

C O N F I D E N T I A L

FROM: D J R HILL
Political Development Team
8 October 1992

-9 OCT 1992 | SQ 143/10
AM 134/10

333/10 cc Mr Thomas
Mr Bell
Mr Alston
Mr Watkins
Mr Cooke
Mr D A Hill

*Check with Mr Hill
Pr. to cover or if
covered "wd. be*

*cc Mr Quinn
Talks. [Sensible]*

MR STEPHENS

IMPLEMENTING ANY AGREEMENT - ENDORSEMENT

8.10

I have seen Stuart Lackie's note of the clearly very interesting VCR discussion of 28 September. I see you are charged with further consideration of the issue of endorsement.

2. This remains a very open subject on which there has not been much debate since the very end of the 1991 Talks. (I commend the relevant records to you as an excellent source for the arguments on both sides and as evidence that both sides saw the other's point of view and agreed to reflect further on it - with no apparent result so far.)

3. The SDLP remains firmly attached to the double referendum proposal. The DUP remains very sensitive to any suggestion that the people of the Republic should be invited to pronounce on the merits or demerits of any agreement to emerge from Strand I. Concerns have been expressed in various quarters about the problems which would arise if the people of the Republic rejected a settlement which was widely supported in Northern Ireland or, conversely, supported a settlement which was opposed by the minority community in Northern Ireland. The UUP last year seemed to acknowledge the force of the case for a "double referendum" and to feel that a way could be found to invite the people of the Republic to vote in a referendum on Articles 2 and 3 "in the light of" information about an overall settlement, perhaps even on the same day as the people of Northern Ireland were invited to endorse any Strand I proposals (which would also be set within the context of an overall agreement). However, there is far from unanimity on this matter, which remains a major issue for the Talks. In short, I would advise you not to make too many assumptions about what will be acceptable to whom.

S11?

signed DAVID HILL

D J R HILL
Political Development Team

C O N F I D E N T I A L

T/914/DW

C O N F I D E N T I A L

-9 OCT 1992 AM 144/10
SQ 147/10

UNDER/ 383/10
SEC

-8 OCT 1992

CENT SEC

FROM: D A HILL
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DIVISION
8 OCTOBER 1992
(X 6495 OAB)

CC Mr Thomas - B
Mr Bell - B
Mr Alston - B
Mr Watkins - B
Mr Cooke - B
Mr Stephens - B

MR D J R HILL - B

IMPLEMENTING ANY AGREEMENTS - ENDORSEMENT

I have seen a copy of your note of 8 October, and do not disagree with what you say. But I must stress that, until the Maastricht treaty is ratified and the heat goes out of the question of a referendum on Maastricht, I very much doubt that the Secretary of State's colleagues would agree to any referendum on constitutional arrangements in Northern Ireland. The parallel between any new arrangements in Northern Ireland and Maastricht is sufficiently strong for a Northern Ireland referendum to be seen as strengthening the case for a Maastricht referendum. For the meantime I feel we would have to advise Ministers that they should not encourage the parties to believe that a referendum on this issue will be automatically forthcoming.

signed

D A HILL
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DIVISION
8 OCTOBER 1992

*Dr Hill
Advise
draft for
pl. workshop
to draft*

*lyce PS/m fill
Advise pl. I think ESC
may be over-reaching. we
constantly make distinctions
between UK + GB policies, e.g.
Scottish devolution; + a
distinction cd be credibly
justified here. Timing cd.
also be important.*

C O N F I D E N T I A L

RN/ESL/13297

*ASD
8.10*