

In this Assembly today we are discussing something that affects the life and well-being of every member of the community. It affects your life, Mr. Speaker, and my life and the lives of our families. We want to say to the British Government loud and clear that the I.R.A. has got to be smashed. Terrorism, whether it is I.R.A. terrorism or the counter-terrorism that I.R.A. activity has bred, has got to be put down. There is a way it can be done. It can only be done if the British Government have the determination and the will-power to do it. I trust that in some way this debate will draw the British Government into action that will lead to the stopping of acts of violence, to the detection and detention of those responsible for such acts and to this community coming again to a state where every man can enjoy freedom and peace.

#### AMENDMENT PROPOSED

3.37 p.m.

**Mr. Hume:** I beg to move, to leave out all the words after "destruction" in line 2 and to add:

"by violent forces in Northern Ireland calls upon the Secretary of State to carry out a thorough review of security policy."

We on this side of the House are deeply concerned about the continuation of murder and destruction. In order to ensure that the debate on the subject would cover all quarters of the community we tabled this Amendment. This is a matter which has needed to be debated by public representatives for quite some time. This is perhaps the first occasion in a number of years when we have come together to discuss this serious subject. Murder and destruction have led to untold misery. It is therefore important that our views are stated clearly.

One of the problems in Northern Ireland is not what is true but what people believe to be true. That is the important thing. People opposite believe certain things and people on this side believe certain things. Both beliefs

will be stated today. Hard things will be said. Let them be said, but let them be said in such a way that in the end we can arrive at a solution to the problems which have existed for several centuries. Let them be said in such a way that we can arrive at a solution which will ensure that future generations can look back on this generation and say that at least we solved the problem and created a stable and just society and lasting peace.

Before we get to that we have hard things to say about the violence. There is no doubt at all in our mind about the actions and attitudes of the Provisional I.R.A. Neither is there any doubt in our mind about the actions and attitudes of other violent forces. Let us deal first with the Provisional I.R.A. No one in this House can tell any Member on this side about the Provisional I.R.A. No one knows the effects of its work more than we do. We live in the areas from which it operates. The people who have suffered most from the Provisional I.R.A. are the people in the areas from which it operates. We have witnessed the effects of its activities. We have seen people in our communities murdered. We have seen the effects of the bombing campaign.

In my own city I have seen the effects of its destruction in the name of Ireland. It tells us that a bomb is to hit the British economy but in my own city it is the business of small Derry men that has been blown to bits. The whole centre of my own city has been gutted by the violence of the Provisional I.R.A. Sites have been left vacant. Who will fill those sites? The big multi-national companies that will come in from outside, taking away from our people ownership of their own soil and of their own businesses.

We are under no illusions about that campaign. We are under no illusions that it had no mandate from anybody to get into that campaign. Neither are we under any illusions that if it has victory it will seek no mandate for anything else and that it will impose a dictatorship on the people. So do not let

[Mr. Hume]  
anybody think that we do not oppose the work of the Provisional I.R.A.

Mrs. Conn: What about the Official I.R.A.?

Mr. Hume: Do not let anybody think either that we do not understand how it has used the feelings of the people. There is the reaction against matters like internment which was mentioned by Dr. Paisley. There were deep feelings about that subject. Those feelings were used and abused to increase the strength of the Provisional I.R.A. just as the same feelings in reaction to terrible events like Bloody Sunday also acted as a major recruiting force for the Provisional I.R.A. or for any other form of I.R.A. that the hon. Lady cares to mention. We know the crimes of which they were guilty as well and we condemn them now as we did at the time.

We have listened to speakers opposite since we came to this House. They have told us of the feelings of their constituents. We understand and accept it when they tell us of the resentment that their people feel at what has happened. It is only natural that they should feel resentment when attempts have been made to bomb and blast them against their will. It has been a long time since elected representatives have come together to discuss what has been happening to various sections of the community. We might liken the situation to a broad river with a battle going on on each bank and the politicians on each bank trying to get people to use political means against violent men but not knowing what was happening on the other bank and only getting across the propaganda message. All that was doing was deepening the river. The river was getting redder and redder with the blood which flowed from both banks.

We have to understand that there are deep feelings. On the bank on which I stand there are deep feelings too. I would hope that when I express them here today Members opposite will understand that I express them so that they can understand them. They are not

expressed in any spirit of bitterness. That is why we have introduced into this Amendment the need to condemn violence from all violent sources in Northern Ireland. Whether people like to accept it or not there has been a considerable history of Loyalist violence in this community and I propose to deal with it. We have the violence beginning as far back as 1966 in Malvern Street with murder. There is no doubt at all that political motives were involved in that killing.

Neither is there any doubt that on 20 April, 1969, the first bombs that exploded in Northern Ireland at the Silent Valley reservoir were Loyalist bombs planted for political purposes. Neither can there be any doubt that this was the first occasion that British troops were called into service in Northern Ireland to defend key installations. Neither can there be any doubt that in the month of August, 1969, on the Falls Road nine people lost their lives at the hands of the R.U.C. in a riotous situation. Nine people died in Bombay Street and 500 people were burned out of their homes. No one has yet been brought to trial for any of these events.

Members may care to consider the effect that these things have on the minds of people. They may care to consider that from 1 January, 1969, until 31 December, 1970, when there was not a very high level of violence in Northern Ireland, 42 licensed premises were systematically destroyed. Every one of them was owned by a member of the minority community. Members might like to consider that no one has yet been brought to trial for these things. They might also consider what happens in a community where there is an organisation which claims to defend the people. They might consider what strength such events give to such an organisation in its recruiting campaign.

Members may understand why there is a sudden growth in the I.R.A. We have witnessed over the past couple of years the bombing campaign of the I.R.A. We have witnessed its shooting campaign. It has been widely

publicised. It has been widely condemned. There has been another campaign as well. We are told that that campaign is a reaction to that conducted by the Provisional I.R.A. Whether it is or not it is a campaign to which any Member of this House should not give any credence or support, but I am afraid before I am finished I will be requiring answers from some Members of this House as to what associations they have with certain organisations which are connected with serious violence.

There is evidence that such association does exist. For example, if we take the figures for assassinations since the campaign of sectarian assassinations began, some 221 people have lost their lives. It may not be generally known that more people have died now at the hands of the sectarian assassins than have been members of the Security Forces killed. That is a fact which is worth remembering. It may not be generally known that the Community Relations Commission produced a detailed report on intimidation in Northern Ireland which revealed that over 60,000 people have been forced to leave their homes in the past 18 months, and that 50,000 of these people—83 per cent. to be precise—come from the minority community.

It is disclosed that more than 50 per cent. of the minority community in East Belfast have already left East Belfast. In 1971 a total of 2,746 cases of intimidation were reported to the authorities; 31 were brought to trial, 10 were convicted—.36 per cent. In the first six months of 1972 there were 1,300 cases of intimidation in which people were forced to leave their homes; 10 were brought to trial, two were convicted—.15 per cent. Those 50,000 people represent one-tenth of the minority community; one-tenth were forced to leave their homes. Members may care to think what effect that has on people, and what effect it has on the violent forces that claim to defend them.

We look at the assassinations, the intimidation and the bombing cam-

paign which is directed at purely sectarian targets. We see that every village in North Antrim has had its church systematically destroyed. We see the same happening in other areas. Then we ask ourselves what are the Security Forces doing about it and what do we find? Let us look at the statistics for the last six months for which figures are available and let us take any month. Let us take the month of January of this year. The Security Forces found 3,235 rounds of ammunition in minority areas and 3,208 rounds of ammunition in majority areas.

In the same month 497 lbs of explosives were found in minority areas and 1,688 lbs in majority areas; 627 houses were searched by the military in minority areas and 74 in majority areas. I could go through every month but I will give the House the figures for the six-month period ending 30 June because they are very interesting: 563 guns were found in minority areas and 438 in majority areas; 14,121 lbs of explosives were found in minority areas and 20,815 lbs in majority areas; 46,705 rounds of ammunition were found in minority areas and 65,000 rounds in majority areas.

These were the finds made as the result of house searches. Some 436 houses in Loyalist areas were searched and 3,708 houses in minority areas were searched.

**Mr. Currie:** Scandalous.

**Mr. Hume:** These are official figures. I am not inventing them. One out of every 25 homes in minority areas was searched in the six-month period and when Members are aware that these refer not to the whole of Northern Ireland—there are many areas that are peaceful—but to specific areas they may begin to understand the depth of feeling against British Army action in our areas. They may begin to understand it themselves very shortly as the mover of this Motion pointed out. They may begin to understand it if the Army adopt the same sort of policies that we have witnessed over the past two years.

[Mr. Hume]

We have witnessed Army searches along the lines I have mentioned. We have witnessed internment. Some 2,500 people from the minority community have seen the inside of Long Kesh. That is one out of every 200 in the minority community as a whole. If one ties that down to the areas that are affected as regards the people arrested one will find that it is a much smaller figure. Throw in their friends and relations and one begins to understand the alienation caused by internment. There is the internment. There are the searches. There is the intimidation.

Against those, what is the security policy? Is it any wonder that people say that such a policy is partial and not even-handed? We are not arguing that that policy should be applied to any other section of the community. We are arguing for a radical review of the entire policy. Let us recognise that security will not solve the problem of this community but that politics will and that is what we are about in this Assembly. There are some organisations about which I should like to talk.

Mr. Hutchinson (Armagh): Will you give way, Sir?

Mr. Hume: Yes.

Mr. Hutchinson: Where did you get all those figures in your possession? What is your source?

Mr. Hume: Those are all official figures, Mr. Hutchinson, and I can supply you with full details of them after the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about some organisations, and some Members opposite may forgive us for regarding them as being closely associated with such organisations. We should like to hear what they have to say on the matter. [Interruption.] The Ulster Defence Association, whose public voice has just spoken, has been engaged in an amount of activity which can only be described, putting it mildly, as illegal.

Mr. Barr (Londonderry): Prove it.

Mr. Hume: It has been involved in strikes—

An hon. Member: Hallelujah.

Mr. Hume—it has been involved in para-military parades in the streets—

Mr. Poots (North Down): Good job, too.

Mr. Hume—it has declared war on the British Army—

Mr. Baird (Fermanagh and South Tyrone): Incorrect.

Mr. Hume—and, even to our limited legal knowledge on this side of the House, for a Loyalist to declare war on the forces of the Crown amounts to—and you can correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Speaker—treason.

Mr. Barr: Will you give way?

Mr. Hume: Yes.

Mr. Barr: Let me make very clear what I, as a Loyalist, stand for. I am not prepared to fight British troops to remain British, but I am prepared to fight anyone to stay out of a united Ireland.

Mr. Hume: You will have an opportunity, when I am finished, to answer a few more questions, Mr. Barr. Treason, I said, and it is treason for a Loyalist to shoot at a British soldier.

Mr. Barr: Prove it.

Mr. Hume: It is treason.

Mr. Barr: Prove it.

Professor Lindsay: What about British agents?

Mr. Hume: The Loyalists have declared war.

Mr. Baird: The British say they have not shot at soldiers.

**Mr. Hume:** British agents, I.R.A., anybody, who shoot are wrong and we have repeatedly said so publicly. But we are dealing at the moment with Loyalists. On their own admission their leaders have said that they run protection rackets in East Belfast.

**Mr. Barr:** Prove it.

**Mr. Hume:** The *Sunday Times* of 17 June, 1973, and *The Guardian* of 18 June, 1973, contain statements by the late Mr. Tommy Herron and they were never denied. They run drinking clubs which have no licences, which are illegal.

**Mr. Barr:** You have clubs.

**Mr. Hume:** They are illegal, too.

**Mr. Barr:** Let us hear about them, then.

**Mr. Hume:** Right.

**Mr. Barr:** How many of them have you?

**Mr. Hume:** I am not a member of any illegal organisation.

**Mr. Barr:** Prove it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I must order you, Mr. Barr, to let Mr. Hume pass his remarks without interruption. You will have a chance to make your remarks later on.

**Mr. Hume:** Arms and ammunition—

**An hon. Member:** Truss him up like a wee chicken when you are at it.

**Mr. Hume—**have been found in the headquarters of the U.D.A. There has been evidence of collusion between the U.D.R. and the U.D.A. in the rather remarkable number of weapons that the U.D.R. has lost in the last 18 months. There have been 170 S.L.R. rifles lost. Are we being told that, on the three occasions when armouries protected by the U.D.R. were raided and large

quantities of arms were stolen, despite the sophisticated alarm gadgets that are in such armouries not a shot was fired on one of those three occasions? Are we being told that that was done without collusion?

I leave to the last my most serious charge, the charge of murder. We had the recent admission in open court by a member of the U.D.A. that on four occasions, as a member of the U.D.A., he had murdered people and had been involved in nine armed robberies.

**Mr. Barr:** On a point of order.

**Mr. Hume:** You can speak when I am finished. There is a long list—

**Mr. Barr:** On a point of order.

**Mr. Hume:** Right. A point of order.

**Mr. Barr:** May I draw Mr. Hume's attention to the fact that, although this gentleman stated that he was a member of the U.D.A., the U.D.A. denied all knowledge and denied that he was a member of the Ulster Defence Association.

**Mr. Currie:** After he was convicted.

**Mr. Hume:** After he was convicted. There is a long list which anyone would agree amounts to quite an amount of illegal activity and yet we have Members opposite associated with this organisation. In fact, the U.D.A. is closely associated, if I am not mistaken, with the grouping known as V.U.P.P. Some of the leaders of the U.D.A. stood as V.U.P.P. candidates in the Assembly elections, and we have one Member who does not fear to appear on television and defend this organisation.

**Dr. Paisley,** who moved the Motion, has talked in this House on many occasions—and I would choose one—about the failure of the Security Forces to enforce law and order. He has talked about people in para-military uniforms parading the streets, about funerals, about shots being fired and about the failure of the Security Forces

[Mr. Hume]  
to deal with these situations. As far back as 8 March, 1972, he said:

"I beg to ask leave to move the Adjournment of the House under Standing Order No. 9 in order to discuss a very urgent and definite matter of public importance, namely: 'The firing of shots over the coffin of an I.R.A. man who was shot by the Security Forces while planting a bomb.'

We have had various very serious incidents in the city of Belfast whereby men armed with revolvers and dressed in the uniform of the Irish Republican Army have made themselves conspicuous at funerals and have actually drawn their guns and fired them, but yesterday we had another: a very serious incident indeed . . ." [OFFICIAL REPORT, HOUSE OF COMMONS, STORMONT, 8 March, 1972; Vol. 84, c. 993.]

Yet recently the same hon. Gentleman could stand beside a grave with people in para-military uniform while shots were fired over the grave. In addition, he gave an oration. He will tell us that that is upholding law and order. What we are about in this debate is trying to find out who is for law and order, because one cannot be for law and order for one side only and one cannot be for law and order unless one is absolutely determined to eradicate violence on all sides.

Rev. Dr. Paisley: Will the hon. Gentleman give way?

Mr. Hume: Certainly.

Rev. Dr. Paisley: I am grateful to the hon. Gentleman. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am opposed to the firing of shots over any coffin and that the leaders of the U.D.A. were informed of my position. If I am invited by any Protestant widow to conduct a funeral service I will do it. But I made it clear—and the U.D.A. leadership knows this—that I deplore the firing of shots. I also want to say that the British Government have made it clear that they will not under any circumstances move in at a funeral to deal with people who fire shots or wear para-military uniform. This attitude only encourages it.

Mr. Hume: It would have helped the community considerably and Dr.

Paisley's credibility in the community had he said so at the time.

Rev. Dr. Paisley: I did say so.

Mr. Poots: He did say so.

Rev. Dr. Paisley: I said so publicly.

Mr. Hume: Now we turn to the person in whose name the Motion, not the Amendment, is before the House, Mr. William Craig. He is the man who in many Loyalist eyes is associated with law and order. I want to refer to another quotation of 8 December, 1972, when Mr. Craig called for Loyalist unity. He said:

"Let the battle lines be drawn."

He threatened that any weakened Constitution which emerged without the approval of the Parliament of Northern Ireland would be destroyed by force if necessary. That is Mr. William Craig. On 17 December, 1972—this is a very interesting one—talking about sectarian murder, he said:

"I personally am not happy about what is happening, but if it is impossible to win our democratic rights without this sort of thing happening then I am prepared to tolerate it."

He is prepared to tolerate sectarian murder. Are Members who follow him prepared to tolerate sectarian murder? Are they prepared to tolerate what happened in Banbridge last week, when a man came to his door and was butchered in front of his daughter? Are they prepared to tolerate the sort of thing that happened to one of our colleagues, Senator Paddy Wilson? Are they prepared to tolerate what happened to the family in Moy, County Armagh, when a man and his wife were butchered? Mr. Craig publicly said he was prepared to tolerate sectarian murder if he could not win his democratic rights. He defined the meaning of the word "democracy."

He also said on the same occasion:

"If these rights are denied."

remember this was before what is being called the counter-terrorist campaign started—

"it will be necessary to indulge in counter-terrorism."

He said the campaign could begin when it became clear there was to be an imposed settlement. There is an imposed settlement and there is a campaign of what has been called counter-terrorism, which is murdering people nightly. Has Mr. Craig got any association with that campaign? Does he know who is involved in it? Are they doing it in response to his public statement? Can he come here and tell us that he is in favour of law and order when he makes statements like that?

Mr. Currie: Maybe that is why he is not here.

Mr. Hume: Maybe that is why he is not here today. Can his followers say they are in favour of law and order? We have seen other statements. Another in December, 1972, was:

"We have plans for military action if there is no other way to preserve the democratic rights of the majority."

Mr. Craig is shown sitting at a table with Mr. Herron and Mr. Anderson. In February, 1973, he said in Enniskillen:

"I have made it clear that I am prepared to fight for any cause. I am not just using the word lightly. I have stated that if I have to I will shoot to kill."

Talking about bombs planted in Cavan, Monaghan and Donegal, he said no one could rule out the fact that they could have been caused by Loyalist organisations and that until the Constitution of Northern Ireland was restored this sort of thing was more than likely.

Mr. Craig leads the Vanguard Unionist Progressive Party, but candidates for that party in the recent election were members of the Ulster Defence Association, whose activities I have outlined. We have heard the quotations from Mr. Craig himself. We have also seen that the full list of

para-military organisations—I am quoting again—behind the Loyalist strike was given as: U.D.A., L.A.W. Vanguard Service Corps, Red Hand, Orange Volunteers, Loyalist Defence Volunteers, Ulster Special Constabulary Association, and Ulster Volunteer Force—a proscribed organisation. Most of these organisations are associated in a body of which Mr. Craig was chairman—the Ulster Loyalist Council. They are organisations which were guilty of breaking the law repeatedly, whose members have been convicted of murder, which have been publicly seen in the streets to be openly flouting, flaunting and breaking the law.

Mr. Baird: On a point of order. The U.V.F. was not at any time—

Mr. Speaker: This is not a point of order.

Mr. Hume: I did not suggest its members were members of the Loyalist Council, but they were involved in the Loyalist strike and publicity said to be working together with everyone on that particular issue. The hon. Member can reply if he wishes.

I have talked of violence on both sides. I have tried to show how people have suffered from violence. The whole community has suffered from I.R.A. violence, but there is no doubt in my mind that the major suffering has been in the areas from which the I.R.A. springs. What has been the reaction of that community, which has suffered so much from internment, from British Army harassment, from the I.R.A. and from sectarian assassinations, where in six months one out of 25 homes has been searched, where one out of 200 people has seen the insides of internment camps, where we see day and daily Diplock operating on the streets?

If a soldier does not like the look of a person's face—this is true—he takes him in for four hours to screen him. If he is taken in for four hours he loses at least half-a-day's work and so does his father, his brother or his wife who comes to ask about him. That is going

[Mr. Hume]

on all the time. We have heard from Dr. Paisley about the operations of Diplock in Long Kesh, which are an outrage to the conscience of any community which regards itself as an upholder of any sort of legal standards. Yet the reaction of that community, having suffered so much, was to reject every single candidate who stood before it in the Assembly election without the slightest trace of sympathy for any organisation which supported violence in any shape or form.

For the first time in the fifty-year history of Northern Ireland one party was elected to represent the non-Unionist viewpoint. There is a lot of meaning in that which may not have struck people. The splinters have gone. That is a force for stability. Anyone who stood on an election platform and expressed the slightest sympathy for the I.R.A. or any other violent organisation got his come-uppance at the polls. The people opted for politics. One section of the community has taken a clear decision. It has sent us to the conference table. It has instructed us clearly, "Sit down with people who have been our bitter political enemies, and whose bitter political enemies you have been. Go there and sit down with them and hammer out a solution, because there is no other solution."

There are two roads we can go. There are the politics of conflict or the politics of consensus. The politics of conflict, as we have learned to our cost, lead but to the grave. It does not matter who is in the grave. Tears are not Orange and they are not Green. The only other road is the politics of consensus. We are attempting to establish that consensus in a community which has suffered greatly on all sides. That places certain responsibilities on all of us. This debate is about violence and violent men. We on this side have our responsibilities in relation to violence as well, and we will accept them. We oppose those who commit violence; we condemn them. That is hardly enough from us in this situation. We must

recognise that one of the reasons on our side for the emergence of serious violence is the failure of political leadership, because when politics stop, war takes over.

There has been—we must recognise it—a young people who are not any different from other young people in any other part of the world—they are all young people, no matter what section of the community they come from—who have got involved in violence and have done so because of the failure of political leadership and political institution. Their idealism has been twisted and corrupted. It is our job to recognise that. If we believe that we can settle this problem by leaving our jails full of them then we are mad, because we are only building another generation of violent men who will wreck yet again.

There is another problem which concerns us specifically on this side of the House, and that is the mythology of violence with which our particular political tradition has grown up. Violence has been glorified by anti-Unionists throughout Irish history. Songs have been sung about it; the ballads have been sung about it. Is it any wonder that if we sing the songs of violence and glorify violence young people take us at our word and believe that when they take up a gun they are committing acts of patriotism? Therefore it is not enough to blame young people who are involved in the Provisional I.R.A. We must examine the whole political ethos, of our society and eradicate from it all traces of glorification of violence.

Let us look at our educational system and our teaching of history and try to show that political means and constitutional means in the long run achieve more because they do it at less cost and at greater stability. Hon. Members opposite for their part have certain responsibilities in dealing with violence. They can condemn and can dissociate from those who practise it. But there are, as always, deeper problems.

When introducing the first Home Rule Bill in the British House of Commons in 1886 Gladstone, talking of what he described as the energetic minority in north-eastern Ireland—the Unionist population—said that what he faced from them was threats of violence and that his duty was to face their threats and disarm the fears from which they sprang. Today, 100 years later, there are still threats of violence and actual violence from the Unionists of north-eastern Ireland and there are still fears. It is time surely that political leadership stepped out from behind the wall of fear and defensiveness and became positive. It is time we stopped depending on Acts of the British Parliament for our security, for the security of our whole position, and looked to ourselves, all of us, for security.

The whole history of Anglo-Irish relations is a history that is about the Irish Protestant community and it is about betrayal of the Irish Protestant community. Look at the history books. Every single Act of the British Parliament giving a pledge to the Irish Protestant community was broken. In 1793 we had the Act of Renunciation, giving a pledge that the Irish Parliament, which was a Protestant Parliament—Grattan's Parliament—would be maintained for ever. "For ever" lasted seven years.

The Act which established the Church of Ireland said likewise. That was passed in 1800. For ever it would be the established Church in Ireland. "For ever" this time was a little longer; it was 67 years. We had an Act of Parliament in 1920; we had another in 1949; we have another in 1973. Each time the leaders of the Loyalist community, rather than come out positively and look forward, have taken the defensive role of defending their constitutional position and forgetting about the stuff by which people live: ordinary jobs, homes that will better their way of life. They are doing it again.

That Constitution Act does not represent a fundamentally sound and secure base for the future of Northern Ireland. It represents a framework and a real opportunity for the future. The future of the Loyalist community in this part of Ireland rests not on an Act of the British Parliament but on the security of their own numbers and in the full knowledge that they are living in this part of Ireland with people who are their neighbours, who are their fellow countrymen, and who have no wish to be involved in conflict.

They have recently taken a clear decision to send us as their representatives to a conference table. We are doing that. That is what we are about when we are sitting down with the Unionist Party and the Alliance Party—sitting down with people who were our bitter political enemies, and we theirs, but sitting down because we know that the parties of conflict lead only to the grave and that the only future for this part of Ireland is in consensus. Dr. Paisley, in a recent speech, talked of Holland and Switzerland, where there were bitter religious divisions.

**Mr. Baird:** Would the hon. Member give way?

**Mr. Hume:** I am just about to finish. Wars were fought there over a century ago. They had the same sort of sectarian bitterness as exists here. Times out of number attempts were made to resolve their differences and times out of number distrust, suspicion and prejudice overcame reason and rationality, but eventually they decided that they would sit down together and hammer out a consensus agreement. Future generations will bless those people because they swallowed their pride, sat down with one another and accepted the first principle that it is necessary to accept if we are to bring peace to a divided society.

That first principle is the acceptance of tolerance. Tolerance and consensus are the fundamentals and the foundations on which we can build a new

[Mr. Hume]

North. But we can only do it together. We cannot do it by trading accusations. We cannot do it by means of a security policy. We can only do it by building political institutions to which this whole community will give their consent. That is precisely what we are doing in Stormont Castle and we will stay there until we have achieved that.

Mr. Baird: Would the hon. Member give way?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I think it would be for the convenience of Members of the Assembly if all three Amendments were discussed together. A separate question will be put to each one.

4.33 p.m.

Mr. McLachlan (South Antrim): I should like to salute the speech to which we have just listened. I found it a deeply honest, deeply sincere and a deeply courageous speech.

An hon. Member: Deeply white-washed.

Mr. McLachlan: I should like also to salute the speech before the last one and in particular the reference it contained to the value of airing openly and honestly the feelings and the fears that are in our community at present. It seems to me that in the two speeches to which we have listened we have had the beginnings of a real dialogue about the basic problems which we have been sent here to discuss. I rise to draw attention to the second Amendment to the Motion only like other speakers, as I suspect, in this debate to highlight one particular aspect of security and the violent problems which we face. The words of our Amendment are:

To leave out all the words after "murder" and add "condemns violence from whatever source it comes and calls upon H.M. Government to take all necessary steps to bring it to an end."

They have little relevance in the context in which we speak but the subject matter is vital to every citizen: to

every father, mother and child in our community. It is with children, with parents and with their relations that we are concerned when we talk about violence.

You may have been somewhat surprised, Mr. Temporary Speaker, to see that we wish to close this Motion with the word "murder" and to leave out "destruction." "Destruction" would be the subject for another debate. I want in my few words to say something about the desperate problem to which Assemblyman Hume has already referred—the problem of murder. Violence corrupts, and to misquote, absolute violence corrupts absolutely. I would contend that what we have seen in the sectarian assassinations of the past months is absolute violence. Here we do not just have violence unleashed in our midst.

We have not any kind of disciplined violence but totally undisciplined violence the source of which is not easy, sometimes impossible, to trace. This kind of violence, which seems to arise almost in a flash because of the height of the emotion that exists at the time, is dangerous, damaging and destructive, not just to the people who suffer but most of all to those who inflict it, because the men who have inflicted it—and I speak, as I am sure other Assemblymen can speak, from bitter experience of people who have inflicted violence—have to live with that fact for the rest of their lives. This is no easy task. This is enough to break a man completely.

I want for a moment to turn to one or two remarks that were made earlier and to make it absolutely clear that in our Amendment we are not seeking to fail to indict any individual or any organisation which has been responsible for violence. What we are wanting to do is to stand up against violence as such in our community, what violence can do to a community and the consequences of violence in human terms. It is for this reason that we want to pin-point this particular aspect of our problem. Anyone of us who has seen *Some As-*