

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF OPENING PLENARY SESSION -  
WEDNESDAY 23 JULY 1997 (14.08)

Those present:

INDEPENDENT CHAIRMEN	GOVERNMENT TEAMS	PARTIES
Senator Mitchell	British Government	Alliance
Mr Holkeri	Irish Government	Labour
General de Chastelain		Northern Ireland Women's Coalition
		Progressive Unionist Party
		Social Democratic & Labour Party
		Ulster Democratic Party
		Ulster Democratic Unionist Party
		United Kingdom Unionist Party
		Ulster Unionist Party

1. The Chairman convened the meeting at 14.08. He reminded participants that on 8 July they had agreed a timetable which included voting today on proposals and amendments previously tabled on decommissioning. The Chairman added that the timetable had also included provisions which dictated the order of voting; namely the parties proposals (and any amendments to these) first, then amendments to the Governments proposal and lastly the Governments' proposal as amended, as amended if amended or in its original form.

2. The Chairman said he wished to suggest for consideration and approval the following procedures. First of all the plenary would vote on the DUP proposals which comprised 17 paragraphs. The Chairman said that the DUP had requested that its proposals be voted on on a paragraph by paragraph basis. The Chairman then suggested that each of the four proponents who had tabled proposals should be given the opportunity to decide to have these voted on either section by section (paragraph by paragraph) or en bloc. The Chairman said voting might be handled in the following manner: The 17 DUP proposals to be voted on a paragraph by paragraph basis; the six UKUP proposals to be voted on a paragraph by paragraph basis; and then the five UUP proposals which would also be the subject of separate voting. Following completion of this the

Chairman said that the plenary would next take those amendments to the Governments' proposals. These comprised one proposal from the DUP and a total of seven selected by the UUP from a longer list it previously submitted. Following these the plenary would then vote on the Governments proposal.

3. The Chairman said that participants would recall that when the process voted on the rules of procedure it had been agreed that a procedure would take effect whereby a proponent could speak for two minutes on the proposal or amendment and a further two minutes would then be available to participants who wished to oppose the measure. The Chairman proposed that the plenary follow the same procedure today. If the proponent and opponent time was taken up for every measure, then the Chairman said that the meeting might take quite a period to resolve all the points. On the other hand, as had happened during the discussions and votes on the rules, not all the time might be required once the early positions had been articulated. The Chairman asked for comments on his procedural suggestions.

4. The UDP said it was content with the procedures outlined by the Chairman. The party added, however, that it wished to include a motion to be voted on after the amendments to the Governments' proposal had been determined but before the vote was taken on the Governments' proposal. The UDP read out the text of its motion - "Noting that agreement is unlikely, we propose that the scheduled vote on the document tabled by the British and Irish Governments be postponed until a later date, to be determined by the participants, in order that a greater level of consensus can be pursued".

5. The Chairman asked whether there was any objection to the UDP motion being included as proposed. No objection were raised. The Chairman said that the time allocated to support and speak against the proposal would be the same as the earlier voting pattern ie two minutes for each side.

6. The UKUP asked the Chairman whether a specific time for a vote could be included in the UDP motion. The Chairman asked the UKUP to state the question again. The party obliged and the UDP provided clarification of what it meant by "postponed until a later date, to be determined by the participants". The Chairman asked whether it was possible for the UDP to copy and distribute its motion immediately so that all could study it before a vote was taken later.

7. The DUP sought confirmation of the time allocated to proponents and opponents of the UDP motion. The Chairman provided this, quoting the two minutes for each side arrangement. The Chairman said that if there were no objections to the proposed voting procedures then these were approved unanimously. Hearing no objections the Chairman said he wished to proceed to the first DUP proposal. The Chairman asked whether the DUP wished to offer comment in support of its proposal. The DUP declined. The Chairman then asked whether anyone wished to speak against the proposal.

8. The British Government said it wished to make a few general comments. It said that it found difficulties in supporting proposals other than its own as many, if not all, of the intentions covered by them were already reflected in the joint Government paper. Clarification had also been given on this document and the British Government said it remained of the view that its contents provided the best basis on which to resolve the issue of decommissioning. There were no further comments against the first DUP proposal. The Chairman asked for a vote to be taken on this. Abstaining were the British Government, Irish Government, Alliance, Labour, PUP and UDP. Voting against were NIWC and SDLP. Voting for were DUP, UKUP and UUP. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

9. The second DUP proposal was voted on. Abstaining were the British Government, Irish Government, Alliance, Labour, NIWC, PUP

and UDP. The SDLP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

10. The third DUP proposal was voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

11. The fourth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

12. The fifth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

13. The sixth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

14. The seventh DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

15. The eighth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC,

PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

16. The ninth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

17. The tenth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

18. The eleventh DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

19. The twelfth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

20. The thirteenth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

21. The fourteenth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining were the British Government, Irish Government, Alliance, Labour,

NIWC, PUP and UDP. The SDLP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

22. The fifteenth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

23. The sixteenth DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

24. The final DUP proposal was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

25. The Chairman stated that the next set of proposals to be voted on were those of the UKUP, composing six lettered paragraphs. The party had indicated its wish to have these voted on an individual basis. With no one wishing to speak in support or against the proposals, the Chairman said he wished to move to a vote on UKUP proposal (a). Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

26. The UKUP proposal (b) was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for

the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

27. The UKUP proposal (c) was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

28. The UKUP proposal (d) was then voted on. Abstaining were Alliance and NIWC. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

29. The UKUP proposal (e) was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

30. The UKUP proposal (f) was then voted on. Abstaining were Alliance and NIWC. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

31. The Chairman stated that the next set of proposals to be voted on were those of the UUP, comprising five separate statements neither numbered or lettered. The Chairman asked the UUP whether it wished to use its two minutes in commenting on the proposals. The UUP said that it would take a short time to make a few points on all five proposals. On the first proposal the UUP said that it had been put in the form of an individual statement since the party hoped that all around the table would find common ground with its

contents. The UUP said that it feared for the process if this proposal wasn't carried.

32. The UUP said its second proposal was entirely consistent with assurances previously given by both Governments and therefore believed it could gain wide support. A similar view existed in relation to the UUP's third proposal. The party said it thought everybody could support this. The UUP said that, in relation to its fourth proposal, this basically set out the compromise proposal established in the Report of the International Body but which now appeared to have been abandoned in the Governments' proposal. The party said that the fifth proposal was self explanatory as it prevented political concessions being extracted in return for arms being handed in.

33. The Chairman asked whether any participant wished to speak in opposition. Alliance said it wished to comment briefly. The party said the UUP's approach was misguided in its delivery. In looking at the first proposal, how could one judge, other than in retrospect, whether an IRA cease-fire was universal, complete and permanent? The second proposal was ill advised since the mechanism it was referring to could be blocked by others who wished to put back decommissioning indefinitely. As to the other proposals, Alliance said it didn't believe that these added anything to the original text of the Governments' proposals. With regard to the fifth proposal, Alliance stated its belief that it was important for there to be a Liaison sub committee on decommissioning rather than have a separate process of decommissioning independent of the discussions in the three strands. Alliance said that in an overall sense, the UUP proposals were likely to obstruct decommissioning and regretfully it could not support them even though the party did have some sympathy for the sentiment lying behind them.

34. Following a request from the DUP that the Chairman identify each UUP proposal, the Chairman asked that a vote be taken on the first UUP proposal. "Plenary believes .....". Abstaining were



Alliance and NIWC. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour and the SDLP voted against. The PUP, UDP, DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

35. The Chairman moved on to the second UUP proposal - "All necessary steps". The UKUP asked the Chairman whether the UUP proposal could be amended. The Chairman said he believed this was probably out of order. A schedule for business had been agreed by all the participants on 8 July. Changing such a schedule would be up to the participants. The Chairman asked the UKUP for its proposed amendment. The UKUP said it wished to alter the timing element in the proposal "from 15 September 1997" to "enable disarmament to be brought forward immediately". The Chairman again stated that he believed that taking such an amendment now would have to be agreed by all participants.

36. The DUP said a better approach might be to wait and see whether the original UUP proposal stood or fell. The UKUP agreed with this. The NIWC and Alliance took the view that such an amendment wasn't possible in the middle of a previously agreed voting schedule and both objected to this. The Chairman reminded participants that there was, currently, nothing before them since the UKUP amendment would only come in to play if the UUP proposal was accepted. The UKUP said it only wished to have guidance from the Chair as to whether tabling an amendment to the UUP proposal was technically possible. The Chairman restated his view that he had no objection to the UKUP suggestion provided none of the other participants objected to it. The SDLP asked the Chairman whether he considered it wise to accept the principle that amendments could be proposed to an issue which was previously carried. The Chairman reminded participants that the UKUP had agreed to defer offering an amendment until the position of the UUP proposal was clear. Then the views of the participants would be sought. The SDLP again referred to the previously agreed timetable for the scheduling of voting and tabling of amendments and asked about the precedent

being set by the DUP's suggestion of waiting to see if the UUP proposal was carried before taking an amendment on it at that stage.

37. The Chairman again reminded participants that nothing was before them which required a determination. The UKUP was, he said, content to wait. The Chairman restated his original position on the question of a UKUP amendment in that he believed this to be out of order. The SDLP, seeking guidance from the Chair, asked whether taking such an amendment would not be viewed as moving away from the agreed procedural timetable. The Chairman agreed that it would but if the entire group of participants decided to go with such a change then it would be their decision. The DUP said that the precedent of departing from the original schedule had already been set when the Chairman agreed to permit the UDP motion to be placed for determination in advance of the vote on the Governments' proposal. The Chairman said that everyone had agreed that the UDP motion could be included. Alliance said that surely there was a difference between the UDP motion, which was concerned with the timescale of the proceedings, as opposed to the potential UKUP amendment which focused on the substance of the document in question.

38. The Chairman said he wished to take a vote on the second UUP proposal. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP, UDP and UKUP voted against. The DUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

39. The third UUP proposal was then voted on - "Plenary understands .....". Abstaining were Alliance and NIWC. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

40. The fourth UUP proposal was then voted on - "Plenary expects .....". Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

41. The fifth UUP proposal was then voted on - "Plenary believes .....". Abstaining were Alliance and NIWC. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was lost.

42. The Chairman said he now wished to proceed to the amendments to the Governments document submitted by the DUP and UUP. There was one DUP amendment - number 18 on page five of the party's submission. The Chairman asked whether the DUP wished to comment in support of its amendment.

43. The DUP said that this amendment had been tabled to make the Governments' document more factually correct. At present the first sentence of paragraph two, page six of the Governments' paper referred to participants "collectively coming to acknowledge that the Report of the International Body offered the only realistic basis on which to proceed". The DUP said it had never consented to this view and therefore the Government's document was inaccurate. Following no response from the Governments, the DUP asked either Government when had this position been "collectively agreed"? The party said it had never been agreed and therefore the Government's document was dishonest as it contained a lie. The Chairman asked for any further comments. Alliance said it supported the overall document from both Governments. The party said it saw the purpose of paragraph two on page six as giving everyone the opportunity of assenting to the approach in the Report of the International Body.

The party said it regarded this as an important component of the document and would be insisting that it remained in the text.

44. The DUP again stated that it seemed incredible that the process could approve a document which was factually inaccurate. Was Alliance actually suggesting that this be done? Alliance replied saying that it wouldn't be possible for the DUP to know whether it was an accurate statement or not until after the voting was complete. The DUP said it wished to place on the record that it was being asked to approve something which was a lie. The party said that it had made clear, on a number of occasions, that it accepted the principles contained in the Report of the International Body, but not the report itself. The party said it still did not believe that such an untrue statement should be included in the Governments' document and then that document be voted on and approved. The Chairman indicated that the time for debate had gone. He now wished to proceed to a vote on the DUP amendment. The British Government, Irish Government, Alliance, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the amendment. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the amendment was lost.

45. Moving on, the Chairman said he now wished to take the UUP amendments. He commented that earlier in the day, the UUP had advised him that they wished to have a vote on only some of the amendments previously tabled. The Chairman asked the UUP whether it wished to comment in support of the amendments. The UUP said it was withdrawing 15 of its amendments. The party believed these to be self explanatory and was not going to go into further comments since it appeared from previous exchanges that the process was only going through the motions. The Chairman asked for any comments against the amendments. There were none.

46. The Chairman then stated that he wished to move to a vote on each UUP amendment. The first of these was (no 1) on the UUP submission. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government,

Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the amendment. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the amendment was lost.

47. The second UUP amendment (no 2) was then voted on. Alliance abstained. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the amendment. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the amendment was lost.

48. The third UUP amendment (no 7) was then voted on. Alliance and the DUP abstained. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP, UDP and UKUP voted against. The UUP voted for the amendment. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the amendment was lost.

49. The fourth UUP amendment (no 9) was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the amendment. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the amendment was lost.

50. Before the next vote was taken on UUP amendment no 12, the DUP said it wished to put forward the view that in the light of the UDP motion it could mean that, if supported, the ending of the Opening Plenary Session could occur after 15 September. The DUP said that if that motion was turned down, then it could support this UUP amendment. The party said it simply wished to explain its rationale should the UUP perhaps wish to consider withdrawing its amendment. The UUP said it understood the DUP point but wished its amendment to be voted on nevertheless.

51. The Chairman then called for a vote. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP, UDP, DUP and UKUP voted against. The UUP voted for the amendment.

The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the amendment was lost.

52. The sixth UUP amendment (no 16) was then voted on. Abstaining was Alliance. The British Government, Irish Government, Labour, NIWC, PUP, SDLP and UDP voted against. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted for the amendment. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the amendment was lost.

53. The seventh and final UUP amendment (no 20) was then voted on. Abstaining were the British Government, Irish Government, Alliance, Labour, NIWC, PUP, UDP, DUP and UKUP. The SDLP voted against. The UUP voted for the amendment. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the amendment was lost.

54. The Chairman then stated that he wished to move on to the UDP motion. The DUP inquired as to whether an amendment could be tabled to the motion. The Chairman asked the DUP whether it had a specific amendment to propose. The DUP said it had not. The Chairman said in view of this he would not rule in the abstract. The UKUP asked for an adjournment to enable it to consult with the DUP, the UUP and among its own members on the contents of the UDP motion. The Chairman agreed to this and suggested that the session be adjourned at 15.04 until 15.30.

55. On reconvening the session at 15.35, the Chairman asked the UDP to comment in support of its motion. The UDP said the contents were self explanatory and realised that others wished to offer comments in support of the motion. The PUP said it believed that if there was insufficient consensus on the Government's proposal then the subject of decommissioning would have to be revisited. The party said it believed a better idea would be to have a vote after the subject had been revisited. The party said it would wait and watch who wished to have a vote today and who wished to support a deferment.

56. The NIWC said it reluctantly supported the motion for deferment. The party said it recognised the UUP wish to engage in a more extensive consultation exercise. The NIWC said it had always been in favour of such an approach provided an open mind was used in the consultation process. The party said its own soundings of the grass roots seemed to suggest that both communities wished to see concrete work towards a peaceful society. The NIWC said there had never been a better position than now to achieve this. There were two cease-fires in operation and it revealed the recent thoughts of one of its office staff when that individual had considered the dire situation facing Northern Ireland in the period prior to the 12 July and contrasted this with the two week period after 12 July and the hope that was now apparent. The NIWC said that there was a sense of confusion, however, in the public mind with thoughts being given over to what deals had been done to reach this situation or what deals hadn't been done. The party said the process should support decommissioning in the manner described in the Governments document since it was likely to be pragmatically achieved during the substantive negotiations. The NIWC said that to isolate decommissioning from substantive negotiations was simply absurd. The key objection for everyone was to engage each other in an inclusive political process. The party said that the deferral period proposed in the UDP motion could be used to make some of these points honestly to all groups in society. The NIWC said it wished to emphasise that if decommissioning needed to be resolved by revisiting the issue then this was fine. The vital issue was that the process was a valuable one and it couldn't be replaced by those who were attempting in their statements to suggest that other formats should now be considered. The process was sound and should be allowed to continue since, in the NIWC's view, it had yet to be fully tested.

57. Alliance said that decommissioning had been discussed extensively in the process. For that reason and for the purposes of clarification the party believed that the participants needed to vote on the issue now. The participants had agreed a timetable for

the scheduling of business in mid July and the process had to stick with this. Otherwise the process would fall to pieces since no one would then be sure whether any other agreement reached could last for longer than a few days. Alliance said the key issue had to be to stick to the timetable. It was not a question of deciding on the content. It was a question of accepting the discipline of the timetable. In referring to the NIWC's comments about using a period of deferment constructively, the party said this sentiment was all very well but past experience in Northern Ireland showed that it was unlikely that anything would come of such consultation in the next few weeks. The timetable had to be complied with.

58. The DUP said the participants had previously agreed to a particular range of procedures. The party noted that there were a number of amendments tabled on the Governments' proposal and after these were determined and before the Governments' proposal was voted on, the UDP motion was to interrupt this business. The DUP said it didn't view the fact that the UDP motion was being taken after the amendments had been decided as a positive move since a better choice would be for the process to reach a decision on an unadulterated document.

59. The British Government said it was not supporting the UDP motion. It said that while it was right to recognise the spirit of building consensus in the process and time and time again this had been admirably demonstrated by the PUP, UDP and NIWC, it had the feeling that most participants wished to vote on the Governments' proposal now. The British Government said it didn't believe there would be sufficient consensus for the proposal. However a timetable had been agreed to and therefore it must be stuck with. The British Government said it would continue working and consulting with others to see if the process could continue in its present form. The British Government said it agreed with the NIWC on this point. The process should continue to see whether it could be fully tested for, as yet, this hadn't happened. The British Government said it recognised that the UDP motion was meant in a



positive and constructive manner but that it would not be supporting it.

60. The UKUP said it was opposing the UDP motion. The party said that, on many occasions, other participants had got at the unionist parties for attempting to stall the process. On this occasion the UKUP couldn't be accused of that. The requirement to determine the fate of the Governments' proposal was not just about a unionist requirement. It was a fundamental democratic right, which everyone should support, to insist on decommissioning before substantive negotiations commenced. The UKUP said it wished to issue a notice of caution to the British Government regarding the timetable. The party said that the British Government had already outlined a timetable to Sinn Féin/IRA regarding their entry into the talks process. The decision taken today on the Governments' proposals should not be lightly regarded. The party said that unionist people did not wish to see Sinn Féin at the talks, the latter having been given a place here, over their heads, by the British Government.

61. The UKUP continued, referring to the earlier SDLP remarks about not amending something which had been previously approved, and said that if that was what the SDLP and the British Government wanted to do this time, then it challenged them to proceed without the agreement of the unionist people. The UKUP said that the present British Government needed some reminding of other initiatives which they had attempted to introduce against the will of the unionist people of Northern Ireland with fairly unsuccessful results. The UKUP said that if there was any attempt to resurrect the governments' decommissioning document then it would be ready to lead the opposition.

62. The Chairman asked for a vote on the UDP motion. Abstaining were the UUP. The British Government, Irish Government, Alliance, Labour, SDLP, DUP and UKUP voted against. The NIWC, PUP and UDP

voted for the motion. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained therefore the motion was lost.

63. The Chairman said he now wished to move to the Governments' proposal for a vote. The DUP asked exactly what comprised the Governments' proposal. The Chairman said he had just been advised by the British Government that it was the text beginning at page five and ending at page 12 of the document. The Irish Government concurred with this. The UDP said it would be abstaining from the vote on the basis that a determination should not be taken now. The Chairman asked for a vote. Abstaining were the PUP and UDP. The DUP, UKUP and UUP voted against the proposal. The British Government, Irish Government, Alliance, Labour, NIWC and SDLP voted for the proposal. The Chairman declared that sufficient consensus had not been obtained and the proposal was therefore lost.

64. The Chairman said participants now had to decide how best to proceed from this position. He suggested the following schedule covering the next few months. Next week the Chairmen would consult with those willing to meet them and obtain views on how to proceed. As well as this, the participants themselves were at liberty to engage in bilaterals to help this process on. The talks facilities would then be available on a limited basis during August, much as they had been the previous August. In the week beginning 1 September, the facilities would be available on an unlimited basis for consultation/meetings from that date onwards. The Chairman said that he would now propose that the plenary adjourn until 10.00 on 9 September. He asked for comments on these proposals.

65. The DUP said it had understood that the plenary would not, according to the timetable, be meeting until 15 September. Why was 9 September being proposed? The Chairman explained that the process had not yet got beyond item 2 on the agreed agenda. The agreed timetable was based on the assumption that a decommissioning proposal would attract sufficient consensus. The timetable, as it

turned out, was now based on an incorrect assumption. The DUP said it was highly likely that some people would view this change of date as the timetable being changed to satisfy the British Government and the entry of Sinn Féin into talks. The party said it looked to it as if the timetable was now being swept away to suit other agendas. The Chairman said he recognised the DUP's disagreement with his proposal.

66. The UUP said it had no difficulty with the initial part of the Chairman's proposal ie the activity outlined for the following week. The party said, however, that if the process now decided to come back before 15 September did this not, in effect, prejudge what participants would be doing on 9 September? The Chairman asked the UUP whether it wished to propose an alternative date to 9 September?

67. The UUP suggested that the issue of deciding where the process went to from here should be addressed the following week, perhaps by holding a plenary session. The party was simply saying that if it was decided to hold a plenary on 9 September then what did the participants do when they came in next week?

68. The DUP said that during the discussions on the timetable, there were essentially two columns; one which contained dates and beside it one which detailed what activity should occur. The party said that the timetable specifically detailed that the plenary would adjourn for the holidays until 15 September. The party said the only matter which had changed regarding the timetable was what business might the participants be dealing with, come 15 September. The DUP said that surely whenever everyone came back on 15 September the issue of decommissioning would again have to be addressed unless some other deal had been agreed outside the process. The DUP said that perhaps the plan was that some participants would be coming into the plenary on 15 September with a view that decommissioning was over and dealt with.

69. The Chairman said he was unaware of any deals being done beyond the process. He said he personally wrote up the timetable and no assumption was made in relation to two columns, as the DUP suggested. It was also to be noted that the 15 September date was actually in the second column! The DUP suggested that the 15 September should be altered to 9 September. The Chairman asked for a UUP view on this. The UUP said it had a neutral view on 9 September but came back to the point that if 9 September was agreed, what were the participants to do next week?

70. Alliance said that it had been hoped that decommissioning would be resolved and that substantive negotiations would begin on 15 September. The party said that, in this eventuality, there were surely circumstances around which one would have seen preparatory meetings taking place or even the Business Committee set up to address various issues in the period between now and substantive negotiations starting on 15 September. Alliance said the position was now different but the UUP's suggestion that a plenary could be held next week was not unreasonable. Alliance proposed that a plenary next week be organised at the call of the Chair. Subsequent to next week there would then be a break but it was likely that a plenary would be required in early September since that was the only mechanism in which decisions could be taken. Alliance summarised its view and said it was quite content for a proposal to have a plenary session next week organised at the call of the Chair and a plenary on 9 September in any case.

71. The UUP said that there had to be some reason for changing the agreed timetable. The party said that if a decision was taken now to hold a plenary on 9 September then the participants were effectively changing that timetable and there was then no point in meeting next week. There had to be a strong reason for changing the timetable.

72. The British Government said the strong reason was to find a way forward from the current position. This was why the suggestion

had been made to have bilaterals to consider this next week and come back on 9 September because it was not possible at present to get on with the rest of the agenda. The British Government said there was no hidden agenda and no secret deals. It was attempting to try and move things forward since it was committed to starting substantive negotiations on 15 September. The British Government said it naturally followed that it was also committed to make preparations for this eventuality and this was why it was now trying to find a way forward. The British Government said it supported the Chairman's proposal.

73. The DUP stated that the process was presently at item 2(a) of the agenda. The party said there seemed to be no prospect of resolving the decommissioning issue until after 15 September. The DUP asked why was the British Government wishing to stick to 15 September? What was so magical about this date?

74. The UKUP said it wished to reinforce the DUP's point. The party said what the British Government was really saying was that Sinn Féin/IRA would at the table on 15 September, thereby leapfrogging the current impasse, to keep in line with the conditions laid down by Sinn Féin/IRA. The UKUP asked why any unionist party should remain at the talks on this basis. The party asked the Chairman how could the British Government dictate to the talks process that Sinn Féin/IRA could be brought in on 15 September?

75. The Chairman replied that he did not believe it was up to him to tell people what they could or could not say. The Chairman said he didn't believe he would get too far with such a policy if it was adopted. The UKUP asked, for purposes of clarification, whether one of the parties could say that decommissioning was deferred while Sinn Féin came in to the process on 15 September? Could this be done and could such a situation be reconciled with agenda item 2(a)?

76. The Chairman said that no ruling was called for from the Chair in this instance. The talks were sponsored by two Governments and under the legislation setting up the process certain powers belonged to the British Government. The Chairman said it was not for him to tell the British Government how and when to use these powers.

77. The UKUP asked whether the British Government would talk everyone through why 15 September was the day set aside for Sinn Féin to enter the talks. The party asked how was it going to be possible to deal with decommissioning at item 2 and at the same time deal with the entry of Sinn Féin into the talks. The British Government in reply said that it looked forward to working with the participants and in doing so making the necessary arrangements to ensure that substantive negotiations could commence on 15 September.

78. The DUP said this was a far more serious situation now than before today's votes were taken. The party said it had now seen the underhand way in which the two Governments had rejected basic principles today. This was also how the two Governments would bring Sinn Féin into the process on 15 September. The DUP said that all this boiled down to a complete surrender by the British Government to Sinn Féin. The promise of a 15 September start for substantive negotiations had to be kept at all costs. All these issues were already fixed. The DUP said the British Government couldn't sit here and not say there was nothing underhand in all of this. It was simply not possible to square the past comments of British Government representatives with the manner of their voting today. The party said Sinn Féin/IRA were already in the building and they would be in talks proper because both Governments had changed their view on decommissioning, yet the Downing Street Declaration talked about decommissioning being dealt with first. The DUP said this position wasn't a mere fudge of the issues, it was a downright lie. The party said it would not continue to

attend the talks on this basis. The British Government was going back on its earlier commitments.

79. The DUP said it deeply regretted that the British Government had become a victim of IRA threats and blackmail - threats such as those issued earlier in the day outside Castle Buildings when the Sinn Féin Chairman had intimated that if unionists were not prepared to attend the talks this situation would only bring back the men of violence on to the streets. The DUP wondered what sort of threat would be delivered when Sinn Féin found out that the British Government could not deliver on some of their demands. The party said it wished to take no further part in the process where democracy was silenced and where the surrender of weaponry was the key issue, rather than the surrender of democracy as it now appeared. The DUP said it wished to conclude its comments by echoing the words of one of the mothers of the RUC victims in Lurgan - "was it worthwhile for my son to pay the ultimate price when the British Government was prepared to do what it was doing". The DUP said there was no place for it at the table and the delegation departed.

80. Alliance said there seemed to be a misunderstanding on the part of unionists when the votes were being cast on the Governments' decommissioning proposal. The party said the whole issue of Sinn Féin's entry to the process was initially dependent on a cease-fire being established and secondly a decision taken by the British Government. If both these loops were successfully negotiated, Sinn Féin could then come in and join the process at whatever agenda item the business had reached. The notion that seemed to be adopted by unionists was that by not voting on decommissioning before Sinn Féin came in to the process the latter would not enter talks until the issue was resolved. Alliance said this was nonsense. The party said that of course it was possible that Sinn Féin might want to come in and discuss decommissioning but that was entirely a matter for them. But a misapprehension remained in unionists' minds that the date of Sinn Féin's entry

into the process was in some way connected with the determination of decommissioning. It was nothing to do with it. Alliance said that if it appeared that decommissioning was not sorted out before Sinn Féin's entry then unionists actually had the opportunity to sort it out while Sinn Féin were present in the process.

81. The SDLP said it had thought the present debate was about procedural matters. The party said it was perhaps worth reminding everyone that two days had been set aside earlier in the week to debate the decommissioning issue through proposals and amendments. The party said it was becoming confused as to who was in the process and who was out, who was going out and who was coming in! No matter what games were being played, the SDLP said that the realities of the situation remained the same. The party recalled the previous Secretary of State's remarks in the House on the subject of decommissioning. He had said that decommissioning would happen "on either a voluntary basis or not at all". The SDLP said that unionists needed to consider this statement carefully. It also had to be remembered that the interests of unionists were the same as those of the SDLP since at the end of the day both had to find a way of living together by achieving a political settlement capable of being supported by both communities.

82. The SDLP said that, with regard to decommissioning, there were two choices facing everyone. Either the weapons could be taken out or talked out. The former option had had, unfortunately, little success in 27 years, yet the process hadn't yet tried talking them out - not as a bartering mechanism but as the only way to finally establish that those who had access to the weapons preferred to use them instead of supporting a political settlement. The SDLP said this was the leverage of the political process and political negotiations. It was about making a choice. Of course attempting to achieve decommissioning was not just a problem facing unionists. The SDLP said it could not affect the decommissioning of guns which had been used at Greysteel and Loughinisland. Decommissioning could only be carried out on a mutual basis.



83. The SDLP said that when Sinn Féin came into the process it would be saying to them that while there may not be a political imperative in the Governments' document on decommissioning or for that matter in the Report of the International Body, there was a moral imperative to make the choice previously outlined. This was the only way in which a settlement could be reached. One issue was clear; it was not going to be possible to achieve a settlement unless the decommissioning issue was dealt with once and for all. It didn't matter about the technicalities or procedures surrounding decommissioning. The party's point to the unionists was that no one could impose a mathematical equation on something which could not be defined. What had to be achieved was the decommissioning of mindsets referred to in the Report of the International Body. The SDLP said it seemed to it that the unionists always appeared to believe that winning the battle or thinking they had won a battle was the way forward, rather than looking at what was stake in the wider picture. The only winners in any successful conclusion of decommissioning were the public because they would be protected by the procedures outlined by the two Governments and the Report of the International Body. The SDLP said it believed the UUP should look at the issue from this angle since it was time for that party to concentrate on winning the argument of reality rather than the one of perception.

84. The UUP intervened and said it didn't see "battles" being won in the process. However the core of the party's objections today was that the Governments' proposals purported to do something which they will not do. The UUP said that it had altered its view on decommissioning in an attempt to ensure that progress might be made. The irony of that position was that the authors of the Governments' proposal professed allegiance to the compromise proposal of paragraph 34 of the Report of the International Body. Anyone, with any intelligence, reading that report would glean from its contents that the actual handing over of weapons would take place during the process, but the Governments' proposal had moved

away from this fundamental compromise. The plain fact was that the compromise approach wasn't in the Governments' document. The document said no arms were to be handed in during the process. This position, according to the UUP, was further reinforced by correspondence between Sinn Féin and the British Government and comments from Sinn Féin since.

85. The UUP said it well understood that decommissioning was not a simple matter. But it was a matter and a test of sincerity for both Governments. The UUP said that the comments made earlier in the day by the Sinn Féin Chairman did not give the impression to some of those gathered around the table that Sinn Féin would be committed to exclusively peaceful means. The Chairman intervened to ask the UUP whether there was a question for the SDLP during this intervention. The UUP acknowledged the Chairman's point and concluded its remarks by saying that Government proposal removed the chance of disarmament during the process.

86. The SDLP said it had made a previous assertion that no political settlement would arise from the talks process unless trust could be developed on both sides. Trust was unlikely to occur if illegal weapons were still on both sides. The party said that the price of achieving an agreed settlement was the level of trust which could then demand the removal of illegal weapons. The SDLP said if that was a faulty premise, could the UUP tell the process how and what exactly would the imperatives be which could be imposed on Sinn Féin to decommission - other than that agreed settlement?

87. The UUP, in response, said if one removed from Sinn Féin any requirement in practice to face up to and comply with the compromise position in the Report of the International Body, what possible incentive was there for them to decommission? The UUP said the proof of this pudding was in the eating and today's comments from the Sinn Féin Chairman said it all. That was the fundamental problem. Sinn Féin were not being put under any

pressure to do anything at all to comply with the Report of the International Body and the Downing Street Declaration. The UUP said if the Governments didn't want to follow either of these documents then why didn't they just come out and say so?

88. The PUP said it needed to be reminded about the Chairman's earlier proposal regarding the scheduling of plenary meetings. The party said it was its belief that most of the participants were happy with the proposals until the issue of 9 September was raised. The issues had now been confused by mentioning 9 September. The PUP suggested that participants approve the Chairman's proposals but leave out the reference to 9 September. In other words the party said it was happy to proceed with the basis of the Chair's proposals but leave the issue of a plenary meeting to the call of the Chair.

89. The UKUP said the proceedings were a complete farce. The party had seen its proposals defeated and the Governments' supported. The party said the whole business was a fait accompli. The talks process was being held in total contempt by Sinn Féin, both Governments and the IRA. The party said it proposed to withdraw from the talks and put all these issues to the people of Northern Ireland. The UKUP said it ventured to profess that when this occurred, the people would utterly reject what the Governments and others were trying to achieve. The party said that too many of the issues in the process had been decided outside of it and behind the backs of the people and indeed the participants. It was time to leave. On departing the UKUP raised a query in relation to the DUP's earlier proposal that the 15 September date for a plenary should be adhered to. The Chairman indicated that the basis of the UKUP's statement was incorrect. The UKUP then left the room.

90. The SDLP said it would liked to have asked the UKUP a question before their departure but instead it would make a point to the UUP. The party said that to date there never had been any agreement as to how both communities could live together in

Northern Ireland. That was the fundamental problem facing everyone. The party said it therefore assumed that it was the absolute priority of everyone around the table to do their best on this issue and not introduce marginal ones. The SDLP said it wished to state categorically that there were no secret deals in the talks which occurred between it and Sinn Féin. Secret deals didn't solve problems; they only made it impossible for progress to occur. The SDLP said the purpose of the talks with Sinn Féin was to stop the killing on the streets and it would have thought that this would have been warmly welcomed by the unionist parties, considering many of the IRA's victims were from that community.

91. The SDLP said the whole question about disarmament revolved around "trust". The real issue was "were they serious". The party said it accepted the trust of the two loyalists parties sitting either side of it in the process. The party talked to them. They talked to the party. This built trust. If the key was not about building trust but simply playing games then everyone knew that guns could be handed over one day and more supplies bought the following day. The SDLP again stressed that no secret deals had been struck in the run up to the current IRA cease-fire. The party said that the Prime Minister had clearly spelt out the terms and these were firmly in the public domain. The party leader had had discussions with the Prime Minister and the former knew that everything was out in the open on this issue. First of all there had to be a cease-fire and secondly Sinn Féin had to commit itself to the Mitchell Principles - a point which the party believed was a much stronger test than others perceived. The party said that if Sinn Féin couldn't abide by the Mitchell Principles then it (the SDLP) would be the first to put Sinn Féin out of the process.

92. The SDLP said the opportunity now existed to do something towards reaching a settlement. If the talks collapsed then the symptoms of such a collapse would quickly appear on the streets. This couldn't be allowed to happen. The party said that if it thought it would be helpful, it would speak to unionists to give

them further reassurances that no secret deals had been done with Sinn Féin. The party said that little attention appeared to have been paid in the past to the content of public statements arising out of the Hume/Adams talks. Yet these had publicly declared that one of the objectives of the discussions was to seek to reach an agreement which had an allegiance between both sets of peoples on the island. Another stated objective was that it was impossible to ignore the position and agreement of the unionist people in any settlement.

93. The SDLP said it had been, since its inception, in the business of challenging traditional nationalism and the support of violence on the basis that agreement had to be reached. It also had to be remembered that the word "consent" had been part of the party's constitution since 1971. The party said that no one was seeking take-overs; it was about living together in peace. The party said it wasn't worth throwing the present opportunity away on the unresolved issue of decommissioning. The party asked where in the world did any conflict start to be resolved by beginning with the hand over of weapons. This was surrender and the unionists knew this position better than most for their motto over hundreds of years had been "no surrender". So why push this policy so hard? The opportunity was present to talk and negotiate in a peaceful background. It should be taken and the question resolved as to whether party politics in Northern Ireland were more important than tackling and solving the wider issues facing everyone. The SDLP said, in this sense, that the talks had been more about two of the unionist parties attempting at numerous opportunities to knife the other main-unionist party in the back. These tactics would never result in achieving an overall political settlement but if the parties couldn't achieve such a settlement then it was up to the Governments to keep on trying by talking to the participants who were willing to participate and ultimately put proposals to the people. The party said that template couldn't be objected to from the unionist viewpoint.

94. Alliance said it wished to address the SDLP's earlier point made to the UUP about what leverage there might be in convincing Sinn Féin to decommission its weapons other than an agreed political settlement. Alliance said the UUP response had focused on the Governments' shifting position. It might perhaps be wiser to retrace some steps and asked where had decommissioning come from? Alliance said the word had come from a member of the previous Irish Government who believed words were of some importance and "decommissioning" was something one could do oneself. A second question was how did it become important? Alliance said decommissioning had had its roots in the background to the conflict in South Africa and the principle of decommissioning had been set out in the principles enshrined in the Downing Street Declaration. However, Alliance said that Sinn Féin had not signed up to the Downing Street Declaration nor did they say yes at the Dublin Forum to the principle of consent. In fact when a report was completed on the issue of consent, Sinn Féin had refused to sign up to it.

95. Alliance said this position begged serious questions about Sinn Féin's commitment to the whole process; therefore other indicators were sought to test their bona fides, and decommissioning rather than consent became the key issue. In relation to the SDLP's earlier comments regarding public statements issued following the Hume/Adams talks, Alliance said it was its belief that people did read statements, they just didn't believe the words. That's why there was no trust in the unionist community.

96. Alliance said it believed that Sinn Féin had betrayed many working for the course of peace in Northern Ireland but the party didn't consider decommissioning to be the issue on which Sinn Féin should be judged. If decommissioning was linked to political progress then the process would simply slip into the mire. Sinn Féin could block agreements achieved between other participants, thereby giving them a veto. Another way of applying a judgement

was to look at confidence building measures and linking these with decommissioning. Alliance said that nationalists often viewed confidence building measures as issues which had to be built up to win their confidence, but unionists need confidence as well. Alliance said, however, that there were other approaches worth considering. It was perhaps worth listing some of the confidence building measures applicable to both sides - issues such as decommissioning, prisoners, policing etc. The party said that if political progress was made then these issues could be linked to that progress on a quid pro quo basis. This was the sort of linkage which needed to be made because the party didn't have the trust in everyone reaching agreement by any other means.

97. The SDLP said the major priority was actually starting a process which might lead to an agreement. There now was a peaceful atmosphere and people had a chance which had to be taken. Alliance said it didn't disagree with this. But its fear was that if everyone attempted to go for a political settlement as a pre-requisite for decommissioning then the latter would only act as a veto. The party said it believed that a complete political settlement must be kept separate. Confidence building measures should be kept together but separate from a process focusing on a political settlement. These measures would run in parallel and comprise issues affecting both sides of the community. Alliance said it wished to caution against the rungs of the ladder for a political settlement being formed by decommissioning on one side and political progress on the other, but instead believed that using other ways as had been suggested earlier, might prove to be more durable.

98. The Irish Government said it had a question regarding the scheduling of business but would wait until the Chairman offered some further remarks on this issue. In the interim it said that while it had only been present for three weeks and many of the other participants had been in the process for some 13 months, it had been fascinated to hear the engagement of the participants over

the last 60 minutes. The Irish Government said it wished to re-echo the words of the British Government in that it wished to see how the process could best be moved forward, perhaps through bilaterals etc. The Irish Government said it would continue to keep its door open to all who wished to be included in moving the process forward.

99. The Chairman said he wished now to modify his original suggestion, particularly in view of the comments received from the UUP, Alliance and PUP. He said that he now proposed the consultations next week and in August remain the same. He also proposed that the plenary be adjourned, subject to the call of the chair, to the week commencing 28 July. If a plenary wasn't required in that week then one would be called on 9 September. The Chairman said that consultation with the participants could be held next week to determine the need for a plenary then. He asked whether this was agreeable.

100. The UUP said it believed the whole situation should be looked at next week. The Chairman asked whether this statement meant that the next plenary be left to the call of the chair period, in other words no definite date being organised? The UUP said it did not wish any date before 15 September to be organised. It had no commitment to anything before 15 September.

101. Following a short intervention from the PUP, the Chairman again asked for clarification of the UUP's position. The UUP said it was content to leave the scheduling as it had previously outlined. Alliance said the difficulty with this was that a plenary might not be held before 15 September. The UUP said there was a way round this and considered that a plenary should be left to the call of the chair next week. The Chairman said he would go round all the participants to get a definitive view of each position since there appeared to be little consensus at present.



102. The UUP said that no plenary meeting should be organised before 15 September. The British Government said it wished to leave the possibility of a plenary before 15 September open and it preferred 9 September. The Irish Government said it was content to go along with the British Government's view with the idea of having a plenary no later than 9 September. Alliance said it preferred the proposal of both Governments but could support the concept of a plenary being organised at the call of the chair either next week or in early September. Labour said it was content with the Chairman's most recent proposal. The NIWC said a plenary arranged by the call of the chair next week was fine but in the event of this not happening, a plenary should occur on 9 September. The PUP also went along with the NIWC's position. The SDLP said that a plenary should be organised for 9 September. The UDP said it was unclear as to what procedures would be required if specific dates were organised now and had to be adhered to. The Chairman said in view of the range of inputs he would call a short adjournment to enable him to consult the parties. An adjournment was therefore called at 17.19.

103. At 17.40 the Chairman convened the meeting and said he wished to propose the following. The plenary would now adjourn until 16.00 hours on Monday 28 July. During Monday the Chairman would consult with every participant present following which a decision concerning the timing of reconvening in September would be made at that plenary. The Chairman said that it was his view that the post summer plenary would reconvene no later than 15 September and perhaps earlier than this. He hoped that the present proposal was agreeable to the participants. Hearing no objections the Chairman said that his staff would contact each participant regarding meeting times during Monday (between 10.00 and 16.00.) and then a decision would be taken at 16.00 hours. The Chairman then adjourned this session at 17.42 until 16.00 on Monday 28 July.

**Independent Chairmen Notetakers**  
**30 July 1997**

OIC/ps74