

FR.

PAB/4756/JS

PS/Secretary of State (L) M

cc - PS/S of S (B)
PS/PUS (B&L) M
PS/Sir Ewart Bell ✓
Mr Brennan M
Mr Bourn
Mr Merifield
Mr Angel M
Mr Abbott M
Mr Boys Smith M
Mr Edis
Mr Reeve
Mr Carvill

WJ
22/11
O Sir Ewart
B P

UUP STATEMENT

We now have the full text of this afternoon's UUP statement which reads as follows:-

The Ulster Unionist Assembly Party believes that the sectarian murders at Mountain Lodge Pentecostal Church tragically underline the failures of those responsible for political and security policy in Northern Ireland.

The Northern Ireland Assembly now constitutes nothing more than a formal device for ritual protest without any effective power to protect those it represents and for whom it should be responsible.

The Assembly Party hereby resolves to withdraw from further participation in the Northern Ireland Assembly until such time as the Government discharges its basic security obligations to her citizens in Northern Ireland, and grants to their elected representatives such powers and responsibilities as are essential for the restoration of public confidence in democratic institutions.

In the meantime we shall as individuals and as a Party continue to discharge our duties and responsibilities to those whom we represent.

The leadership will initiate immediate negotiations with Her Majesty's Government and such other interested parties for the purpose of securing these necessary and essential changes.

S G Hewitt
S G Hewitt
PAB

21 November 1983



E.P.

CONFIDENTIAL

401/11

PS/S of S (B&L) M

*① Sir Ewart
② Psc*



cc PS/Mr Scott (B&L) M
PS/PUS (B&L) M
Sir Ewart Bell ✓
Mr Bourn.
Mr Brennan M
Mr Angel M
Mr Buxton
Mr Doyne Ditmas
Mr Gilliland
Mr Reeve

*WJ
22/11*

SHOOTINGS IN COUNTY ARMAGH

1. The text of the UUP statement is annexed. It supports withdrawal from the Assembly until the Government
 - (a) "discharges its basic security obligations to her citizens in Northern Ireland", and
 - (b) "grants to their elected representatives such powers and responsibilities as are essential for the restoration of public confidence in democratic institutions."

2. The first of these provisions will strike a chord of public awareness and there is likely to be growing support for demands for a higher security profile. It is not clear whether the second part of the resolution, more opportunist in tone, will attract the same degree of interest, nor whether it relates more to security than to both security and other matters.

3. The Speaker has decided that the Assembly should continue its work in the normal way (its quorum is 10 for the Assembly and 4 for Committees), but I understand that UUP Members are resigning from their Committee posts. This takes us back to the days of last January.

4. We need to see how the Official Unionists will develop their case. On the security side they have for some time been looking for a greater say in policy (eg to get more stop and search and follow-up etc), greater accountability of the Chief Constable (eg in matters such as over-time and deployment), and more finance for security measures. If the security situation quietens down, it may be that a higher level of security force operations and announcements of 1984-85 public expenditure may influence UUP views.

E.R.

If so, and they are wanting to get off that particular hook, they may be satisfied with a special meeting of a ^{re-convened} Security Committee with the Secretary of State, particularly if the Secretary of State felt able to have the Chief Constable and an Army representative sitting with him.

5. On the other hand it is more difficult to see how the UUP could escape the logic of their second demand. Here, given the Government's views that public confidence in democratic institutions will only be complete if there is widespread community support, it is difficult to see how there could be any meeting of minds.

6. PAB will be making enquiries of Parties and other contacts to see if we can tease out something more about the Official Unionist position. We gather that at least 4 Members opposed the resolution. In the meantime the urgent need is to take as much as possible out of the immediate anger. The Secretary of State has already used the opportunity of his being in London to see Dr Paisley and I think it would be helpful if he offered to see Mr Molyneaux, along with the border MPs Mr Nicholson and Mr Maginnis, both of whom are seeking meetings. This meeting might be offered to discuss the immediate issues arising, rather than the UUP's motion as such, because the Secretary of State was not able to have a word ^{this afternoon} at the House. If Mr Molyneaux is not available, or does not wish to be accompanied, Mr Nicholson's constituency interest would justify a separate meeting. (Mr Maginnis would have a "border" interest, but as far as can be judged he would no longer be Chairman of the Security Committee following the UUP resolution. However time could be saved if Mr Molyneaux was able to agree to include the other MPs who have asked for a meeting.) The Secretary of State could use the meeting as an opportunity to tell them that he had seen the Chief Constable and GOC (a key step in public relations apart from its other values), reassure the MPs of steps being taken by the security forces, and listen to their views.

E.R.

7. At any early meeting with Mr Molyneaux the Secretary of State would probably not wish to be drawn into detailed discussion on the UUP resolution. At least in public it would not seem wise to challenge the UUP too specifically, for fear of providing them with "tests" which they would then have to pass before they could reconsider their position about a return to the Assembly. An expression of disappointment at their precipitate move would be timely!

AJP.

A J MERIFIELD
21 November 1983