



cc: PS/Secretary of State (L&B)
PS/Sir John Wheeler (L&B)
PS/Michael Ancram (L&B)
PS/Malcolm Moss (L&B)
PS/Baroness Denton (L&B)
PS/PUS (L&B)
PS/Sir David Fell
Mr Thomas (L&B)
Mr Bell
Mr Legge
Mr Leach (B&L)
Mr Steele
Mr Watkins
Mr Wood (B&L)
Mr Beeton
Mr Currie
Mr Hill (B&L)
Mr Lavery

57/010

Mr Maccabe
Mr Perry
Mr Stephens
✓ Ms Bharucha
Ms Mapstone
Mr Whysall (B&L)
Ms Collins, Cab Off (via IPL)
Mr Dickinson, TAU
Mr Lamont RID FCO
HMA Dublin
Mr Westmacott (via RID)
Mr Campbell-Bannerman
Mrs McNally (B&L)

Office of the Independent Chairmen

Castle Buildings Stormont Belfast BT4 3SG Northern Ireland
Telephone 01232 522957 Facsimile 01232 768905

4 September 1996

TO: All participants

Attached are four draft records of the Plenary sessions in June and July. Any amendments should be submitted to the Office of the Independent Chairmen, Room B4.32, during business on Monday 9 September.

Madeleine Magee

Madeleine Magee

DRAFT RECORD OF OPENING PLENARY SESSION - WEDNESDAY 12 JUNE 1996
(00.32)

Those present:

Independent Chairmen	Government Teams	Parties
Senator Mitchell	British Government	Alliance Party
General de Chastelain	Irish Government	Labour Party
Mr Holkeri		Northern Ireland Women's Coalition
		Progressive Unionist Party
		Social Democratic and Labour Party
		Ulster Democratic Party
		Ulster Democratic Unionist Party
		United Kingdom Unionist Party
		Ulster Unionist Party

1. At 00.32 hours Senator Mitchell and his two colleagues took their seats in the main Conference Room. The DUP raised strong objections to this situation and stated that no opportunity had been afforded to the party to agree the appointment of Senator Mitchell as Chairman of the Plenary. The DUP said that it was for all participants to agree all issues under discussion and that no matters, including the appointment of Chairmen, should be imposed by the two Governments. The DUP stated that the Secretary of State and his officials had deliberately avoided visiting their rooms to let the party know about an impending Plenary Session. The DUP restated the point that the ultimate say in the appointment of any Chairmen belonged to the participants and therefore the party strongly objected to Senator Mitchell being put into the Chair without any opportunity to voice an opinion. With those comments the DUP delegation departed from the Conference Room at 00.36 hours. The UKUP delegation also left the Conference Room at this time.

2. The Chairman then read from a prepared text. Following the conclusion of his introductory remarks he indicated to delegates that he now wished to move forward to the point whereby all participants were to make a formal declaration making clear their total and absolute commitment to the International Body's principles of democracy and non-violence. The Chairman stated that he intended to read the Principles aloud and then ask both Governments and all participants to affirm their commitment to them. The following participants then affirmed their commitment to the Mitchell Principles in the manner outlined in the Report of the International Body:-

- (a) The British Government.
- (b) The Irish Government.
- (c) The Alliance Party;
- (d) The Labour Party;
- (e) The NI Women's Coalition;
- (f) The Progressive Unionist Party;
- (g) The Social Democratic and Labour Party;;
- (h) The Ulster Democratic Party;
- (i) There was no response from the Ulster Democratic Unionist Party;

(j) There was no response from the United Kingdom Unionist Party;

(k) The Ulster Unionist Party

3. The UUP expressed regret that both Governments had not yet put the legal steps in place to support commitment of the Principles even though it had made representations to the Irish on this point in early March.

4. The Chairman deleted the names of the parties who did not respond but directed that the press be told that this deletion did not reflect a refusal on their part to sign up to the Principles - merely their absence from the proceedings

5. The Chairman requested the participants to return at 11.00 am later that morning to resume the informal discussion on procedural rules and the agenda for the remainder of the Opening Plenary session. The Chairman then proposed an adjournment of the Plenary Session until noon on 19 June 1996. The SDLP referred to the fact that some delegations might have to travel long distances and asked that the restart time be extended to 13.00. The UUP said that although it had sympathies with the SDLP's point, its preference would be for discussions to commence at 11.00 am. The SDLP withdrew its proposal.

6. The Chairman then indicated that while it might appear that there was a calendar week available, in practice, official duties for some elsewhere would reduce the time for informal discussion considerably. The Chairman considered it might be appropriate, to enable better progress to be made, for the numbers in delegations to be reduced. The Chairman said that with limited time available delegates should be prepared to devote as much time as possible so

that work on both rules and agenda could be completed by 19 June. The UUP then referred to the temporary absence of two of the parties. The Chairman agreed that these parties could return for the purposes of the informal discussions on rules and agenda. The Chairman stated that both parties would have to give the same commitment to the Principles of non-violence and democracy and make the affirmation already made by all the other delegations in the appropriate manner.

7. The Chairman then read out the text of a prepared press statement. There were no objections to the text.

8. Finally, the Alliance Party enquired from the British Government whether the meeting of the Forum scheduled for that Friday was still on. The British Government confirmed that it was. The Chairman thanked the participants for attending and adjourned the Plenary Session until 12.00 noon on 19 June 1996.

Independent Chairmen Notetakers
13 June 1996

OIC/PS2

DRAFT RECORD OF OPENING PLENARY SESSION - WEDNESDAY 19 JUNE 1996 (12.03)

Those present:

Independent Chairmen	Government Teams	Parties
Senator Mitchell	British Government	Alliance Party
General de Chastelain	Irish Government	Labour Party
Mr Holkeri		Northern Ireland Women's Coalition
		Progressive Unionist Party
		Social Democratic and Labour Party
		Ulster Democratic Party
		Ulster Democratic Unionist Party
		United Kingdom Unionist Party
		Ulster Unionist Party

1. At 12.03 the Chairman convened a meeting of the Plenary session and indicated that pursuant to the request made prior to the adjournment of the previous Plenary, it was now his intention to make a brief report to the meeting which consisted of two parts. The first part of the report would deal with the commitments to the Mitchell Principles from those parties who had not given that commitment at the same time as their colleagues during the previous week. The second would feature an update on discussions focusing on agreeing the rules of procedure and finalising an agenda for the Opening Plenary session.

2. The Chairman then indicated that during the course of an informal meeting chaired by himself in the late morning of Wednesday 12 June, the DUP and the UKUP confirmed their total and absolute commitment specifically to the principles of democracy and non-violence as set out in para 20 of the Report of the International Body. The Chairman went on to indicate that this

took place in the presence of delegations representing parties who had already signified their commitment to these Principles at a Plenary meeting earlier that same day.

3. The Chairman commented on the on-going discussions regarding the rules of procedure and proposals for the agenda for the Opening Plenary. A significant amount of work had already been put in by the delegations on these issues and he believed considerable progress had been made thus far. The Chairman however indicated that a position had not yet been reached where a recommendation on either of these issues could be put forward to the Plenary. Further informal discussions were required to resolve some outstanding points. The Chairman then asked for any comments from the meeting on the content of the report. There were no comments at this stage. The Chairman then adjourned the Plenary session at 12.06 and thanked everyone for attending.

Independent Chairmen Notetakers
19 June 1996

OIC/PS1

DRAFT RECORD OF OPENING PLENARY SESSION - MONDAY 29 JULY 1996
(10.07)

Those present:

Independent Chairmen	Government Teams	Parties
Senator Mitchell	British Government	Alliance Party
General de Chastelain	Irish Government	Labour Party
Mr Holkeri		Northern Ireland Women's Coalition
		Progressive Unionist Party
		Social Democratic and Labour Party
		Ulster Democratic Party
		Ulster Democratic Unionist Party
		United Kingdom Unionist Party
		Ulster Unionist Party

1. The Chairman said that the initial agenda items for the meeting had been established by the unanimous agreement of the participants in previous informal discussions. He therefore proposed to deal with the adoption of paragraphs 30-36 of the rules of procedure concerning the powers of decision making. Hearing no objections to this proposal the Chairman stated that those paragraphs would now be adopted to govern the decision making process in the negotiations and would be used henceforth.

2. The Chairman said he now proposed to deal with those amendments submitted on the rules of procedure. There were nine from the DUP and two from the UKUP and each would be time limited as already agreed; five minutes for each of the DUP amendments and five minutes for the first UKUP amendment. Thirty minutes would be allowed for the second UKUP amendment. The Chairman reminded participants that it had already been agreed that there would be three minutes for the proposer of each amendment and two minutes

for those who wished to speak in opposition. The Chairman indicated that there would be twenty minutes allocated to the proposer of the second UKUP amendment with ten minutes for anyone speaking in opposition. This was agreed without objection.

3. The DUP asked the Chairman whether he proposed to call the votes on the amendment and then put the actual rule up for adoption by the meeting. The Chairman said that at the end of each amendment he would call a vote to be signalled by a show of hands in support. He would then name each party who supported a particular proposition. The Chairman said that he proposed to take all amendments in order and then vote on the complete rules as amended or otherwise.

3. The DUP and UKUP stated that the best way of proceeding might be to adopt a rule automatically once a particular amendment was completed for if an amendment was voted down it was not the position that the rule stood automatically. The rule would have to be specifically approved by the participants. The SDLP stated that after all of the amendments were dealt with individually there should be a collective affirmation of the particular rules. The Chairman stated that an overall affirmation of the rules was required and he asked the UKUP to which rule did their second amendment relate. The UKUP said that they wished to come back to this particular point as more time was needed to consider the question. The Chairman then noted that particular amendments by both the UKUP and the DUP affected the same rules so the adoption of such rules could only be considered after both sets of amendments were considered. This point related to rules 3 and 29 in particular.

4. The Chairman then proceeded to deal with the DUP amendment No 1 dealing with rule 1. The DUP spoke in support of the amendment. The British Government spoke against it. The Chairman then asked the parties for a declaration of support for the DUP amendment. Support was indicated by the DUP, the UKUP, the UUP and the UDP. The Chairman stated that there wasn't sufficient consensus for this amendment and the amendment was declared lost. Rule 1 was then voted upon and supported by the British Government, the Irish Government, the Alliance Party, Labour, NI Women's Coalition, the PUP, the SDLP, the UDP and the UUP. The Chairman declared the rule adopted.

5. The DUP spoke in support of amendment No 2 on rule 2. No-one spoke in opposition to the amendment. Support for the amendment came from the DUP, the UKUP and the UUP. The Chairman said that there was not sufficient consensus for adoption of the amendment. Rule 2 was then voted upon and supported by the British Government, the Irish Government, the Alliance party, Labour, NI Women's Coalition, the PUP, the SDLP, the UDP and the UUP. The Chairman accordingly declared that rule 2 was adopted.

6. The DUP said that they proposed to take amendments dealing with rules 3, 12 and 28 together. These related to DUP amendments Nos 3, 5 and 8. No-one spoke in opposition to these amendments. Support for these amendments came from the DUP and the UKUP. The Chairman declared that there wasn't sufficient consensus for adoption of the rule. He also said that paragraph 3 was covered by the UKUP amendment so rule 3 could not be put to the meeting for adoption now. A vote was however taken on rules 12 and 28. Those supporting the adoption of these rules were the British Government, Irish Government, the Alliance Party, Labour,

NI Women's Coalition, the PUP, the SDLP, the UDP and the UUP. The Chairman accordingly declared that rules 12 and 28 were adopted.

7. The DUP spoke in support of amendment No 4 on rule 4. No-one spoke in opposition to the amendment. Support for the amendment came from the DUP and the UKUP. The Chairman said that there wasn't sufficient consensus to adopt the amendment. He then put the adoption of rule 4 to the meeting and this was supported by the British Government, the Irish Government, the Alliance party, Labour, the NI Women's Coalition, the PUP, the SDLP, the UDP and the UUP. The Chairman accordingly declared rule 4 adopted.

8. The DUP again spoke in support of amendment No 6 in relation to rule 16. No-one spoke in opposition to the amendment. Support for the amendment came from the DUP, the UKUP and the UUP. The Chairman said that there wasn't sufficient consensus to adopt this amendment. He then put the question of the adoption of rule 16 to the meeting and it was supported by the British Government, the Irish Government, the Alliance Party, Labour, NI Women's Coalition, the PUP, the SDLP, the UDP and the UUP. The Chairman accordingly declared rule 16 adopted.

9. The DUP spoke in support of amendment No 7 in relation to rule 18. No-one spoke in opposition to the amendment. Support for the amendment came from the DUP, the UKUP and the UUP. The Chairman declared that there wasn't sufficient consensus to adopt this amendment. He then put rule 18 to the meeting and it was supported by the British Government, the Irish Government, the Alliance Party, Labour, the NI Women's Coalition, the PUP, the SDLP, the UDP and the UUP. The Chairman accordingly declared rule 18 adopted.

10. The DUP spoke in support of amendment No 9 in relation to rule 19. No-one spoke in opposition to the amendment. Support for the amendment came from the PUP, the DUP, the UKUP and the UUP. The Chairman declared that there wasn't sufficient consensus for adoption of the rule. He also stated that he would not present the question of the adoption of the rule itself because there was a UKUP amendment to the same rule. The Chairman then proceeded to deal with the UKUP amendments. He said the first amendment dealt with six different rules. At this point the UKUP stated that this amendment would be withdrawn. The Chairman then said that he would proceed to deal with the adoption of rule 3 which had already been touched on. Support for rule 3 came from the British Government, Irish Government, the Alliance Party, Labour, the NI Women's Coalition, the PUP, the SDLP, the UDP and the UUP. The Chairman then said that there was sufficient consensus for rule 3 and declared it adopted.

11. The UKUP spoke in support of the second amendment. The British Government spoke against the amendment. Support for the amendment came from the DUP, the UKUP and the UUP. The Chairman said that there wasn't sufficient consensus for its adoption. Rule 29 was then put to the meeting. It was supported by the British Government, the Irish Government, the Alliance party, Labour, the NI Women's Coalition, the PUP, the SDLP, the UDP and the UUP. The Chairman accordingly declared rule 29 adopted.

11. The Chairman then proceeded to the adoption of the remaining rules of procedure. These were adopted unanimously at 10.40. The Chairman said that his staff would prepare a final version of the rules dated that day for distribution to the parties as soon as possible.

12. The DUP intervened to say that its ongoing participation in the negotiating process was based on the understanding that the provisions of the Ground Rules document published on 16 April 1996:

1. did not govern the process;
2. did not have any continuing application beyond the three paragraphs referred to in the 1996 Entry to Negotiations Act, viz paragraphs 8, 9 and 17, and
3. did not have any binding effect on the delegations as participants.

The DUP also stated that while a hearing would be given to each participant who wished to raise a relevant issue, there was no requirement on them to negotiate on topics other than those subjects on the agreed comprehensive agenda. For example, while the DUP would negotiate on the subject heading of "Constitutional Issues", they would not negotiate "Northern Ireland's constitutional position as part of the United Kingdom" if such an issue was raised under a general subject heading. The UKUP said they endorsed, in broad terms, what the DUP had said. The UKUP had fought the election on the basis that they would not negotiate the Union. The UUP stated that they supported the rules on the basis that they were a single set of rules - as was indicated in rule 2. The UUP also endorsed the other two unionist parties' comments

14. The Chairman said that the next item was to take the agenda for the remaining Plenary session. However that had not yet been agreed. The first two items on that agenda were, in his view,

non-contentious, ie the ratification of the UKUP resolution and the establishment of the Business Committee and he asked the meeting to approve both these items. There was no disagreement on this point. The resolution by the UKUP had been unanimously agreed to by the informal group the previous week. There was no opposition voiced from the participants when the Chairmen put it to the meeting and the UKUP resolution was unanimously agreed. The UUP wondered whether the meeting would have to decide on the relevant voting strengths of the delegations who were to take part in the Business Committee. The Chairman said that it was desirable that maximum flexibility should apply re membership to enable people to be absent for other discussions. The DUP wondered whether the participants in the Business Committee had to be delegates. The Chairman said the rule was silent on that issue. The DUP stated that the Business Committee was not involved in any negotiations and therefore it appeared there was no problem, but in earlier discussions the British Government thought that there might be a difficulty.

15. The Chairman said that the term "representatives" had been used deliberately in the rules to allow maximum flexibility to the delegations. The British Government stated that it was happy with the Chairman's interpretation. The UKUP also supported the Chairman's view. The Chairman said that accordingly his view would act as a ruling if any questions arose on the issue in future. The Business Committee would not be dealing with the substance of negotiations but with procedural matters only; that was why people other than elected delegates, could take part in its deliberations. The numbers would, however, be limited to two persons from each delegation. The DUP sought confirmation that no decisions of substance would be involved in the Business Committee. The Chairman was emphatic on this point. He then

proposed the establishment of the Business Committee with General de Chastelain in the Chair. There was unanimous support for this proposal.

16. The UUP wondered about how notifications of meetings and procedures etc of the Business Committee would be issued. The Chairman said he would discuss this matter with General de Chastelain. The DUP wondered whether, on the resumption of the Plenary meeting later that day, it would be possible to proceed to a discussion of the decommissioning issue. The Chairman said the next item to be considered was the agenda for the Opening Plenary session and that had not yet been agreed to. He proposed to recess the meeting subject to the participants being recalled by him, and added that bilaterals should now take place to see what progress could be achieved on the agenda issue. The DUP asked whether there would be another meeting of the Plenary that day. The Chairman said there would be. The meeting then broke up at 10.54.

Independent Chairmen Notetakers
30 July 1996

OIC/PS4

DRAFT RECORD OF OPENING PLENARY SESSION - MONDAY 29 JULY 1996
(18.47)

Those present:

Independent Chairmen	Government Teams	Parties
General de Chastelain	British Government	Alliance Party
Mr Holkeri	Irish Government	Labour Party
		Northern Ireland Women's Coalition
		Progressive Unionist Party
		Social Democratic and Labour Party
		Ulster Democratic party
		Ulster Democratic Unionist Party
		United Kingdom Unionist Party
		Ulster Unionist Party

1. The meeting commenced with the participants joining with the Chairman in expressing condolences to Senator Mitchell who had earlier left to attend the funeral of his brother in the USA.
2. The Chairman (Mr Holkeri) emphasised the achievements of the day's discussion. Some common ground had been established on the agenda issue, however differences remained, and it was not in his view possible to overcome these in the short time available before the summer break. He proposed that the Plenary should be adjourned until Monday 9 September on the basis that participants would, in the meantime, reflect upon the agenda issues. He invited comment upon this proposal.
3. The DUP drew attention to a document given to the press that morning which stated erroneously that the rules of procedure had been unanimously agreed. The DUP was concerned about both the

release and the misrepresentation of the document and about the criticism directed at the party by other participants during discussions on the grounds that it had been delaying proceedings. Those same critics were now supporting a very lengthy recess. The DUP said that the promise of the two Prime Ministers to address the decommissioning issue right at the beginning of the process seemed to have gone by the board. The DUP proposed that a committee be set up now to report on the issue. The Chairman expressed regret for the typing error in the document and reminded participants of the confidentiality of the discussions (Rule 16). The Alliance Party questioned why the hitherto proposed date of 3 September for resumption had now become 9 September. The Chairman said that this was at the request of most of the participants. The Alliance Party said that it was willing to continue working on the agenda.

4. The UKUP endorsed the DUP position and assured participants that there never had been any intent on its part to delay the proceedings. The UKUP considered that decommissioning was the real issue and when the opportunity had now arrived to address important issues such as the status of Northern Ireland and decommissioning, some participants were looking for time-out. Those issues would have to be faced and would remain crucial to the pro-union participants.

5. The UUP said it welcomed this morning's decisions. About a week ago a shopping list had appeared in the press of issues to be resolved before the summer recess. The UUP had considered that public expectation had been unnecessarily and unwisely heightened and the Irish Government had been identified with this undue optimism. The UUP said it believed that the complicated agenda questions could not be addressed in a couple of days. There was a need for a period of reflection on the agenda. The UUP said it

would be available for any bilaterals on the issue during August and hoped that some progress could be made before 9 September.

6. The British Government said that, along with other participants, it shared a feeling of disappointment about progress and had hoped that more could have been achieved before the summer break. Participants had, however, worked hard during the discussions and a summer break was appropriate. The central questions affecting the agenda remained, and would have to be faced in September. They might be better and more fruitfully addressed then and the Chairman's proposal was therefore a reasonable one in the circumstances.

7. The UUP said it would now prefer to proceed with the agenda, feeling that the proposed break was inordinately long, especially in the context of present community instability, and the need to show the community that progress was being made at the talks. The UUP was also concerned that during the proposed break some parties might misinform the community as to where the talks had reached, and create false expectations.

8. The DUP noted that some other parties seemed to favour continuing the discussions. It also raised two requests with regard to participants receiving a record of meetings as provided by the rules and the distribution to all participants of proposals for the agenda made by the various participants. General de Chastelain confirmed that a draft record of formal meetings would be issued to the participants as soon as possible. The Chairman said he had received proposals for the agenda from three parties and these would be circulated to other participants if this was agreed by the parties concerned. He also invited those participants who had not submitted proposals to consider doing so.

9. The UUP said that the Government communique of 28 November 1995 had introduced the twin-track process as a way of making progress. In referring to paragraphs 34 and 38 of the International Body's Report the UUP now questioned whether one or more of the parties had retracted from the spirit of the earlier undertaking. It said it would welcome an indication of the continued commitment to the twin-track process from these participants. The UUP asked whether the two Governments had identified the technical experts needed, and in relation to paragraph 40, at what stage legislation had now reached. The UUP said it suspected that the two Governments were trying to sideline the decommissioning issue and were being assisted in this by other participants to the talks.

10. The Irish Government expressed satisfaction with progress to date and assured participants that both Governments were anxious to proceed with the agenda. The Irish Government rejected the inference of backtracking on the twin-track approach and considered that a great deal of careful thought had to go into the treatment of the agenda and decommissioning. It seemed however that participants could not reach conclusions on the agenda in the remaining 24 hours of the schedule and therefore a resumption on 9 September with opening statements was proposed. The UUP intervened to ask about progress with the creation of a verification committee. The Irish Government said that work on the legislative aspect was being advanced and that commitments given would be honoured.

11. The UUP pressed the point about the verification committee. The SDLP asked the Chairman if it was in order for participants to pose such questions to Government ministers. The DUP challenged

differentiations between Governments and other participants. The Chairman said that under rule 24 all remarks had to be addressed through the Chairman. In relation to specific questions, it was up to participants whether they wished to respond or not. He then reminded participants that they were presently discussing a proposal of the Chair.

12. The British Government said that the work of the two Governments on the matters in question was well advanced and assured the UUP that both Governments were taking the matter of decommissioning very seriously. They hoped however to benefit from consultation with other participants.

13. The UKUP said it believed the IRA had no intention of disarming and that there was no interest in disarming the IRA on the part of the Irish Government or the SDLP. The UKUP also stated it had no confidence in Articles 2 and 3 of the Irish Constitution nor confidence in the British Government's willingness to defend Northern Ireland from the IRA. There would be no softening of the views of the UKUP in these areas come September. The DUP challenged the Irish Government's proposal to resume in September with opening statements. In its view there would be no option but to begin with the with the sequence presently recommended by the two Governments. The DUP then proposed that the Chairman should ask each of the participants for their views on whether to adjourn or press on with the agenda.

14. The UKUP said that the whole question of linking decommissioning with the talks was flawed. It was nothing more than a lure to Sinn Fein. The issue of terrorist arms was for the rule of law and not a sort of bait. The DUP said that the British Government had indicated to it that the Irish Government wanted to

get into Strands One, Two and Three before addressing decommissioning. As long as terrorists had weapons in their hands the people of Ireland would be held to ransom. Decommissioning should proceed now but there was nothing but silence from the Irish Government at the legislative aspects. This was a matter for the two Governments, and not the political parties, to deal with as it was a law and order issue.

15. The Chairman reminded the participants that he had made a proposal, that the DUP had made a counter-proposal and that it was up to participants whether they continued this week or adjourned. The UUP said that they were willing to continue. The PUP said that the Chairman had given as a reason for adjournment the unlikelihood of agreement this week on the agenda issues. The PUP would support the Chairman's proposal in the circumstances, but suggested that each Monday and Tuesday in August should be set aside for bilaterals.

16. There being no further comment the Chairman asked for a vote of those in support of the DUP amendment to continue to work on the agenda issues. The DUP, UKUP and UDP supported the amendment. The Chairman declared that there was insufficient consensus for the proposal and called for a vote on his original proposal. Support for this came from the Alliance Party, Labour, PUP, SDLP, NI Women's Coalition and both Governments. The DUP enquired as to whether this did represent sufficient consensus. The Chairman then adjourned the session for 20 minutes to reflect on this point. Upon resumption he said he now proposed to employ the power vested in him by Rule 20 to adjourn the proceedings. The DUP and the UUP suggested that rather than exercising his authority under Rule 20, the Chairman should put the proposal to the participants again. The Chairman said that he would accept the suggestion but first

requested General de Chastelain to address the participants on the matter of proposals for the agenda.

17. General de Chastelain said that he had received proposals for the agenda from the DUP, SDLP and UKUP and inquired if other parties would be submitting proposals. The PUP, UDP, UUP and NI Women's Coalition said that they would submit proposals. The Alliance Party said that they had submitted a verbal proposal. General de Chastelain then inquired if participants wished the Chairman to circulate these proposals. The SDLP said it was not prepared to agree to the circulation of its proposals for the agenda until the Plenary discussions on agenda took place. The DUP said that if the participants were to make an attempt to progress the agenda before the proposed resumption in September it was surely desirable for the parties to exchange proposals. The UUP inquired if names should be put forward for the Business Committee. General de Chastelain said that he would be in touch with participants on this. The SDLP said that they would not be taking part in any meetings of the Business Committee before September.

18. The participants expressed thanks and appreciation to the Chairmen and all their staff for their services to the parties and Governments. The Chairman then proposed that the Plenary be adjourned until Monday 9 September. There were no objections. On behalf of the Chairmen and staff he thanked all of the participants for their kind words. He then adjourned the Plenary session until 9 September at 10.00. The session ended at 20.48.

Independent Chairmen Notetakers
1 August 1996

OIC/PS3