnation.

Interestingly, the Alliance Party's written submission in relation to Drumcree is confined to an assertion that there was a breach of principle (a). It was only during the Plenary Session on 18 September that this was expanded to cover principle (d). I think we both tended to the view that the oral presentation of an allegation should be confined to the matters asserted in the 'pleadings' and that a party should not be allowed to use this device to introduce a new allegation. However, I have retained the material relating to the alleged breach of principle (d) in the interests of completeness given that it relates to the same factual circumstances as the allegation in respect of principle (a). I think this may be the safer course to adopt in the instant case.

CONFIDENTIAL

I have again sent a copy of the attached material to the Secretariat. However, we agreed that in the interests of expedition I should continue to work directly to you as well.

I hope that I have provided you with sufficient material to take this matter forward. Should, however, you require anything further at this stage, please do not hesitate to let me know.

[signed DAL]

D A LAVERY

CONFIDENTIAL

DL/LM/1255

Hidden copy:

PS/Secretary of State (B&L)	В
PS/Michael Ancram (B&L)	В
PS/PUS (B&L)	В
PS/Sir David Fell	В
Mr Thomas (o/r)	В
Mr Leach (B&L)	В
Mr Watkins	В
Mr Bell	В
Mr Hill (B&L)	В
Mr Maccabe	В
Mr Stephens	В
Mr Whysall (B&L)	В
Mr Jagelman	

FOR ENCLOSURE PLEASE SEE MY NOTE TO PS/SECRETARY OF STATE OF TODAY'S DATE

The Attorney told so that he was content with the analytical approach set out in the Steleton Judgment. He could not, he said, inmunistely think of any other approach that would be legally sound. We would, however, wish to discuss the draft with Ministerial colleagues.

4. Un one point of detail, the Attorney agrees that we entried acknowledge that the events at Drumtree amounted to the here of force or the threatened use of force. Revever, he suggested that he would prefer to omit any combonistion of those events (in order to avaid introducing contraversy even what he termed the 'lexicon' of condensation. It will be interesting to see whether his colleagues agrees with this approach.

5. The Attorney thinks that we should continue to aim to have the judgment ready for delivery on Monday, but recognizes that this may not be presticable to matters of substands remain to be discussed between the Coversents.

5. The Attorney will let us have his further thoughts on the draft on showing the possible.

to pare the attached draft to the Inial through afficial

CONFIDENTIAL

DL/LM/1255