

**DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF OPENING PLENARY SESSION -
MONDAY 4 NOVEMBER 1996 (15.10)**

Those present:

Independent Chairmen	Government Teams	Parties
Senator Mitchell	British Government	Alliance Party
Mr Holkeri	Irish Government	Labour
General de Chastelain		Northern Ireland Women's Coalition
		Progressive Unionist Party
		Social Democratic and Labour Party
		Ulster Democratic Party
		Ulster Democratic Unionist Party
		United Kingdom Unionist Party
		Ulster Unionist Party

1. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 15.10. He said that the outset of the meeting earlier in the day he had suggested for the consideration of the parties a process of dealing with item 2(a) on the agenda which would accommodate their suggestions made in the previous week's discussions. Accordingly, for the day's business he now proposed that the meeting deal with clarification of positions and that the delegations could ask questions orally or in writing and replies could be provided in similar formats or positions could be reserved. Parties would also be free to comment as they wanted during this clarification phase to obtain clearer understandings of presentations which had been made. The proceedings on the following Tuesday/Wednesday would be devoted to an open discussion.

2. Labour said that on the Wednesday session in the previous week, the British Government concurred with a proposal by the DUP that it would be sensible to have an opportunity for delegates to probe and clarify each presentation. Labour said it would like to proceed on that basis as it had been agreed. The Chairman concurred and said his proposal was based on that approach.

3. The DUP said that it also understood that was the position. However, the party felt that responding by way of written replies was a weakening of the position as it denied the opportunity for cross examination. The oral presentation of views on decommissioning had been done, written submissions had been made by nearly all of the parties and the meeting was now at the stage of clarification and discussion. The next stage should be a determination by a vote on the applicable principles and methods of decommissioning. These proposals, the party said, were in keeping with the agreed agenda. The UKUP said that proposals just outlined by the DUP were a joint proposal between the two parties which seemed to meet the mood of meeting the previous week. The UKUP said it apologised for not being in a position to submit its written presentation on decommissioning. Nevertheless, its preliminary views in the matter had been made and were on record in the minutes. The party's full written presentation should be available for circulation the following day (pm). That would then complete item 2 as referred to in the joint paper dealing with the matter of written submission and comments on proposals on applicable proposals for decommissioning. The party would then be able to take questions on its position on the following Wednesday allowing the delegations an opportunity to consider the UKUP material overnight on Tuesday. That would complete the third element in the joint proposal.

4. The UKUP said that the fourth element in the joint proposal, namely, a determination by vote of each participant's proposals on the applicable principles and methods of decommissioning, reflected the necessity of arriving at a decision in the matter. This was because it affected the whole issue of the entry into the negotiations of any party which fronted or had influence over bodies with weapons and explosives. The UKUP said that there could be no progression to that stage of the process until the matter of decommissioning was determined. Paragraphs 34/35 of the

Mitchell report were also relevant in this regard, because they provided that decommissioning during the course of the negotiations was a fair and reasonable compromise between the opposing views on the entry question. The UKUP said that the SDLP have endorsed those paragraphs, but the reasoning behind the suggested compromise was flawed. Its basic premise was that each party was beginning from an equidistant point and that the compromise in the Report represented the middle position between the two opposing views. But parties who wanted to see decommissioning prior to the start of negotiations were in the position of democrats. Those who wanted to achieve political objectives by violence were not and were beginning from the totally anti-democratic position of using violence for political purposes regardless of the principles of democracy. The UKUP said it would be advancing the reasons why paragraphs 34/35 which were central to the position adopted by some parties are flawed and it would clarify its view of the situation in its written submission.

5. The Chairman summarised the four main points in the joint DUP/UKUP paper and enquired at that stage whether the proposals were available in writing for circulation to the other delegations. He said the fourth point in particular relating to determination by a vote seemed to be new. The UKUP said that the DUP had indicated that the proposal was in keeping with the agreed agenda and was aimed at arriving a decision following the discussions. The Chairman said that there were many ways of arriving at an agreement and it might be preferable to hold off the discussion until the joint document was available for the parties to consider it.

6. Labour said that it was, perhaps, regrettable that the previous minutes were not yet approved, the decision having been deferred for the following day. They would show that in relation to the question of probing and clarification, the meeting last week had decided that the Business Committee could have a role in

determining the way forward in the matter. The feeling was that three days, or more, if needed, were to be devoted to dealing with the initial discussions and then the Business Committee might take up the question of structuring further progress. The Chairman agreed and said that the UKUP had suggested the previous Wednesday that the discussion phase could be completed this week, though that was a target not a limitation, and the period could go on for longer, if required. At that time it was suggested by the UKUP that it might be appropriate to consider a meeting of the Business Committee and the Chairman agreed that he undertook to raise that matter at the appropriate point. The Chairman then proposed (15.27) to have a brief break (not an adjournment) to allow for copying and circulation of the joint DUP/UKUP paper. The meeting resumed at 15.38.

7. The Chairman asked whether anyone wished to comment on the joint paper, which proposed a structure for the debate. The SDLP said that the proposal was an amendment to the way of proceeding which was agreed on the previous Wednesday. There was a certain amount of overlap, but a new item had been added which required a vote on proposals made by each delegation on respect of the principles and methods of decommissioning. The party favoured proceeding in the manner proposed by the Chairman earlier.

8. The Chairman said that, in fairness, the meeting had not agreed in as much detail as that presented in the joint paper. It did include various concepts which had been raised by the DUP and the UKUP. But it was presented in furtherance of the discussion and the previous discussion did not preclude such a proposal. His requests for comments on the paper should be considered in that context.

9. Alliance said that the proposals seemed to it to be an amendment to what had been agreed after three months of discussion

and it had difficulty with the proposal on that basis. Item 2(a) of the agreed agenda is "discussion of proposals" and it had been agreed to proceed into open discussion of those proposals this week. It had also been agreed that written submission could be made by lunch-time on the previous Friday and the late start to the plenary session was to facilitate such a discussion. Labour said it was keen to get into a practical discussion on decommissioning and it did not wish to open up the whole issue of the agenda all over again.

10. The Chairman said that the only new element introduced was the provision for a vote by the parties on the proposals, in other words the specific mechanism by which a determination on the issues was to be made. The first three items were not too different from what had been agreed the previous week and it seemed to be understood that a determination would have to be made in any event.

11. The UKUP, in response to the SDLP point, said that it had no objection or difficulty with the proposals. They were in the nature of a route map. The party was perfectly willing to devote the week's discussions to item 3. As far as the position of Labour in the matter, the UKUP said it was prepared to accept the Chairman's point that the first three proposals were the necessary outworkings to get into a position to make a determination. The UKUP said it would be happy if the matter could be agreed by consensus, but in all probability it would go to a vote. It wasn't desirable to have weeks of oral presentations and submissions on their own without coming to a conclusion or determination on the issues. That was the thinking behind paragraph 4 in the joint paper. The UKUP said that Alliance seemed to envisage a talking shop to duck out of decisions on the principles to be agreed. The Chairman said that his reading of the agenda before the meeting was that as agreed the previous week. The joint DUP/UKUP paper contemplated paragraphs (a), (b)

and (c) of item 2 of that agenda. It also contemplated an agreement or determination being reached under paragraphs (b) and (c).

12. Alliance requested and obtained clarification that the meeting was presently dealing with item 3 of the joint paper - discussing proposals, etc. The party then asked where did the proposed item 4 on voting differ from paragraph 2(c) on the agreed agenda. The UKUP said that it always understood that the agreed agenda implied that there had to be agreements reached notably in relation to paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) and that those agreements would come first on the general principles, before any subsequent agreement to work constructively to implement them. Item 4 on the joint paper referred to item 2(a) of the agenda. As to item 2(c) of the agenda, the mechanisms could cover a range of issues from modalities to the procedural mechanisms required within a committee, if such a committee was a product of the discussions. The UKUP said that if there was not actually going to be an agreement on how decommissioning was to be implemented, the meeting was only a talking shop.

13. The DUP said that the whole picture was now emerging. The party had been assured that a determination would be arrived at. It raised the question as a specific matter the previous week and stressed that there should be specific proposals leading to a determination. There were differences between the basic papers which had been presented and decisions had to be taken. The DUP said that the two Governments maintained that agreement on proposals would end the discussion on decommissioning without a determination. What was the point in examining the position of delegations in the matter without making a determination. The requirement to "address" decommissioning was colossal cover up, the party said. According to the DUP, the British Government was questioned closely in the matter in the Commons but succeeded in not providing any answers. It seemed that Alliance also was not

willing to go on to the decision taking phase. The two Governments, the DUP said, have the same poisoned chalice - there would be no addressing of decommissioning if that meant determining the matter. With regard to agenda item 2(b), the DUP wondered how people would know that it had to come to any agreement at all on this basis. It appeared that some people wished to leave out item 2(b) and proceed to 2(c), but the joint DUP/UKUP proposal meant sticking to the agenda and arriving at the agreements which are necessary.

14. The UUP said that there was no question of the agenda being changed. That was not what was happening. There was confusion over the word "methods" in paragraph 4 of the joint DUP/UKUP paper. It was being confused with agenda item 2(c). Perhaps the best way of getting an outcome, the party felt, was to build on the principles and work up from that. The objective was to get agreement with a commitment to implement it and then proceed to discuss the mechanisms necessary to move on. It was not enough just to have a debate, the party said. The debate, in fact, was like a Business Committee debate. The UUP said that the meeting should proceed as agreed in the previous week, take decisions on principles and build up from there with the objective of getting a definitive outcome.

15. The SDLP noted the impatience of the UKUP and the DUP to get on with decisions. A decision was made on 15 October, the party said, on the opening agenda and the means of implementing it. It was made by sufficient consensus in plenary discussion. The joint DUP/UKUP proposals ran counter to that decision. Agenda item 2(c) on mechanisms very obviously involved the testing of opinions and proposals on those mechanisms. That would happen inevitably. It was not acceptable to attempt to change the opening agenda. Decisions taken as recently as 15 October, the party said, should not be railroaded in such a way. The SDLP said that the agenda of 15 October should be adhered to and the meeting should proceed on

the basis of the Chairman's earlier proposals. The commitment should be made under item 2(b) to work constructively on decommissioning and then proceed to item 2(c). The party said it was bad to have a rerun of past tactics and, in the name of making a decision, the process of making it would be delayed.

16. The DUP referred to the comments by the Chairman that the first three items on the joint DUP/UKUP proposal were not outside the agreed agenda. The SDLP did not quote item 2(b) in full, the DUP said. It did not refer to "work constructively on decommissioning" but "work constructively to implement agreements on decommissioning". It was necessary to be able to determine something and the purpose of the joint paper was to keep the discussion to the agenda. The fourth item on the paper was only carrying the matter further forward. It was the case, the DUP said, that the two Governments did not want the parties to arrive at a determination on the issue.

17. The British Government said that the meeting was working in an atmosphere of competing suspicions. There was a need to consider how to complete agenda item 2(a). Item 1 as proposed by the DUP/UKUP had been completed. Item 2 was ongoing. So was item 3. With regard to item 4, all seemed to accept that before item 2(b) was reached an agreement had to be made on 2(a). The British Government agreed with the UUP on the need to build up common ground. It said that the joint proposal did not run counter to what was agreed in the discussions the previous week, but its terminology might need to be worked out. The British Government said it was presenting this benign view of the situation to allay suspicions.

18. The Chairman said that the one thing agreed was that the agenda of 15 October was controlling the proceedings. The only difficulty was whether the joint DUP/UKUP proposal was

inconsistent with that agenda. The UKUP said that the meeting had to determine whether the interpretations of the position put forward by the British Government, the UKUP, the UUP and the DUP on the first three points in the joint proposal were correct. The Chairman said that the mechanism in paragraph 4 of that proposal was new.

19. The UKUP said that that may well be the case but it was the only means of getting consensus if there was no agreement. The UKUP continued, saying that the two Governments had put forward their views on decommissioning based on paragraphs 34 and 35 of the International Body's Report. These, however, had not found favour with the UUP, DUP and UKUP. Even at this stage, said the UKUP, there were competing sets of proposals. Item 4 of the DUP/UKUP proposal sought to determine what the agreement was at 2(a) in the agenda before moving on to 2(b). The UKUP stated that some sort of means had to be adopted to resolve and agree what the principles of decommissioning were or alternatively fail to agree. Such a point had to be reached as it was not possible to go further down the agenda in the absence of that determination.

20. The UKUP said that with regard to the point made by the SDLP it was quite happy to sit for as long as possible and expand fully on its case in order to convince others of its merits or otherwise. There was no hurry on this but there was a requirement, in the UKUP's view, to examine all proposals, whatever time it took, and then go forward and reach a consensus. The UUP and DUP were also in agreement on this. In order, however, to overcome the remarks of other participants which appeared to show an unease over the wording of item 4, an alternative form of words could be proposed. A suggestion was read out by the UKUP at this point. The Chairman said that the party had used the word "principles of decommissioning" in its alternative formulation. Yet such principles were not mentioned in the agreed agenda. The UKUP said that at item 2(a) of the

agreed agenda, the process had to reach agreement - but agreement on what? The UKUP stated that "agreement" must imply that it was agreement on the principles that were required. The Chairman indicated that an alternative view was possible. The agenda referred to agreeing on the mechanisms, both in 2(c) and item 4. It was, however, at the end of the day, up to the participants as to what they thought was meant by these definitions.

21. The UKUP then looked at the agreed agenda document. It said item 2(a) did not mention either principles or mechanisms. Item 2(b) did not mention mechanisms, but if there was any logical sense to the agenda then agreement had to be inferred in 2(a). Item 2(c) did mention mechanisms, so it was referring to something other than principles, therefore it was open to interpretation that 2(a) and (b) could refer to principles. The UKUP also said that the issue of definitions was for the participants to decide upon by voting in due course. The Chairman stated that, as a broad principle, it was normally the writers of the document who were asked to provide an interpretation of definitions. The DUP recalled the events which led up to tabling of the agenda document. It was, in its view, a UUP/SDLP proposal - supported by the others listed.

22. In reply the SDLP said that when the agenda document was finally agreed, this had happened as a result of three months work. It had been proposed by seven parties present. The SDLP said it now appeared that the joint DUP/UKUP proposal was challenging the nature of the original agreed agenda and this situation was unacceptable to the party. Alliance stated that there appeared to be a new element being introduced by the DUP and UKUP on principles, not just mechanisms. It said that it looked as if a more staggered process was being proposed with this suggestion although it was unclear as to how much more complicated this made the issue. Alliance thought, however, that there were now two levels of agreement being introduced.

23. The UKUP asked whether Alliance, by its comments, was seriously saying that parties could commit themselves to making agreements in principle without knowing the nature of those agreements? Alliance indicated that mechanisms were not agreed on the agenda until item 2(c) - but the UKUP seemed to be saying that agreement in principle on these was required before 2(c). The UUP said that when 2(a) had been debated previously it had been agreed that proposals other than those contained in the International Body's report could be introduced at this point. The party said it believed the process was in danger of getting into a flap over something which was relatively straight forward. The UUP said this was a sensitive issue. It had suggested that the debate commence with the building up of principles in terms of finding some common ground between the participants. This had been put forward as a helpful proposal for the party wished to see whether a consensus was possible. Now people were getting a little overheated, but there was no change or threat to the agreed agenda from the UUP. The key question was whether the participants could reach agreement as to the best proposals necessary to take the decommissioning issue forward. The UUP said that divergent views only created difficulties, yet it believed there was some common ground. Perhaps it was a case of allowing questions and answers which might develop or widen this commonality. The UUP said, however, that it was unsure as to how one got agreement from the process but that was what was required. The UUP was simply suggesting a way of building agreement. If this method wasn't acceptable to the participants then the party would listen to other proposals.

24. The SDLP asked the UUP what was the difference between principles and the application of principles. What was, in the UUP's view, a principle? The UUP said that it had given a clear example that morning, regarding the conditions of entry of Sinn Fein into the negotiations. It was an issue which the SDLP were

content with but the UUP wasn't. The SDLP said that this was surely a political decision and not a principle. In this sense was there one principle which was not contained in the International Body's report which the UUP could highlight? The UUP said if the word principle caused problems, then another word could be used. Whatever words one wished to use, however, the issue of conditions of entry for Sinn Fein into the process was one such topic or principle which required to be decided upon at this point in the business. The SDLP said it understood the type of decision being referred to but this debate was focusing on principles. These had been identified in the Mitchell Report so what other principles was the UUP referring to? The UUP said it seemed the discussion was now moving on to item 2 on the DUP/UKUP proposal. If so, this was fine but it was wrong for the SDLP to say that the Mitchell Principles were the only ones to be considered. The process at this point needed an agreed methodology to handle such issues, as had been highlighted by the UKUP. If such issues couldn't be called principles, then they had to be called something else. The SDLP said in reply that the process had determined a methodology for the handling of the decommissioning issue on 15 October and that methodology was the agreed agenda which did not include principles.

25. The UUP said it had no difficulty with the agenda and wasn't attempting to amend it in any way. The Chairman indicated that he now had five speakers on his list. He suggested that in terms of item 2(a), item 3 of the DUP/UKUP proposal seemed to be a more detailed way of handling this. He therefore asked the participants whether there was any disagreement to using the DUP/UKUP's item 3 to get the process started. The Chairman commented that the day had so far been spent discussing how the process should get discussions going on the decommissioning issue. He therefore wondered whether agreement could be given to starting in this way. The UUP said it had no difficulty with the Chairman's suggestion. The difficulty for the party was the

difference between the abstract and the practicality of principles. For example, the party had no difficulty with the six Mitchell Principles, but how were these best applied? Also paragraphs 25 and 34 of the Mitchell report gave rise to difficulties for the party.

26. The UUP said that as regards the DUP/UKUP proposal, it had pointed to the fact that the process must have intended to agree something if one looked at the 15 October agenda. It therefore seemed logical that once item 3 of the DUP/UKUP proposal had been completed it would be necessary to try and determine agreed elements relating to the principles of decommissioning which derived from the stated positions of each party. Such a position, having been reached, would then take the process through item 2(b) of the agreed agenda and on to 2(c) which would focus on the mechanisms and modalities, etc. That would then complete an overall examination of decommissioning at that stage.

27. The SDLP said it had the feeling that the more the discussion went on, the more it seemed as if there was an amendment being produced against the 15 October agenda, despite the apparent overlap of item 2(a) and item 3 of the DUP/UKUP proposal. The SDLP said that item 4 on the DUP/UKUP proposal raised a particular new issue. In relation to item 2(b), the SDLP recalled an earlier Alliance point about making agreements to principles which had yet to be reached. The SDLP said that nothing should be regarded as peculiar about this. The process had already evidenced good faith commitments. The party said that the present debate needed to be advanced along the lines of the Chairman's earlier proposals, which conformed to items 1-3 of the DUP/UKUP proposal - themselves an elaboration of item 2(a) on the agreed agenda. The SDLP said that, in its view, it was not a good idea to have proposals tabled which only opened up previous agreements reached.

28. The DUP said that some parties had a different interpretation of the word "agreement". Item 2(b) could not be logical if implementation was to be considered at this point without any agreement being reached at item 2(a). In terms of reaching agreement at this point, and referring to the DUP/UKUP proposal, the DUP asked what other way was there for agreement to be determined other than by voting? The Chairman said that, to the best of his knowledge, there had not been, to date, a separate vote on an individual party's proposal. Each time a vote had been taken, it was always concerned with a position which involved more than one party. This aspect, rather than the actual concept of deciding by voting, was the new angle which the DUP/UKUP proposal appeared to be introducing. The DUP in reply stated that votes had been taken on proposals during the rules of procedure and on the agenda which had been put forward by individual parties.

29. The UKUP asked whether the DUP would go along with the notion that the SDLP's interpretation that para 20(a) of the International Body's report was an agreement entered into unanimously as opposed to a majority vote, thereby representing a distinction between the two positions articulated earlier. The DUP acknowledged this and continued, stating that it would not accept that paramilitaries get together to decide whether they will disarm. The party needed to know how the process was going to come to item 2(b). It was not possible, in its view, to reach item 2(c) as quickly as that suggested by the SDLP. Agreement was required before 2(b). It was, therefore, in the DUP's view, useless to move on to 2(c) unless there was a determination. Alliance stated that at some point the issue of decommissioning had to be resolved in item 2(c). Item 2(b) referred to implementing agreements on decommissioning, not principles. The Mitchell Principles were concerned with democracy and non-violence, not principles of decommissioning - a point which the UUP seemed to be confused over. If one looked at the principles of decommissioning then one had to look at paragraphs 36-50 of the

International Body's report dealing with the modalities. Alliance had no problem with this position. It didn't, however, regard the issue of Sinn Fein entering the negotiations as part of the decommissioning debate. Conditions of entry was a separate item and inclusion of it at this stage could endanger the debate on decommissioning.

30. The UUP said that there was even more confusion likely when parties were told that the Mitchell Principles were about democracy and non-violence and had nothing to do with disarmament and then actually read the contents of principles (b) and (c). The Chairman said that, following the UKUP's next contribution, he would suggest a break for around 45 minutes. The UKUP said that, to date, some proposals aired had been simply bizarre. How could one implement mechanisms without agreeing principles? This was a ludicrous position. The party said that whatever the terminology used, the process had to focus on how decommissioning would actually be effected. Some participants had used a variety of words such as principles, fourth strand, committees, terms and conditions, etc. The UKUP said that all of these terms covered the issue of effecting decommissioning. When the UKUP talked about principles it was talking about the basic terms and conditions which must be applied to those entering the negotiations. The UKUP said that Alliance's earlier comments on the relationship between decommissioning and entry conditions were nonsense. The linkage was clear. The process had to impose more stringent conditions for Sinn Fein's entry into the negotiations if a new cease-fire was not permanent, as against the conditions required if a new cease-fire was permanent. The UKUP said that the Alliance position indicated a superficial approach to a complex issue. In the UKUP's view, the whole process had to decide whether it was simply a complete fudge for a peace conference which the UKUP believes it is, or whether it actually was a meeting of democrats in Northern Ireland.

31. The UUP said that, despite earlier remarks, Alliance had used the word "principles" in Section 5 of its document on decommissioning, entitled "Principles of decommissioning". The UKUP returned to Alliance's remarks regarding the modalities of decommissioning contained in paragraphs 36-50 of the International Body's report. The UKUP said that it was undoubtedly the position that Sinn Fein would be happy to discuss these from now until doomsday, so long as there were no principles affecting the basis of its entry into the negotiations. Alliance stated that the task of the talks process was to agree on the modalities for decommissioning. The UKUP said that this still required the issue of entry conditions for Sinn Fein to be addressed. If this was addressed Sinn Fein couldn't then shape the outcome of the discussion of this debate if appropriate procedures had been agreed democratically. The DUP asked whether there was any point in getting into a discussion such as this if one didn't know whether there would be a determination at the end of it. The DUP said it wasn't trying to change the agenda, it simply required to know whether a determination would be arrived at or not.

32. The Chairman, in referring to the DUP/UKUP proposal, said that he did not believe that items 1-3 represented new material. The fourth item did. The Chairman, referring to the DUP's previous point, stated that participants had debated the rules of procedure for eight weeks on the implicit assumption that everyone sought agreement and agreement was reached. The Chairman stated that four hours had been devoted to discussing how to get the discussion going. Perhaps now that discussion could begin in the certain knowledge that the objective is to reach agreement. To continue in the current mode would only delay the decisions that any discussion might produce. The Chairman said that it was important to get back to the discussions and ascertain what common ground there might be. The DUP asked that if there was going to be such a discussion without a consensus, would there then be a determination? If item 4 on the DUP/UKUP proposal was not

acceptable to the participants then so be it, but if there was not going to be a consensus, then there was no point in going on. If such a consensus was available and could be reached, then this was okay.

33. The Chairman stated that a discussion leading to a decision had to be consistent with previous business. A discussion should be opened up and a consensus reached, then if a consensus wasn't reached, a determination would have to be made. The Chairman stated that a conclusion to the debate should be reached and he wished to achieve this. The DUP said that its proposal was also supported by the UUP and the British Government. The UKUP then asked how should the discussion start. Some structure was required before it commenced. Did the main players commence or perhaps some other party would start the debate? The Chairman said it appeared there were two options. One was to throw the debate open and allow each party to expand on its position or to time limit each party's additional comments and/or questions to others. Either way must provide a clear opportunity for each participant to decide to involve itself in the debate or not. The PUP said that it thought the DUP/UKUP had suggested that some form of cross-examination should take place. Was there therefore a need for participants to make further presentations? The PUP also reinforced the point, in referring to some earlier remarks, that it had already made a lengthy contribution on the decommissioning issue and it was therefore wrong to say that it had said nothing on the matter. The Chairman stated that both the DUP and UKUP had specifically raised a desire to question other participants on their proposals and there seemed no reason why this couldn't be accommodated. The British Government clarified an earlier DUP remark by saying that it only supported items 1-3 of the DUP/UKUP proposal. The Chairman indicated, at this point, that he would adjourn the meeting for 45 minutes. This was done at 17.24.

Independent Chairmen Notetakers
14 November 1996

OIC/PS44