



**An Chartlann Náisiúnta**  
**National Archives**

**Reference Code:** 2021/102/49

**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.

16 December, 1992

*c.c. H/S ShUqm  
PITENERRY*

Mr. David Donoghue  
Counsellor  
Anglo-Irish Divison  
Department of Foreign Affairs  
Dublin 2

*PSM  
PSS  
Mr J. Brennan  
Mr. D. Brennan*

*Revised proforma from  
Dr P.!*  
*SDH*  
*21/12*

Dear David

I am attaching a copy of Paisley's recent speech to the DUP Annual Conference. It contains flowery language to say the least! Incidentally, we were told that the NIO were excluded from the Conference. Chris McCabe was phoned at midnight on the Conference eve and told he would be barred if he turned up seeking admittance.

Yours sincerely,

*Sean Farrell*

Sean Farrell

## DUP Leader's Speech To Conference '92

In every generation since the Plantation settlement in the 17th century Ulster loyalists have been forced to defend their heritage. There is no discharge in this war. In every generation Ulster expects every man to do his duty.

Enemies which recognise no laws, who are convinced that they are doing God's service, who are inspired from childhood by the anti-British teaching of the Irish Catholic Church, who have admitted that priestly absolution has been theirs after the most bloodiest of their crimes, and whose leaders like Gerry Adams can publicly parade in the glare of television lights to the mass altar and eat the so-called Body of Christ and can be seen to be recognised by Mother Church as being in a state of grace, are enemies most difficult to conquer.

There is no lie too black, there is no crime of blood too crimson, there is no murder too diabolical, and there is no act of lawlessness too monstrous in which they will not engage in order to achieve their ends.

Age, sex, religion, form no deterrent to them. They have swallowed and imbibed and are totally controlled by the Jesuits' hellish principle - the end justifies the means. There are therefore no damnable means that they will not harness to forward their juggernaut of hell's destruction.

The cries of orphans, the agony of widows, the sorrows of families and the outrage of their fellows curb them not.

They relish wading knee-deep in blood. Bombing, maiming and killing are their delight.

Those on the other side, those who seek to outdo them in similar dark deeds of so-called retaliation are like unto them.

They however cannot claim any support from Bible and historic Protestantism. Protestantism's genius is civil and religious liberty for all men. Those who murder are guilty of the most heinous crimes against God and man and will answer at the Bar of the Holy God in the terrible day of God's justice. 'Thou shalt not kill' is God's commandment to all. Protestantism has no place for them at the Communion Table. Protestantism offers to them no false pardon in the name of God.

Protestant ministers carry about no vital information in their memory of atrocities which in the hands of the security forces could lead to the conviction of murderers and the prevention of further heinous acts.

There is no confession in Protestantism or no secrets. Protestants boldly declare "No lie is of the truth whether the lie be spoken by Priest, Parson or Prelate." Protestantism totally repudiates the Jesuit principle that the end justifies the deed. In our day the battle with these enemies rages unceasingly and incessantly.

With organised Protestantism shot through with the cancer of ecumenism and hastening back into the embrace of Rome; with a Government unwilling to really take on terrorism and destroy it from our midst; with Ulster's constitutional position betrayed by the Anglo Irish Diktat treachery; with security forces handcuffed so that they are not permitted to extirpate the foe, with the enemy shouting victory in the most auspicious of circumstances for them our task is of the most difficult and most strenuous nature.

While our enemies increase and those who should be our friends are becoming our enemies simply because of political expediency and world pressures, our task becomes impossible except we have Divine Intervention.

I have never at any time offered this Province any quick-fix nor minimised the mountains of difficulty which lie before us. I am confident however, that with God's help we can make it.

No one is so well aware of the grass roots feelings of the loyalist people as I am. It has been my task and duty through good report and ill report to articulate those feelings for nigh a quarter of a century in Stormont, in Westminster and Europe. Yes, and on many occasions without any support from any one else whatsoever.

The Unionist people have seen themselves betrayed by their leaders and sold to their traditional enemies.

The base surrenders of Terence O'Neill, James Chichester Clark and Brian Faulkner at the Conference Table with the South are not and cannot be forgotten.

It is a fact that with the exception of Lord Craigavon the past Unionist leaders always surrendered when they came face to face with the Dublin enemy.

Margaret Thatcher betrayed us all by signing up with the Republic in the Joint Authority Diktat. That was the supreme surrender. It altered our constitutional position. It left us a prey to our traditional foes.

I told the people at that time there would be a long struggle which would take all our courage, resolution, determination and patience to right the great wrong done to us.

I remember being asked along with a number of leading politicians to contribute to a book called "Dear Next Prime Minister" Open Letters To Margaret Thatcher And Neil Kinnock.

I addressed my letter to Mrs Thatcher. I will read you an extract, for it sets out exactly how we were betrayed:

To think that you, madam, who pose as the great law and order, anti-terrorist stateswoman of the world, the defender of the democratic faith, the scourge of dictatorship, the Iron Lady who will not bend before threats and assaults, would help forward the IRA's goal and hand part control of Her Majesty's territory in Ireland to that well-known terrorist sanctuary provider - the Irish Republic.

What right have you to claim the authority of the ballot box and cheer on the downtrodden majorities of

Eastern Europe in their righteous struggle for majority rule when in your own back yard you have entered into arrangements to deny to the Ulster people their inalienable right to be ruled as free men and women?

'What right have you to promise any future Republican majority their goal to break up the United Kingdom and thrust Northern Ireland out from under the Crown while at the same time refusing to grant to the present Unionist majority the right to be governed as any other part of the United Kingdom?

'What right have you to institutionalise the religious faith of the Ulster people so that you can hound Protestants out of their jobs and by the most jesuitical and sectarian law which has ever been devised since the dark ages of the Romish Inquisition seek to push them into a Roman Catholic State which denies the most simple and basic human rights to its citizens?

'What right have you to deny the right to fly the flag of this United Kingdom in this part of Her Majesty's dominion and at the same time provide police protection for the flag of Haughey's republic?

'What right have you to close down by force the Northern Ireland Assembly, which your own Government set up, just because its members refused to bow the knee to your dictatorship?

'What right have you to shackle the security forces from defeating the murdering scum of IRA terrorism and allowing Ulster to deteriorate into another Lebanon?

'What right have you never once to praise the law-abiding Protestant majority population of Ulster from whom you get the vast majority of your security recruits who because of your policy are savagely murdered by the IRA?

'What right have you to refuse to come to grips with Mr. Haughey on extradition and his savage attacks on the gallant Ulster Defence Regiment?

'What right have you to allow members of that Regiment and also members of the Royal Ulster Constabulary to become scapegoats to appease the SDLP and all their fellow travellers?

'As a British Prime Minister you have betrayed British rights.

'As a Unionist Prime Minister in Ulster you have destroyed the Union of Northern Ireland and Great Britain.

'As a Democratic Prime Minister you have sold out democracy in this part of the United Kingdom.

'You may disregard their indictment now and shrug off these charges with disdain but the damned spot is irremovable. It has already blotted your history, tarnished your rule and will eventually, if you repent not, lead to your fall.

I leave you to ponder the word of God from the lips of the Old Testament prophet:

'Then she that is mine enemy shall see it, and shame shall cover her which said unto me, Where is the Lord thy God? mine eyes shall behold her, now shall she be trodden down as the mire of the streets.' Micah 7: 10.'

I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet but the Scripture I quoted was fulfilled to the letter. Margaret Thatcher fell in an act of treachery as cunning and vile as the act of treachery which she committed against the Ulster people. With her have also gone the architects in Ulster's destruction - the Geoffrey Howes, the Garrett Fitzgeralds, the 'Tea Bag' Barrys and the Tom 'Cat' Kings of this world. Meanwhile the Ulster people have patiently to endure the dark reaping of blood, the harvest of this treacherous sowing of the dragon's teeth.

The protests of the enraged Ulster people went largely unheeded, the democratic vote for the upholders of the Union was scorned, the imprisonment of Members of Parliament was relished by the Coalition with Dublin. Meanwhile the IRA had their field day.

Listen to these figures and add to them the tears, the bitterness, the sorrow and the agony, the pangs they endured:-

1981 - 101

1982 - 97

1983 - 77

1984 - 64

1985 - 54

Note the steady decline

(TOTAL 393)

Signing of the Anglo/Irish Agreement

1986 - 61

1987 - 93

1988 - 93

1989 - 62

1990 - 76

1991 - 94

1992 (so far) - 80

Total from 1986 to present is 559

Since the Anglo Irish Agreement there have been over 3,500 shootings, 2,300 explosions and defusions of bombs; 350 incendiaries.

Before the Anglo Irish Agreement the graft of killing was going down. The diktat gave the IRA a much needed supply of oxygen and has been increasing the supply ever since.

Faced with the situation the Unionist leadership took their electorate into their confidence and asked on three occasions for a mandate to seek negotiations which would lead to an alternative to and a replacement of the Agreement.



Scorn and laughter greeted the announcement of that objective and especially when James Molyneux and myself insisted that there could be no Anglo Irish Conferences during any negotiations, nor could the Maryfield Secretariat operate in servicing the Conference during the same period. We were told it was impossible.

We were told we were asking for the moon, and other less quotable expressions were used, but we achieved our objective and what is more, three times we received a mandate for it.

Those who have no alternative strategy, who have been strangely absent when prison sentences have been handed out, who are bereft of any plan to deliver us from the impasse and who have been loudest in branding as traitors those who have a mandate from the electorate for their course of action, a mandate which they don't possess, now sulk behind their confusion because at the Talks the Ulster Democratic Unionist Party delegates were not conned by Her Majesty's Government, nor did they fall a prey to Irish Republican blamey, but rather called the tune to which the enemies of Ulster had to dance.

Our delegates, unlike some Official Unionists, did not socialise with the enemy nor stand drinking at the bar with them, nor were they on personal name terms. What is more we not only did not sit at the dining table with them but to their habitation we did not go. We did not meet them at private bilateral meetings nor did we receive from them any praise as other Unionists did.

Our attitude was the same as the members of Her Majesty's Government adopted when the Irish Treaty was negotiated. No hand shaking, no photographs and no fraternising.

The first aggressive attitude of Strand One the Irish Government was to try and get a place at the Table for the first Strand of the Talks. It was only the unyielding attitude of the Unionist leadership which had Dublin rightly excluded. Dublin can have no say whatsoever in the internal affairs of Northern Ireland - not today, not tomorrow and, as far as we are concerned, not forever!

After the commencement of Strand One it soon became clear that the SDLP were going to adopt a most intransigent stance. When, after much pressure, their proposals at last saw light of day they were an insult to the people of Northern Ireland. They made it crystal clear that a Northern Ireland Assembly would, if they had their way, never have the wishes of its majority respected. It could only be consultative in nature.

A new mongrel hierarchy of six would preside over Northern Ireland - three elected and three additional members, the nominees of Europe, Dublin and London.

This body which the SDLP had carefully planned, could never have a Unionist majority but would have 'practically assured' for ever a Roman Catholic and United Ireland majority. What is more, the nominee from the Republic under its consensus rules would have the power to stop all legislation and administration in the North.

Mr. Hume had the brazen effrontery to tell us that this was a very light thing. He was asking us to slit our political throats and then as democracy bled and died in Northern Ireland he would write an obituary notice on how light the burden was that he had graciously laid on the backs of the Unionist majority.

For John Hume it is still a United Ireland or nothing. Our answer is No John! No John! No John! No!

Seamus Mallon regaled us with his personal experience that as he passed Sir Edward Carson's statue each day his flesh crept and it also crept as he sat at the Table at the Talks because the Table came out of that awful place, Gosford Castle.

He told us how he felt insulted that the Prince of Wales couldn't marry a Roman Catholic. He insisted that that was Protestant bigotry and undemocratic practice and flew in the face of liberty.

I pointed out to him that it was exactly similar to the principles and practices of his own Church. In fact, his claim was false. The heir to the British Throne could marry a Roman Catholic but if he did so he forfeited his right to the Throne under the terms of the Williamite Revolution Settlement. The choice was the Prince's.

The Pope could become a Protestant but if he did Mr. Mallon would be the first to insist that he be no longer the King of the Vatican State. What was sauce for the Protestant gander was sauce for the Papist goose.

I also asked how would it be possible to come to a settlement with the Mallons of this world when they argued in this way.

As it was totally impossible to reach any agreement whatsoever with the SDLP on John Hume's outrageous and insulting proposals it seemed as if the Talks must come to an end.

However, as we stated in our press statement at the end of the Talks:-

'In the Strand One discussions all the parties with the exception of the SDLP agreed to a report which outlined a democratic, fair, reasonable and accountable system of government for Northern Ireland which provided a role for all constitutional parties in proportion to their strength in the Assembly but was not executive power-sharing. Throughout the process the SDLP has continued to pursue its totally unacceptable proposal for external commissioners from London, Dublin and Europe to have a say in the government of Northern Ireland, denying to Northern Ireland any form of democratic rule whatsoever.

Her Majesty's Government, however, made it clear that it was prepared to support and implement the proposals of the three other Constitutional Parties subject to overall agreement.

It was in the light of this and further endorsement by HMG of the Strand One proposals that we were prepared to move to Strand Two of the process.

This was the first time in recent memory that a British Government indicated that it was prepared to implement a system of government for Northern Ireland which did not include executive power-sharing.

Remember that statement was never challenged.

From the first meetings in the Strand II and III formations the DUP raised the question of the immoral, illegal and criminal claim of Dublin in the De Valera Constitution of 1937 and especially the Articles Two and Three.

Let us remind ourselves what they state:-

Article 2:- 'The National Territory consists of the whole Island of Ireland, its Islands and the territorial seas.'

Article 3:- 'Pending the reintegration of the National territory, and without prejudice to the right of the Parliament and Government established by this Constitution to exercise jurisdiction over the whole of that territory, the laws enacted by the Parliament shall have the like area and extent of application as the laws of Saorstas Eireann and the like territorial effect.'

The DUP alone raised this vital matter at the first meeting of Strand III formation which was the first meeting where and when Dublin ministers were present.

We said to the Dublin Ministers:-

'An illegal claim must be dealt with, and not rewarded. It is an Irish mess which must be cleared by them. The prospect of amendments to Articles 2 and 3 is not a quid pro quo to involvement in some future package of agreement on the internal affairs of Northern Ireland. Amendments to Articles 2 and 3 must be without precondition on the basis of good will and respect for the self-determination of Northern Ireland.

For a thief to demand compensation for returning his ill-gotten gains is the height of lunacy.'

It was quite evident that the Dublin Government and the SDLP had no intention whatsoever in negotiating a settlement in Strand II. They were determined to maintain the illegality, criminality and immorality of Articles 2 and 3 and to demand the destruction of the Union.

For the first time the attempt was made to put the 1920 Act on the Table for negotiation. That act defines the geographical extent of Northern Ireland.

It was I, who on every occasion this attempt was made drew the attention of the Chair to the terms of our meeting and said if the attempt was proceeded with my delegation would leave the Table for good. The Union is not negotiable and could not be. That was our reiterated position. I must say in all honesty that I fear what would have happened if the DUP had not been present to put down this marker.

The hinge of progress lay upon the position of the SDLP and Dublin re this illegal claim.

It was here the squirming amongst the Irish delegation took place.

I had the great pleasure in casting back in his teeth the statements of Des O'Malley in his speech in the Dublin Parliament on Articles 2 and 3.

Here are his statements:-

'Articles 2 and 3 of the 1937 Constitution are clearly unhelpful and incompatible from a political point of view with the emergence of tolerance, peace and concord in Northern Ireland ...'

'I want to state quite clearly and unequivocally that Articles 2 and 3, as currently framed are of no use to Nationalism or to Nationalists, North or South because they hinder peace and reconciliation with the Unionist tradition on this island. Before considering how they should be revised it is appropriate to review the Articles in their historical context. The plebiscite which approved them was carried by a narrow majority of voters who turned out to vote on the 1937 Constitution. Only 38.6% of the electorate of the then Free State voted in favour. 29.6% voted against and 31.8% abstained or spoiled their votes. Nobody in Northern Ireland was consulted.

Yet this is the mandate offered for a claim of right made in the name of the people of Ireland to the entirety of the island. Article 3 speaks of the 'right of the Parliament and Government established by this Constitution to exercise jurisdiction over the whole of that territory.' What right has this House as the level of common sense, morality or international law to exercise jurisdiction over Northern Ireland? Such jurisdiction as we have can only be exercised in accordance with the Constitution. What right have I, or we, to tell the people of Northern Ireland that they may not have divorce because 38.6% of the electorate of the Irish Free State ordained it so in 1937? We have no such right, politically, historically or legally. The pretensions of Article 3 are as threadbare as they are absurd.

It is well known that Ireland withheld submission to the full compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in The Hague precisely because the 'claim of right' made in 1937 would have been exposed, to our own embarrassment, as an international law nullity...'

'Articles 2 and 3 should be revised because we, the citizens of the Irish Republic, want them changed to reflect our real aspirations as being peaceful in intent and to be achieved only by consent, and not as some crude bartering exercise with the Unionist community of Northern Ireland...'

But now Mr. O'Malley in cohorts with his colleagues was arguing for the very things he condemned in the Dublin Parliament. I put it to him that he was a different man in Dublin than he was in Stormont.

'Put not your trust in princes,' I quoted, John Wilson said his country had no princes. I retorted, 'What about the princes of the church?' That silenced John, son of Will!

Certain Official Unionists boasted if they went to Dublin and got a deal they could come back and claim that the DUP had let Ulster down and the Official Unionists alone were the people able to deliver. They seem eager to part company with the rest of the Unionist family. Well, what happened in Dublin?

A paper presented there was afterwards shredded and disowned by the party of those who presented it.

When I asked the Chairman, Sir Ninian, at the full meeting what had been decided, he replied, 'Nothing

officially or unofficially.' We had stated that except progress had been made we would not be going to Duh No progress was made before Dublin and no progress in Dublin. So the Official Unionists' journey over Boyne gained no glorious victory. The DUP was fully vindicated.

Let it be said that until the Dublin Government acknowledges the illegality of their territorial claim Northern Ireland there can be no firm basis for progress. That is an essential prerequisite for const' agreement. Without that no amount of Irish blame can avail. Dublin must come out of her past and into the 20th Century.

Having eliminated 80% of the population since partition, in no way will her Irish method of ethnic cleansing be tolerated.

Speaking in Belfast this past week Conor Cruise O'Brien a former Dublin Labour Minister said that Articles 2 and 3 represented the 'extreme nationalism of Hitler and Mussolini.' Just think about it, the Unionists of Ulster are commanded to give away a package of concessions which will satisfy the greenest of Republicans in the South in order to get rid of Hitler and Mussolini extremism.

Let me state our position clearly, there can be no negotiations with any Dublin Government until that Government indicates clearly that it will sponsor, in the Dublin Parliament, legislation to have a referendum in the South to remove the jurisdiction claim over Northern Ireland and will support such a proposition in the country.

This must be done, to quote Des O'Malley, 'not as some crude bartering exercise with the Unionist community in Northern Ireland' but because it is the legal, honest and democratic thing to do.

Until the South and the SDLP cease to justify the illegal claim and get rid of it, there is no prospect of any progress.

Let me cut through all the Irish blame of Johnny the Son of Will, and Porridge Skin Flynn and Andrew Liver Republican Salts and tell them you can't con us! You are the Hitlerite and Fascist aggressors. Give up your illegality, come into the 20th Century, quit your lying and be honest for once.

The world has caught you on. Articles 2 and 3 have become an international debating point. You have got to face up to them.

That is why the DUP Executive has decided with the best possible advice from international lawyers to launch a crusade to bring the illegal claim to the attention of the world.

In Westminster, in Europe, in the UNO, in Washington, this iniquitous claim must be exposed and how it is giving oxygen to the IRA.

The fact that the Supreme Court of the South has ruled that this claim is 'a constitutional imperative' makes it a matter all the more serious.

In the House of Commons this week the Secretary of State seemed to look upon it as a matter for the Unionists. His words were a Pilate-like washing of his hands.

The Prime Minister must now declare himself. Is he going to bow to Dublin's claim or is he going to fight for the integrity of the United Kingdom.

Last week Mr. Reynolds claimed that John Major and he had agreed to put the Talks back on the rails after the election and that the 1920 Act would be on the Table for negotiation along with Articles 2 and 3.

John Major must tell us if he has agreed to the negotiation of the Union. The people of Northern Ireland have the right to know.

Since making that claim Albert the Wren has been struck a mortal blow so yet another of Ulster's enemies has been removed from the field.

Who killed the Wren? I said the Mighty Spring killed the Wren. But none of the birds of the air sighed or sobbed when they heard of his death. Instead they sang not a dirge but a dance.

What happened in the last weeks of the Talks was simply an attempt by Her Majesty's Government to get a cobbled up agreement with Dublin.

When an Official Unionist delegate could say in an open meeting that 'the ordinary Unionist did not care a d\*\*\* about Articles 2 and 3' it could be discerned what way the wind was blowing.

The final paper submitted by the Dublin Government and which seemed to be swallowed by HMG revealed exactly what Dublin was up to.

I made clear to the Secretary of State my attitude to that paper.

On the 18 September I made the DUP position clear to the Secretary of State. I stated:-

'I was appalled at your commendation of the Dublin Submission and your recommendation of it to the committee.

The last sentence of Paragraph 4 of the Dublin submission states:-

'Therefore the real and actual denial of the nationalist identity has to be addressed no less intently than the perceived theoretical denial of the Unionist identity in terms of the Irish Constitution.'

The nationalists have a real and actual denial of their identity but Unionists have only a perceived theoretical denial of their identity according to Dublin.

If that is the foundation you want us to build on then you must think Unionists are the most gullible of people.

In paragraph 5 sentence 4 we read:-

'We made clear in our statement of 28 August that we do not rule out constitutional change, including change in our jurisdiction, ensuing from the present negotiations.'



This is a blatant attempt to legitimise their territorial claim by referring to Northern Ireland as their 'jurisdiction' and evidently accepted by you. What of all the claims by Dublin that Articles 2 and 3 were only a settling for Nationalist aspirations.

In the same paragraph 5 sentence 6 they state:-

'We have mentioned various factors likely to shape the judgment of the electorate in such circumstances, including the satisfactory expression of nationalist aspirations and the strength and quality of the links between both parts of Ireland.'

Evidently the links which they want to achieve are quite acceptable to you indeed are accepted as fundamentals.

When you could read from a typewritten script your comments, shortly after Dublin had spoken, my delegation could only draw the conclusion that you were in cahoots with Mr. Andrews.'

The UDUP listed the obstacles which Dublin and the SDLP refused to face:-

While there are a number of obstacles in the way of developing proper relations between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic we have been asked under Agenda Item 6 to deal with fundamental aspects of the problem. We see the fundamental obstacles as being:-

1. The claim by the Irish Republic over Northern Ireland as a Constitutional imperative.
2. The claim that Northern Ireland is regarded as part of the territory of the Irish Republic.
3. The claim that the Irish Republic has the right to exercise jurisdiction over and in Northern Ireland.
4. The failure to recognise and the existence of such an entity as 'the people of Northern Ireland.'
5. The claim that 'the people of Northern Ireland' are part of 'the Irish nation.'
6. The denial to 'the people of Northern Ireland' of their right to self-determination.
7. The refusal to recognise that Northern Ireland is in law part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
8. The undemocratic and unconstitutional nature and existence of the Anglo Irish Agreement.
9. The absence of effective security/extradition cooperation on the part of the Irish Republic.

On these issues there can be no compromise and there will be no surrender.

Let me now put up some markers:-

Those who would divide Unionism are those who have no mandate whatsoever for their policies.

Any Unionist who proposes power sharing with Republicans in an executive over Northern Ireland's internal affairs has no mandate from the Unionist people.

Any Unionist who proposes power sharing in an executive with Dublin Ministers over Northern Ireland's external affairs has no mandate from the Unionists.

Any Unionist who only wants devolved government in Northern Ireland in order to find a way for the Nationalist people etc has no mandate.

Any Unionist who is prepared to settle for an arrangement where Unionists would always be in a minority in any Northern Ireland/Southern Ireland body has no mandate from the Unionist people of Northern Ireland.

Any Unionist who would secede for large parts of Northern Ireland interests in agriculture, tourism culture be handed over to joint bodies from North and South with extensive power has no mandate from the Unionist people of Northern Ireland.

When the Anglo Irish Conference meeting which broke up the Talks finished, it all came out in the wash. Note carefully what the Secretary of State said live on the BBC after the meeting:-

Sir Patrick Mayhew: Well, I think we have probably broken away for good from the three stranded process or structure. It served its purpose to get the talks going in a reasonably orderly way, but I think we have found in the last four weeks of that process that people got on very much better when they met just party to party, one to one whether it's you, you know, in the corridors, in a small room, in the bar or wherever - that's the sort of environment in which the horses are bought and sold and horses were being bought and sold during those last four weeks and I think we'll get back to that. We won't go back to formal strands.'

So down in Dublin without any consultations whatsoever with the other parties, Dublin and London decided that there would be no more Strand 1, 2 or 3 meetings. This let the SDLP off the hook as far as the agreed proposals of that Strand 1 were concerned.

It let the Dublin Government off the hook as far as addressing Articles 2 and 3 are concerned. It kept the Anglo Irish Agreement and Secretariat in place without any suspensions whatsoever.

To add insult to injury it informed us that our future would be negotiated 'in the corridors, in a small room, in the bar or whatever' and informed us that horses were bought and sold during the last four weeks of the Talks. More likely asses selling asses.

This is the Mayhew/Dublin plan for the deciding of our future.

The proposals are insulting and in no way will we negotiate on this basis. We reject it out of hand.

Mr Andrews said:-

David Andrews: The DUP wanted us to make preconditions in relation to Articles 2 and 3 of the constitution. We could not do that as I already explained on a few occasions it was not in our gift and it is not in any Government's gift to say that Articles 2 and 3 may be changed. The only way that Articles 2 and 3 may be changed is a matter of legislative fact, is that a bill must be introduced in the Dail on the one hand and that bill must go through both Houses of the Oireachtas and be sent to the people. But in advance of sending that bill to the people by way of Referendum I would have thought that we would have had to have a



substantial package in place to offer the people with a view to the possibility of changing Articles 2 and 3. Now the DUP as I have indicated to you and I don't want to be in the finger pointing business or the recrimination business far be it from me to suggest that or make charges or counter-charges but I think that the whole thrust should now be to get back into the Talks process. But as a matter of fact the DUP treated the Talks in a rather A La Carte fashion. They came in and out of the Talks as they felt was necessary to protect their own best interests. I would like to pay tribute if I may say to the moderation of Mr. James Molyneux of the OUP. He's a man who has indicated that he would be willing to come back into the Talks process and his post-ending of this Talks process was very moderate, very conciliatory. He is strong in the defence of his own particular position and support of his own position as a Unionist as so be it, but I met him once in bi-lateral and I was very impressed with his whole attitude, and I think that an Irish Government could in the nature of things talk to people very positively with the hope of substantial progress with people like James Molyneux and in no way as I say diminishing his position as a Unionist and support of his own strong defence of what his beliefs are.'

The purpose of this statement was to divide the Unionists by giving Mr. Molyneux the kiss of death.

I welcome his attack on the DUP. Mr. Andrews recognised where his main opposition came from. His pointing of his dirty finger at us is welcomed. We have no apology to make for our stand against Dublin's claim and we are glad that Andrews could not contain his anger at the DUP's refusal to budge.

The DUP came out of the Talks with clean hands and a pure heart and determined as ever to deliver our Province.

Our Province must be delivered from Dublin's immoral, illegal and criminal claim of jurisdiction over us. It must be delivered from the betrayal of the Anglo Irish Agreement.

It must be delivered from having its future within the UK decided in liquor bars by the Secretary of State in cahoots with Dublin.

It must be delivered from any departure from democratic British principles in its future government.

It must be delivered from the scourge of terrorism.

It must be delivered from all Dublin interference in its internal affairs.

It must be delivered to build a future of peace, prosperity and full employment for its people.

With trust in Almighty God, with faith in the final triumph of the right, with confidence that our cause is good, we once again put our foot to the uphill road and our face to the wind, knowing that in the end our hopes shall be accomplished. We are determined to deliver!