r KOM:

D J R HILL Political Development Team 25 September 1996 => 2. July 578 3019 3. PA Trans

```
PS/Michael Ancram (B&L &
     Washington)
PS/PUS (B&L) - B
PS/Sir David Fell o/r - B
Mr Thomas o/r- B
Mr Steele - B
Mr Leach (B&L) - B
Mr Bell - B
Mr Watkins - B
Mr Wood (B&L) - B
Mr Stephens - B
Mr Maccabe - B
Mr Lavery - B
 Mr Priestly - B
 Mr Perry - B
 Mr Whysall (B&L) - B
 Mr Campbell-Bannerman - B
 Ms Mapstone - B
 Ms Bharucha - B
Mr Lamont, RID FCO - B
 HMA Dublin - B
 Clarke, Dublin - B
 Mr Westmacott,
    Washington via IPL - B
 Mr Oakden No 10 via CPL - B
 Ms Collins, Cab Off
    (via IPL) - B
```

PS/SECRETARY OF STATE (B&L) - B

BULL POINTS FOR MEETING WITH THE UUP, 25 SEPTEMBER

As promised in the handling plan circulated earlier today I attach a set of bull points which the Secretary of State might aim to make at this afternoon's meeting with Mr Trimble and his team. They aim to bring out those elements of the proposed package which should be attractive to Unionists and deal with likely UUP reservations.

2. An additional card which Mr Watkins has suggested might be borne in mind is the possibility of developing the role of the Northern Ireland Grand Committee on the lines already cleared by Cabinet

colleagues. If it seemed that Mr Trimble could be influenced by this relatively minor concession, the Secretary of State could offer to let him have some firm proposals in this area which would parallel recent developments in the role of the Scottish and Welsh Grand Committees.

[Signed]

D J R HILL
Political Development Team

MEETING WITH THE UUP, 25 SEPTEMBER

Key Points to Make

- as the two Governments agreed on Monday, we have been working with the Irish to put together a paper which summarises our proposals on how the decommissioning issue should be handled.
- it goes as far as we believe is possible to meet your stated concerns while remaining consistent with the two Governments' policy positions.
- we have worked very hard with the Irish to achieve agreement on this. They have had to consider throughout what the SDLP could accept. I want to ask you to weigh this paper very carefully before rushing to any conclusion.
- the two Governments look forward to further trilateral with the UUP on Monday to hear whether our proposals are acceptable to you.

'Selling Points'

- The paper emphasises the two Governments' commitment to legislate, to introduce the Bills early in the coming session, and to secure enactment by Christmas.
- Obviously, the draft legislation makes provision for an <u>Independent Commission</u>, but I believe you accept that final definition of the Independent Commission's role and privileges can only be achieved once there is agreement on a decommissioning scheme.
- Agreement on such a scheme can in our view only be reached, as the International Body suggested, in a forum which embraces all the talks participants, including those close

to the paramilitary organisations. Hence our proposal for a <u>committee</u> to take this forward. It seems to us that that is the only forum in which you could be given confidence in the Republican Movement's good faith on decommissioning.

- We have responded to the concern which you and Ken Maginnis and your colleagues have expressed that there should be continuity between now and the point at which the Commission can be established.
 - the two Governments have agreed to make a range of

 technical expertise available to the proposed

 Committee, which would also be available to the

 Commission.
 - the paper also reflects a commitment to make available independent experts of international standing to support the work of the Committee and who we envisage would play an appropriate role in relation to the Commission when it is established.
- We have also noted your concern that a Committee could lead to prevarication and delay:
 - we are proposing an active and substantial working agenda for the Committee.
 - we propose regular <u>reviews by the plenary</u> of progress across the negotiations as a whole, initially in December
- If and when Sinn Fein come in they will be bound by whatever conclusions are endorsed by sufficient consensus in the plenary address to decommissioning.

- the Governments also propose that all participants should specifically acknowledge, as the Governments do, that progress in the negotiations will only be possible in the context of the implementation of all aspects of the Mitchell report.
- if the negotiations fail to reach a conclusion because there has been no progress on decommissioning it will be entirely clear where the political responsibility rests.
- "timetabling". There have been misunderstandings about the use of this term, including Monday's trilateral.

 Obviously, the work of the Committee can, by agreement, be scheduled, and with the support of both Governments and the UUP it should be able to do a considerable amount of ground clearing work before the decommissioning legislation is through. But there is clearly no possibility of specifying in advance a timetable for actual decommissioning: any such timetable can only be established with the assent of the paramilitary organisations and the parties which represent them.

Packaging

I appreciate that this will be a difficult paper for you, requiring careful consideration. I am ready to do my best to present the case to plenary for moving forward on this basis in the most positive and sympathetic manner. [Take him through the speaking note - Annex B to Mr Leach's submission of earlier today.]