

An Chartlann Náisiúnta National Archives

Reference Code: 20)21/102/46
--------------------	------------

Creator(s): Department of Justice

Accession Conditions: Open

Copyright:

National Archives, Ireland. May only be reproduced with the written permission of the Director of the National Archives. <u>Plenary Meeting Tuesday 10th November 3 p.m.</u> (Position as appears 10 a.m.)

- 1. The meeting will have two purposes:
 - to consider the outcome, if any, of the Business Committee discussions of a draft concluding statement this morning.
 - (ii) The unionist parties may insist, for the record, on having the Irish Government's reaction to the paper tabled. Paisley also gave notice of two questions he may wish to put, presumably to check whether the UUP was "selling out".
 - (a) does the Irish Government see anything new in the unionist paper
 - (b) was there agreement that the two Governments would provide information to the UUP on existing North South contacts.
- 2. Since the purpose of discussing the unionist paper can only be tactical it is suggested that Ministers might dispose of the matter as quickly as possible, using points in the attached Speaking Note as appropriate.

GNAI/JUS/2021/102/46

Points to make on UUP paper

- 1. We have read the paper carefully.
- It is not the kind of significantly new statement we were led to expect on Friday.
- It is rather a restatement of basic unionist positions already put forward.
- 4: It is clear that the "Principles" on page 2 would be . acceptable only to unionists (and even then, we wonder if principle one: "Those responsible for the Government of Northern Ireland must be ... accountable only to the electorate of Northern Ireland" is deliberately intended to rule out Secretaries of State?).
- 5. We would not accept the rather emotive and declamatory language on page 3 about the Irish Government's position, or about Articles 2 and 3. It is as if the paper was intended for a public platform.
- 6. We should make emphatically clear we at no time questioned Mr Molyneaux's integrity. Neither did we question his confidence in his team. Our concern was only to ensure that we had the fullest and most authoritative statement of positions all round.
- It is not fair to say we "ignored" unionist proposals for an Inter-Irish relations Committee. We can all recall very lengthy discussions of them.

2

- We do not consider it realistic, to put it mildly, to suggest that the next Conference should both abolish all future Conferences and determine arrangements for removing Articles 2 and 3.
- 9. While our negotiations have clearly not reached the point of agreement, and this paper does not change that situation, we would not wish to be totally dismissive of it.
- We consider it a convenient summary of the unionist position as put forward.
- 11. Even if it is clearly not the basis for agreement, we believe it can serve as a point of reference for future discussions, which we all know are necessary and which our people want to see continued.
- We hope these discussions can be put in place very soon.
 We will be ready to resume such discussion as soon as the Unionist parties feel able to do so.
- [If Paisley presses his two points in a point-scoring way:
- We have made clear we see nothing new in the Unionist paper.
- (2) We would not consider it appropriate to discuss bilateral contacts (particularly in the presence of representatives who refused to engage in such potentially helpful contacts with us).
- (3) We can of course make clear to all delegations that we would be happy at any time to provide technical or factual information on existing North/South contacts.]

QNAI/JUS/2021/102/46

3