



An Chartlann Náisiúnta
National Archives

Reference Code: 2021/47/21

Creator(s): Department of Foreign Affairs

Accession Conditions: Open

Copyright: National Archives, Ireland.
May only be reproduced with
the written permission of the
Director of the National
Archives.

885(2)

AN RÚNAÍOCHT ANGLA-ÉIREANNACH
BÉAL FEIRSTE

ANGLO-IRISH SECRETARIAT
BELFAST

12 July, 1993

SECRET

Mr. Sean O hUiginn
Assistant Secretary
Anglo-Irish Division
Department of Foreign Affairs
Dublin 2.

Dear Assistant Secretary

I enclose a draft note on the meeting of the Anglo-Irish
Inter-Governmental Conference held in London on 8th July 1993.

Yours sincerely

Bob Barr

p.p. Sean Farrell

MEETING OF THE ANGLO-IRISH INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCELONDON, 8 JULY, 1993Introduction

The 47th regular meeting of the Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Conference was held in London on 8 July 1993. The Conference was attended, on the Irish side, by the Tanaiste and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Dick Spring T.D., the Minister for Justice, Mrs. Maire Geoghegan-Quinn T.D., the Minister for Enterprise and Employment, Mr. Ruairi Quinn, T.D., Mr. Noel Dorx, Mr. Tim Dalton, Ambassador Small, Mr. Sean O hUiginn, Mr. Caoimhin O hUiginn, Mr. David Donoghue, Mr. Pat Hennessy, Mr. Fergus Finlay, Mr. Michael Fahy, Mr. Sean O'Flaherty, Mr. Eugene Forde, Mr. John Brosnan and, from the Secretariat, Mr. Declan O'Donovan, Mr. Sean Farrell and Mr. Michael Mellett.

On the British side, the Conference was attended by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Sir Patrick Mayhew M.P., Minister of State, Mr. Robert Atkins MP, Minister of State Sir John Wheeler MP, and Michael Ancram MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Mr. John Chilcot, Mr. John Ledlie, Mr. Quentin Thomas, Mr. Graham Archer, Mr. John McKervill, Mr. Ron Spence, Mr. Ken Morrison, Mr. Tony McCusker, Mr. Jonathan Stevens, Mr. David Brooker and, from the Secretariat, Mr. Martin Williams, Ms. Christine Collins and Mr. Clive Barbour.

Also present for discussion of security matters were Mr. Patrick Culligan, Commissioner, Garda Siochana and Mr. Hugh Annesley, Chief Constable of the RUC, accompanied by C.S. Sillary.

The Conference began at 12.45 p.m. with tete-a-tete over lunch which was followed by a Restricted Security Session (recorded separately) from 2.45 pm to 4.05 pm. The Plenary Session ran from 4.10 pm to 6.00 pm.

(The following account of proceedings is in the form of direct speech and is based on detailed notes taken during the meeting. It does not, however, purport to be a verbatim record nor is it necessarily exhaustive of all the exchanges).

Meeting of the Anglo-Irish Conference
London
8 July 1993

Agenda

- 12.45 Arrival at Lancaster House (Ministers)
Arrival at Old Admiralty Building (Officials)
- 13.00 Lunch (including Tete-a-Tete) Ministers at
Lancaster House,
Officials at OAB
- 14.10 Ministers travel from Lancaster House to OAB
- 14.15 Restricted Security Session
- 15.00 Plenary
 - 1. Political Matters
 - 2. Confidence Issues
 - (a) Cross-Border Roads
 - (b) Parades
 - (c) Allegations of harassment
 - (d) Carlingford Lough
 - 3. Treatment of Fugitive Offenders (including extradition and bail)
 - 4. Public Appointments: Arts Council
 - 15.45 (tea) 5. Social and Economic Matters
 - (a) Enterprise and Employment
- Consideration of Joint Paper
 - (b) Science and Technology
- Consideration of Joint paper on the potential for increased co-operation
 - 6. Disadvantaged Areas
 - 7. Rural Development: Take note of Steering Group's Report
 - 8. Date of next Conference
 - 9. Any other Business
(Broadcasting)
(Royal Victoria Hospital)
- 16.45 Press Conference
- 17.00 Departure

Mr. Mayhew: I would like to welcome you here, Tanaiste, together with your Ministerial and other colleagues. We have lost an hour of our time, something we did not want. However, we have had a fruitful and valuable first session over lunch. To the others, I would like to offer our apologies, we have kept you waiting. We said we would try to avoid this happening but there it is. Well, we had an important private discussion during the time in question.

Item One: Political Matters

Mr. Mayhew: Now I see the first item on the Agenda is Political Matters and I would like to begin with the situation regarding the resumption of political dialogue. At the recent Summit both Governments were agreed that there should be a continuation of the process of active talks with the political parties concerned. We've been doing this. In recent weeks Michael Ancram has been engaged in a round of familiarisation meetings which have been used as a means of sounding out informally the views of the previous participants. He has not yet finished that process but he intends following with a second, slightly more formal round of talks, to begin in about ten days time. We regard this as a valuable part of the process of sussing out how the parties feel, what is their reaction to entering into further talks and how they see the common ground between them. This is not, I would stress, a resumption of the talks or the process of dialogue.

What he has found is a strong reluctance on the part of the parties to going back into what might be termed a goldfish bowl situation. At the same time, however, he has found a refreshing degree of readiness to continue with the process that would hopefully lead to a resumption of the talks based on the three-stranded approach which we all signed up to in March 1991. This is at least one ember of encouragement. What we want to see is everyone back in the talks process on before though not necessarily in the same

format. Perhaps there will be smaller groups engaging in bilaterals, rather as we had towards the end of the talks last year.

That process is ongoing. I think, however that we have to address, in this connection, the consequences of the story, the interview, in today's Guardian. I am afraid that the sentiments expressed in it will be seen to have had a very unhelpful effect on the process of getting talks restarted. I am quite prepared to acknowledge that newsmen often do not get the balance right. Nor are we, when giving interviews, the masters of what will appear ultimately. However, I regard it as unhelpful now. With regard to the content of the article, Tanaiste, I think there are two or three aspects in it which will cause Unionists disquiet. When I speak of Unionists I do not mean just Paisley's lot - who have been considerably unforthcoming - but rather Jim Molyneaux's party also. There are, as I said, a number of features which could cause them to put a leg out at each corner and refuse to budge. Firstly, they may well see themselves as being threatened that a package will be put to them by the two Governments if they have failed to come on board by a deadline such as the end of September. Secondly, there is the suggestion that the proposed Agreement between the two Governments would embrace an internal settlement. This would be contrary to the three strand approach under which the Irish Government were not involved in the Strand One negotiations. I feel we ought together to reemphasise that we are both committed to the three strand approach to securing agreement among everyone and we should use this meeting to do this. The British Government remains committed to the proposition that new overall arrangements should be agreed across the community, including by necessity, constitutional politicians. I believe we must begin by doing this today.

Tanaiste: Thank you, Secretary of State, for your words of welcome and for the comments you have just made. I think its

clear what we are both trying to do. We are trying to get back to the talks process. And there is a very difficult situation at present. This was recognised at the recent Summit meeting in Downing Street. With regard to the interview, it was given by me several days ago. We have had an assessment of the prospects for talks already today over lunch. Could I also however, make reference to Molyneaux's recent interview in, I think it was last Thursday's Belfast Telegraph. We found that to be particularly disappointing in content. It displayed no signs suggesting progress and was not particularly encouraging in the context of the resumption of talks. I think we may be facing a prolonged period of Unionist resistance to political dialogue. The reactions to my Mansion House speech and to the various overtures I have made to Unionists in recent months have all been disappointing. I regret that our calls for talks were disparaged by the reaction from Paisley. For the time being we have to pursue our posture of calling on the parties to return to the talks. However, this is a position whose credibility is wearing increasingly thin. In my view we haven't made much progress over the last 6 months. We will have to address this eventually. If we conclude that we have failed to get the parties back to the table in the foreseeable future then the two Governments will have to take stock. Perhaps at our next meeting when the results of Michael Ancram's discussions become known. The ultimate responsibility lies with the two Governments. We need to make this very very clear if there is no sign of progress next time around. However, we are not getting much cooperation from the Unionist parties who appear willing to draw things out.

Mr. Mayhew: I share somewhat your feeling that some see advantages in spinning things out. Perhaps it might be helpful to get some impressions from Michael. I do accept that the responsibility of the two Governments is there. I interpret this to mean that I should do all I practicably can to foster whatever I can do in order to revive the talks

process. We are building on two years work by our predecessors. In going about this I have to curb a native impatience and irritation at something so vague and murky as the opaque goings on of the politicians here. I've got to get on top of that. However, another aspect to my interpretation of the Governments responsibility is that it not lend itself to something which is unlikely to succeed. That precludes the British Government from acquiescing in a settlement, not accepted by the constitutional politicians. I recognise the dangers of allowing any group to hold a veto. To seek to go however over the heads of the constitutional parties to the people in a referendum would probably end in a smoking volcano crater. We are doing our darnedest to get the parties back to talks. I'm utterly committed to fulfilling the remit from the Heads of Government meeting. It would in my view be very beneficial to this, if we could agree today on some form of words to set out our continuing commitment to securing the agreement of the parties. Michael, perhaps you can now say a word.

Mr. Ingram: Thank you. I'll begin by saying that I very much take the Tanaiste's advice about not being too optimistic with regard to my contacts with the parties. These talks are informal and are a way of familiarizing myself with the parties and their positions. Since the talks have been both informal and confidential I don't want to betray confidences but I can give some impressions. I perceive two main strains from both sides. They do not want to participate in a goldfish bowl exercise like last year because they stress that "talks cannot afford to fail again". Secondly, both sides see the way ahead as bilateral contacts. In the first instance between the British Government and the parties and in the second instance between the parties themselves. Though I have not yet completed my first round of talks I will try to start my more formal talks soon. Thus far I have perceived that, although there is common ground between the parties significant differences still remain. I think there will have

to be compromise from stated positions and it will come down in the end to a balance of concessions' between the parties. I feel its important that neither Government should in the meantime take stands on Strands One or Two. There is a need to keep things moving. I see the exercise I'm engaged in as having a fairly tight schedule but I wouldn't like to put a final deadline on it.

Tanaiste: Yes, a balance of concessions is what it all comes down to. One question I might put is whether you think people are willing to make the necessary concessions. I don't see much evidence of conciliation in Northern Ireland at present.

Mr. Ancran: It is difficult to give a categorical assurance but can I say that what I've heard privately from party leaders does not match their public rhetoric.

Mr. Mayhew: Thanks for that. Now, giving thought as I said to finding a form of words today, can I ask if our drafters have come up with something. Have the problems been resolved?

Mr. O'Donovan: Not all.

Mr. Mayhew: Can we leave it for the moment and come back to it later ?

Tanaiste: Yes, why don't we go through the Agenda.

Mr. Mayhew: First we have to say goodbye to the Chief Constable who has to go off to an Interpol meeting.

Now, can we turn to Item Two on our Agenda, Confidence Matters.

Item Two: Confidence Matters(A) Cross Border Roads

Mr. Mayhew: The first item I have is Cross Border Roads. Here I note there has been agreement for the terms of reference for the scoping study with regard to the research project concerning border crossing points. This represents progress since our last meeting. I've noted with satisfaction that the 'scoping study' is now under way with cooperation between our officials from DFP and yours from the Economic and Social Research Institute. I understand that the scoping study should be completed about the end of August so we would see it at the September Conference. This will enable us to focus in on where the shoe pinches most and to see whether we should commission further work.

Tanaiste: I've also noted with pleasure that progress has been made and I attach importance to the target of the timetable being met so that this phase will be concluded by the time of our next Conference. I have little to add but I want to make just two more points. This issue is raised constantly in the Dail and, as you are aware, it was also raised at last week's meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Body. Secondly, I wish to mention one case, the plight of two elderly ladies, the Gallen sisters, who live at Aughrim on the Cavan/Fermanagh border. We have been contacted on a number of occasions, most recently last month, about the difficulties which these ladies face in gaining access to their home because of the presence of British Army barriers in the lane leading to their property. I would be grateful if you could take steps to ensure that the inconvenience caused in this case is kept to a minimum.

Mr. Mayhew: That case is well known to me and I have noted it. I would add that we are on common ground in our approach to this and part of this is that we want to see as many Cross Border Roads open as are consistent with security.

(b) Parades

Mr. Mayhew: Now we turn to Parades. We have already had a considerable discussion on this in our Restricted Session. The position of Parades in this society is quite extraordinary. Last year there were no less than 2700 of them. They take a lot of handling and I can only offer praise for the expertise and qualities of tact of the police in handling such numbers. I wish to acknowledge the very real success the RUC have achieved. Out of all those last year only one caused trouble, that on the Lower Ormeau Road on the 8th of July. This year the Chief Constable has some anxiety about the prospects for the coming weekend following the Ainsworth Avenue incident in which a man blew himself up with a grenade he was about to throw at the RUC. The Chief Constable is worried that the subsequent arrests might lead to further trouble this weekend. On the general point I think that both sides here are satisfied as to the impartiality of the RUC in dealing with Parades. I hope this issue need not detain us for very long now.

Tánaiste:

The issue of Parades, we recognise, is a sensitive one which can stir deep emotions. The approach we have consistently taken in this framework is that parades should not take place in an area, or along a route where they are not welcome. This is a principle which has been clearly enunciated by your predecessors. Your forthright views on the matter on the occasion of the mini-Twelfth march down the Ormeau Road last year were also appreciated. Both the Irish and British sides last year committed the

1992 to the view that "the right to demonstrate should be exercised with respect to the rights and sensitivities of others and with regard to the maintenance of public order". As I said to you at our last meeting that is really the bottom line. I hope that despite the difficulties this year's marching season will pass off without further incident. Can I say also that we understand the dilemmas facing the RUC in a difficult policing situation and appreciate the approach they are taking.

Mr. Mayhew: Thank you. I am most grateful for those kind remarks and also for the way in which you have proposed treating this issue. Can I say that questions of rerouting are, of course, matters solely for the Chief Constable. The only powers I have are to ban marches, which I have not done.

(c) Harassment

Mr. Mayhew: Now we come to the subject of harassment. Here we have previously recognised that there could be some merit in studying patterns of harassment across the province to see if there are regional variations. I would just confirm that we have very recently received the Irish paper on harassment and that we will make a close study of it. I very much hope that it will emerge that the incidence of harassment is very small, though I hasten to add that it is our intention to see it completely eliminated where it occurs. Can I suggest that we come back to this issue next time we meet?

Tánaiste: Thank you for those remarks. The problem of harassment by the security force, particularly of young males, continues to be a source of concern to us. We appreciate that efforts have been made to tackle this problem and it's not intended to suggest that the problem is universal or that it applies equally to all sections of the security forces. However, as Lord Colville commented in his recent report, incidents continue to occur in which, in his words, "soldiers

appear to be intent in imposing indignities on young men in Catholic urban areas". This obviously gives cause for concern. It is an issue that paramilitaries are only too happy to exploit. If I could just mention one particular case then I would like to bring to your attention Seamus Mallon's words in the House of Commons during the recent EPA debate with regard to the inadequate response to complaints about an alleged incident of British Army harassment. I admire Seamus Mallon. He stands his ground firmly and has I think brought conviction to this case. I hope you will be able to satisfy him with regard to this.

Mr. Mayhew: That is the Loughran case. I can tell you that it is under investigation by the RUC. I think, though I am not absolutely sure about this, that no formal complaint was made in the case. Since it is under investigation I can not make any substantive comment here. But I can assure you that the RUC is not anxious to drag its feet on this. We do indeed have common purpose here and I am aware that the spectacle of people looking down the sight of a rifle can cause concern. Often however, this can be the only way in which a soldier can view a situation, but obviously that should not be used for improper purposes of harassment.

(d) Carlingford Lough

Mr. Mayhew: And now we come to Carlingford Lough on which I think you may wish to raise something. May I say that I would take it extremely remiss if there were shown to be any cases of harassment of boat owners on the Lough. However, you must realise that the Carlingford Lough operation is an important part of our security operation. I have visited Carlingford myself and have been winched down into the patrol vessel. Warrenpoint is at the head of the Lough and it is very easy to move arms and materials across.

Tanaiste: You recently provided us with a note on the current operational practice in Carlingford Lough. As you know we have been concerned that the guidelines laid down in your previous 1972 note were being put aside. Obviously we will need to study your latest document carefully and we will be in touch again about it at official level. It is our view that in any event the practical objective must obviously be to ensure that patrols are conducted with tact and sensitivity and react only when vessels are behaving in a manner which gives reasonable grounds for suspicion. The recent incident involving the boarding of the Flying Fish highlighted many of the concerns felt locally in this regard. While we did receive a prompt reply to our enquiries about this incident, we have not been told why the vessel was boarded. It would be particularly helpful if we could have this information because what occurred appeared heavy-handed to say the least.

Mr. Mayhew: Yes, I am familiar with the case. The vessel is owned by a Mr. Morgan and I have got the background to the seizure of it and will provide the background. I confirm that the Royal Marines did board the vessel at the time stated. I can tell you there were proper indications there might be persons of interest to the security forces aboard the vessel. I understand that as soon as the patrol boarded the vessel the yacht dropped its sails and made for Greenore, at which point the Marines were forced to disembark. Throughout the boarding the Marines acted in accordance with standard procedures which involved the craft remaining alongside the yacht and the second craft holding off to the side to provide assistance. I know the Senior Naval Officer in charge in Carlingford Lough, Commander Fairbourne. I am entirely confident that he would have ensured that his men operated in a correct fashion. Mr. Morgan's boat, I understand, has been stopped three times in the last two years. The yacht was not taking part in a race when stopped.

Tanaiste: It was returning from a race.

Mr. O'Donovan: May I intrude, Secretary of State, to say that the random boarding of vessels is the item of most concern to us. In the case of the Flying Fish, if we could be given the information, even on a confidential basis, I am sure it would be of help in defusing the situation.

Mr. Mayhew: I think there has to be an element of random searching and I would like Mr. Ledlie to say something about this.

Mr. Ledlie: I would compare the situation on the Lough with that regarding PVCPS. As with PVCPS, vessels in Carlingford Lough are stopped on both a random basis and where suspicion exists. All this is fully explained in our note.

Mr. O'Donovan: If you are going further than saying in practice that you board only on grounds of suspicion then that is new.

Mr. Mayhew: Is that all right? Can we leave it there? Boats are stopped at random in the Lough. Perhaps we can come back to this next time round. I would stress that it is necessary for deterrent purposes to do this and I would compare it with the situation in which the police can stop motorists on a random basis with a view to ascertaining whether or not they have had drink taken. There is some misapprehension that the police do not have power to do this but I can assure you that the police do have power to stop cars on a random basis.

Tanaiste: Our information is that on 18 June a local yacht called the Flying Fish was boarded by the Royal Marines based in Carlingford Lough. The yacht had been participating in a local yacht race in the Lough and was returning to the Southern shore at the time of the incident. The skipper of

the vessel, Mr. Johnny Morgan, has alleged that his vessel is regularly stopped and searched by the Marines and that during this incident a second Marine speed boat circled his vessel continually in a way purposely to soak the crew of the yacht.

Item 3: Treatment of Fugitive Offenders

Mr. Mayhew: Now we come to Item 3 on the Agenda which is the treatment of Fugitive Offenders. We have already had a useful discussion about this in the Restricted Session. I must say it came as a disappointment to us that the Bill on Extradition is not to be introduced in the Dail this session.

Mrs Geoghegan-Quinn: It will be introduced early in the new session.

Mr. Mayhew: As I said this has been a matter of soreness to us. This will inevitably send a signal to the Unionists and to the people in Great Britain that the Irish Government is not fully committed to ensuring that extradition arrangements between our two countries are effective. However, the Minister has carefully explained to me the two factors which make necessary a postponement of the introduction of the Bill. Firstly, there is the log-jam of legislation at present. Secondly, she has informed me that the Attorney General has detected matters of technical difficulty which have to be addressed by the drafters and which, if not dealt with, could, if challenged, bring down the new act as well as other extradition legislation. I accept the gravity of this and the necessity of postponement of the legislation. I welcome the Minister's assurance that the bill will be introduced in the new session in October. We are also encouraged by what the Minister has said with regard to the forthcoming meeting of Working Group II when we will be given a full indication of the policies which the draughtsman has been tasked to address. I think in the light of this we can leave this matter here

Mrs. Geoghegan-Quinn: Can I ask you Secretary of State whether the Speciality legislation will be enacted before the end of July, as had been previously indicated to us ?

Mr. Mayhew: Yes. The provisions in the Criminal Justice Bill have now passed through most of their stages and I am happy to say that its provisions are unamended. We expect it to get royal assent before the end of the month and can I say that we look forward to your own legislation appearing. Could I perhaps have an indication of when that is likely to be ?

Mrs. Geoghegan-Quinn: The legislation is in course of preparation. I can tell you that in the Working Group II meeting on 30 July we should be able to give you a strong indication of the likely timetable for introducing the legislation.

Mr. Mayhew: That is very welcome news. Reciprocation is the name of the game. It would be good if that item could be removed from the litany that we get. Can we move on ?

Item 4: Public Appointments

Mr. Mayhew: Now we come to Public Appointments. Michael can I ask you to take this ?

Tánaiste: Before we consider the general question could I just return to the matter of the two Arts Councils which we discussed over lunch ? There is good existing cooperation between the two Arts Councils North and South and it seemed to us that it was a very good idea that we cooperate to appoint one or more individuals to our two Arts Councils, both of which are in process of being reconstituted. The area is not politically sensitive and this would seem a good opportunity to make cross appointments. It is a modest proposal. We were disappointed and somewhat surprised to see that apparently

this is not acceptable. I hope you can look again at the matter.

Mr. Anoram: I firmly believe in building on existing cooperation between the two Arts Councils. I also believe that there should be scope for further practical cooperation on specific issues of mutual interest. Additionally Councils may see value in some form of reciprocal participation at each other's meetings. I believe that the detail of such arrangements should be a matter for determination by the Arts Councils themselves. The question that we really have to ask ourselves is whether the existing good relations should be formalised in the way suggested. Perhaps a better way forward would be by the encouraging of joint ventures in the Arts fields.

Tanaiste: On the subject of Public Appointments generally we last discussed this issue at the February Conference and at the time I expressed our concern at the very low rate of success of Irish nominees. I am pleased that, since then, there has been some improvement in our success record. I hope that this will continue. I think it is in the interest of both Governments that the objective of Article 6 of the Agreement - to correct Nationalist under-representation on the Boards of Public Bodies - be achieved. This is a very important item of our work.

Mr. Atkins: Can I say that there is a willingness and a steady recognition on our side of the importance of tackling this matter. We want to attach importance to the nominations of the Irish Government. Unfortunately there have been one or two problems. Some of your nominations were either made very late in the day, or frankly were not appropriate for the posts for which they were nominated. I don't mean to say that the people nominated weren't eminently suited for other posts but, in some instances, for example, a man was nominated where the job required a woman. However, I can assure you that we on

our side are keen that there be progress in this area and it would be sensible for us to consider ways and means of achieving this.

Tanaiste: Let's work on this together. I'd like also to mention the question of District Councils' powers of nomination to public bodies. There has been a tendency on the part of some Unionist controlled Councils to present exclusively an overwhelmingly Unionist list of candidates for Board vacancies and we would welcome the use of the powers available to you to correct any imbalances arising from the recent elections. What is the current position in this respect ?

Mr. Atkins: Well there have in the past been problems on the housing front and with regard to Belfast. However, the point is well made and I might add that we have high hopes in the Council in Belfast for the future.

Mr. Ancram: Getting back to the Arts Council, one of the names put forward by the Irish side is under active consideration for appointment.

Tanaiste: Do I take that as good news ?

Mr. Mayhew: I would just like to restate that our main criterion and over-riding concern is the suitability of the candidate. To get around the problem of very short notice, perhaps a list of Irish nominations could be furnished from which nominations would be made from time to time.

Mr. O'Donovan: There is some difficulty between us over the period of notice. The difficulty over the matter of the list is that it makes it very difficult for us to chart the success of our nominations.

Mr. Chilcot: Is that so ?

Mr. Atkins: As I said we are committed to doing what is right and we will look at this matter again.

Mr. Mayhew: Yes. The idea would be that there would be a list of the "great and the good" submitted by the Irish side. The Irish side would nominate for vacancies as they occurred from that list.

Mr. O'Donovan: That is slightly different to what we have heard before. Look at that.

Mr. Williams: It would be possible for the Irish side to be informed whenever someone was chosen from their list.

Mr. Mayhew: We will continue to review the situation. May we now move on to Item 5.

Item 5: Economic and Social Matters

Mr. Mayhew: Now I'd like to bring Mr. Atkins in on this. He and Mr. Quinn have been having some talks separately.

Mr. Atkins: Minister Quinn and I have agreed that in order to save time and bearing in mind that we have discussed these matters, we will just treat them very briefly here. We considered two agreed papers. Both list areas for cooperation in the future and I can say that from our discussions we are determined to continue to ensure that there will be cooperation and joint activity in the various fields as far and as fast as we can. I might just mention in particular the complementary nature of the aerospace industry North and South, with Shorts in the North and with the various activities of GPA and Aer Lingus in Shannon. We are also keen to do things together on innovations for example, in the area of new EC relays. I can assure you that we are both determined that cooperation will be enhanced.

Mr. Quinn: I would endorse what Minister Atkins has said. The reports have identified areas of cooperation which can and could be explored further. What we aim to do is to really change the mind-set, to have people in both parts of the island looking in North-South directions rather than simply looking across the water. We also have good existing cooperation in the training area.

Mr. Mayhew: I well recognise that mind-set to which you refer.

Mr. Quinn: I might add that in addition to agreeing the two joint papers Minister Atkins and I also agreed on another matter, the merger of Aer Lingus and British Airways!
(laughter)

Item 6: Making Belfast Work

Mr. Mayhew: Well, the name of the game here is impartiality and even-handedness, in using resources in areas of disadvantage, wherever they are found, and irrespective of the community background, where there is most need. It is inherently right that the Government should seek to level up the standards of the more deprived sections of the community. It's a long-term business but we are committed to it and have allocated very substantial resources to Making Belfast Work. Since its introduction in 1988 the MBW initiative has been allocated £124 million and I announced recently an extra £24m to be spent over the coming year on projects connected with it. The themes of MBW continue to be: a desire to increase employment and business opportunities, to equip residents to compete for jobs and increase education, further education and training opportunities and to improve the quality of life in the targeted areas. It is encouraging also to note that I went recently to St. Colum's school in the Whiterook area where no less than 40 companies had given equipment to help

train all the pupils in the fourth form in computer skills and skills that would assist them secure employment. A further point, with regard to the people from disadvantaged areas, is that it is encouraging that there are signs that these people are now willing to go outside their area, in the search for work where previously they were not. I must add that the Making Belfast Work Programme is currently under a review, which is not yet completed, in the light of the financial situation. However, we regard it as very valuable and we all hope that it will be able to continue and carry on its extremely valuable work.

Tánaiste: I think this is an issue we should keep under review. I welcomed your announcement last month of plans for spending under the programme for next year and I understand that this announcement marks the completion of the first phase of the funding plans which were announced in 1988. It would be useful if some work could be undertaken on an assessment of the scale of deprivation in the area covered by Making Belfast Work. I understand some preliminary work has been done on this already.

I would also like to comment briefly on two other matters which have a bearing on the problems of Disadvantaged Areas. In February 1991 Peter Brooke announced the launch of the Targeting Social Need Programme. He described it as "a third public expenditure priority of Government". It was widely understood that TSN would channel additional resources to the areas where deprivation is most acute. I believe that the credibility of this programme requires that it receive dedicated resources and that it is made more than simply a statement of policy objectives. In my view, the establishment of a definite additional budget for TSN would, more than any other action, stimulate Departments to include equality considerations in their policies. I feel that some tangible gesture on the part of the British Government is required in this regard, for example, by providing additional funds to

launch Making Belfast Work-type programmes for deprived urban centres elsewhere in Northern Ireland.

Secondly, I see the forthcoming review of the Fair Employment Act as a good opportunity to enlarge our understanding of the problems of the disadvantaged areas. It's also an opportunity to agree additional measures for these areas. At a meeting which our officials had last March to discuss the review, we put to you a proposal that a document setting out in factual terms the socio-economic situations of the two communities might be prepared. You indicated that you would consider this suggestion. I think it would be helpful if such a document could be prepared.

Mr. Atkins: With regard to Making Belfast Work and the review, this is, of course, on financial grounds. But, can I add, that we would have a desire to ensure that the ad hoc nature of certain activities of Making Belfast Work should be maintained. If it became more structured it would lose something en route. The essence of it is to enable the local community to react to stimulus and to have a say in fostering their own destiny. With regard to Targeting Social Need and the other things you mentioned I would like to give some thought to a document to assess its potential and assess carefully the impact of its programmes. TSN is vital. There are differentials existing in North as well as West Belfast. These problems need to be assessed overall. We will give some thought to providing a paper to the Irish side on TSN.

Tánaiste: Can we discuss this in the Autumn?

Mr. Quinn: Can I just mention that we have some schemes in Dublin with regard to area based partnership programmes to combat urban deprivation and I think it would be useful to have exchanges of information on these programmes. We are for example trying to qualify for EC funding. I will liaise with Robert on this.

Mr. Atkins: That's an excellent idea.

Mr. Mayhew: I would like to endorse Robert Atkins' remarks. This is an exciting area which has achieved some remarkable successes and even though it is fashionable for Unionists to say that it all goes to Catholic areas, the facts are that it does not. It's true that most money does, because of the levels of need which exist in that community.

Now, can we move on to the next item on the agenda, Item 7 Rural Development.

Mr. Mayhew: I see that we have before us the First Annual Report of the Joint Steering Committee on Rural Development which has been approved by the respective Agriculture Ministers. I suggest that the Conference should take note of its contents.

Tánaiste: I understand that the Committee is currently considering ways in which it might have a more pro-active role in encouraging cross-border rural development partnerships. This is an area for improvement and I look forward to seeing this work reflected in the next annual report.

Mr. Mayhew: That would be essential to its purpose, I would think. The way forward lies in cross-border cooperation.

Item 8 Any Other Business

Mr. Mayhew: "Now we come to the item Any Other Business and I would like to ask is there any other business?"

(a) Broadcasting

Tánaiste: I would like to raise the subject of Broadcasting. We agreed at our last meeting that officials should jointly

examine the technical issues affecting the reception of RTE in Northern Ireland. I am glad to hear that officials had a useful meeting in London on 9 June and are following it up by a detailed technical examination of the various options put on the table by the Irish side. I hope we will be able to have a substantive discussion on this subject at the next Conference when our Minister for Arts and Culture, whose remit includes Broadcasting, will be in attendance. As you know, we feel that, given its direct impact on the communities in Northern Ireland, the question of RTE reception is an appropriate matter for discussion with the framework of the Conference.

Mr. Atkins: The problem is that we don't control Broadcasting, it is the responsibility of the DTI in London.

Tánaiste: Then perhaps you could get delegated responsibility for one day.

Mr. Ancram: I have to point out that even the BBC is independent of the DTI, so there is actually a limit to what we can do in this area.

Tánaiste: I consider that ultimately all responsibility rests with Governments.

Mr. Quinn: Can I just refer to the recent decision to maintain Radio 4 on the Long Wave. I can assure Ministers opposite that this decision has been welcomed across the Republic.

Mr. Atkins: Not just there.

Mr. Wheeler: There was a proposal to turn Radio 4 into a twenty-four-hour news programme which would be taken off the Long Wave. Can I just say that until I took on my current post I was a member of the Advisory Board to the BBC and in

that connection I fought hard for the retention of Radio 4 on the Long Wave.

Mr. Mayhew: Is there anything else?

(b) Royal Victoria Hospital

Tánaiste: I would just like to raise the Royal Victoria Hospital.

Mr. Mayhew: What happened there was that, after weeks of total stalemate in which the parties were at odds, we have come up with a solution for this year. Under it very much less will be permitted to be done regarding transferring facilities from the Royal Victoria Hospital than had been recommended by the Eastern Health Board. I can tell you frankly that what happened was that the Board had not consulted the hospital. Of course the hospital should have been consulted. However, the Royal Victoria was not told until April what was to happen. This whole mess should not have happened so what has been decided is that over the next year up to 10% of general surgery and ear, nose and throat facilities may be transferred from the Royal Victoria Hospital. In the meantime the Health and Social Services Board will go ahead and engage in full consultations. This was a wise decision though we don't know what the final outcome will be.

Tánaiste: It's very important that adequate consultations be held. We very much welcome Lord Arran's recent announcement not to accept the totality of the Eastern Health Board's proposals concerning the transfer of a significant number of surgical procedures from the Royal Victoria Hospital in the current year. I note that Lord Arran's decision relates only to the current year and leaves open the question of the Royal's status in future years. We would wish to urge the Board and indeed the Minister to bear in mind the wider

considerations relating to the Royal, such as its pivotal economic and social role in the life of North and West Belfast.

Mr. Mayhew: Of course I welcome that. There is indeed a hearts and minds attachment to the hospital. It can't be exclusively a money matter. Of course, the Government would have to be sensitive to allegations that we were interfering in the work of the Boards which have devolved authority but in this case it was felt necessary to pull back. I think we are all aware that hospitals raise passions.

May I just say, a'propos the matter of hospitals, that we on our side are delighted that the issue of the Adelaide Hospital has been satisfactorily resolved. We are all aware of the Archbishop's concerns regarding the maintenance of the Protestant ethos at the Adelaide and he is delighted with the outcome. We know your own concerns in the matter and I would just like to tell you Tánaiste how appreciative we are of the efforts you personally made to resolve the problem.

Date of next Conference

Mr. Mayhew: We still haven't discussed the date of the next Conference.

Tánaiste: I think there should be one held, probably during the first half of September.

Mr. Mayhew: Yes, but can I point out that the British-Irish Association takes place on the weekend of 12 September.

Tánaiste: Then we should hold it at an early date after that. How about 14 September?

Mr. Dorz: You will be away then.

Tánaiste: I will be away for up to two weeks. How about the Monday after the British-Irish Association meeting?

Mr. Mayhew: Well, I suppose we could all criticise each other's speeches. Tuesday actually suits us better.

Tánaiste: Well, we will look again at the date of 14 September.

Drafting of Joint Statement

Mr. Mayhew: Now that we have finished the other business we can return to the matter of drafting the paragraph for insertion in the Joint Statement. Should we do this in a smaller group?

Mr. O'Donovan: I suggest before we do this that you might have a look first at what has been prepared.

Mr. Williams: Perhaps we might look at the rest of the Joint Statement first.

Mr. Mayhew: Yes, I think that is a sensible approach, let's do that. Shall we work from the back?

This occurred at 5.30. The rest of the Joint Statement was agreed rapidly, leaving only the portion on Political Matters. Discussion on this paragraph continued for 20 minutes and involved both Ministers and officials from both sides. The issue revolved around a British wish to include in the Communique a specific reference that "a new overall accommodation should secure the assent of those principally concerned and in particular the representative constitutional politicians in Northern Ireland". The compromise eventually reached was the exclusion of such a reference and the inclusion of the phrase "to achieve agreement by all

concerned" in the final sentence of Paragraph 2 of the Joint Statement. What follows does not purport to be a complete record of the exchanges while compromise language was being sought, but rather reflects the more important points made. [To clarify matters, the second page of the draft Joint Statement was, confusingly, labelled "p.1", hence the somewhat misleading reference.]

Mr. Mayhew: The top of page one, this sentence is a matter of considerable importance to us. I feel it is necessary for me in the light of the Guardian article to demonstrate what our view is. I very much hope that we can both agree on a suitable wording.

Tánaiste: I suggest the last sentence on the previous page could be amended to take account of your concerns by including the phrase "to achieve agreement".

Mr. Chilcot: Could we add in "with them"?

Mr. Mayhew: I nevertheless consider it essential that we reaffirm our views as I have stated.

Tánaiste: If we go for the option on the top of page one we open up a Pandora's Box.

Mr. Mayhew: I think that the word "should" is very important in this context because it can have a double meaning. Is there some way in which we can bridge it? Could we include a reference to "believing that a new overall accommodation"?

Tánaiste: This is covered in the 26 March statement.

Mr. Chilcot: Not sufficiently.

Mr. O hUiginn: Why not? There is a real difference between

Mr. Mayhew: We do believe new arrangements should have the consent of the politicians.

Mr. O hUiginn: My suggestion is that we take two elements of the March 26 statements. If we depart from the language used there, then we are negotiating a new March 26 agreement.

Mr. Chilcot: If you delete the reference to representative constitutional politicians, the question is very much the issue today and will be asked.

Mr. Mayhew: I am looking at the Common Principles paper of 5 May. Now, I know it is true that the Irish Government was not a party to the talks at that time, but I feel you would not dissent from what is therein. I would urge that the bridge I am suggesting only reflects what has been common ground until now.

Mrs Geoghegan-Quinn: Heretofore we have had joint statements agreed by the two Governments. Can I say that I consider we would be travelling on a very dangerous road if we fail to have a joint statement on this occasion.

Mr. O hUiginn: Why is it necessary that we depart from the language of the 26 March statement?

Mr. Mayhew: The 26 March statement envisaged two stages. Firstly, that nothing should be agreed until everything was agreed and secondly that the issue would then be put to the people. The reference to the constitutional politicians is essential for me, I am afraid.

Mr. O'Donovan: I read the statement of 26 March 1991 as relating to an agreement transcending the existing Anglo-Irish Agreement. It was left open that it might not be possible to reach such an agreement with the participants in which case

other measures might need to be taken. What the statement actually says is that the two Governments "would be prepared to consider a new and more broad agreement or structure if such an arrangement can be arrived at through direct discussion and participation between all the parties concerned".

Mr. Dorr: Could I suggest language in the final sentence on page one along the lines of "to achieve agreement by all concerned" after the word participants?

Mr. Mayhew: That's helpful. However, I would have to say to the press if I was asked that any agreement would have to be acceptable to the constitutional politicians. Your's is a clever and helpful suggestion but as I say I am going to have to give my views to the press if asked.

Tánaiste: I will have to repeat my views on the matter if asked as well.

Mr. Mayhew: Shall we say snap now? No, there is still the matter of the opening sentence of paragraph two. I would prefer to have it out given the current sensitivities.

Tánaiste: The sentence is taken from the Downing Street Summit Communique.

Mr. Chilcot: Perhaps it could be incorporated in a new paragraph.

Tánaiste: Have you a problem with the sentence?

Mr. Mayhew: I am very worried about how the Unionists would react in the light of the Guardian article to seeing this sentence at the beginning of the paragraph.

885(32)

30

Mr. Ancram: In the context of my discussions with the parties, this would represent a headwind rather than a following one.

Tánaiste: Very well then I agree.

The meeting then adjourned just before 6.00 pm.