

11/96

RESTRICTED

107/96 J1-8-1-96

660 EWA 26
9/1

FROM: A J N Tansley
British Embassy, Dublin

DATE: 3 January 1996

cc: PS/PUS (L&B) - B
PS/Sir David Fell - B
Mr Watkins - B
Mr Thomas - B
Mr Leach - B
Mr Stephens - B
Mr Lamont, RID - B
Mr Pellew, NAD (via RID) - B
Mr Westmacott, Washington - By fax

129/11

W Gouville

Mr Mearns
for us file
W

DESK IMMEDIATE

Ms Checksfield - B

1. in Mr Gilman 100

2. in from

5.1

18/1
Julie pt file
in Chicago
file Third Investment
conference.
MD 19/1

CHICAGO INVESTMENT CONFERENCE

- Please refer to your minute of 4 (sic) January to David Watkins.
- We agree that it would be worth putting our case for the Chicago Investment Conference to be in a 6 + 6 format, rather than on an all-Ireland basis, to the Irish Government. Initial soundings here (with Brendan Scannell, Counsellor in Anglo-Irish Division in the DFA responsible for, inter alia, North-South economic matters) indicate that Irish thinking on the arrangements for the conference is still at a very early stage. There is a chance that the Irish Government could be persuaded of the merits of a 6 + 6 format for the conference. But there are bound to be strong pressures the other way, from TD's and others representing areas outside the border countries - as there were a year ago. An all-Ireland investment conference is also more likely to provide a platform for those who seek to promote "harmonisation" of tax rates on manufacturing companies North and South of the border - by which they mean Northern Ireland detaching itself from the UK and adopting a 10% rate (as in the Republic). This, as we know, would only alarm unionists. We need to head an all Ireland event off.
- We therefore see merit in raising the matter at an early stage with the Irish Government and suggest that we do so at tomorrow's Liaison Group meeting.

(Signed)
A J N Tansley

RESTRICTED

~~10-8/96 JK 8-7-96~~

cc Mr Watkins
(top page)

Sp D.J.W. I am not at all
sure it is worth fighting battles
that can be undertaken to be done.
And the matter was raised with
the Irish at the IGC on 20 December, when
they declared their firm view on it being an
all-Ireland affair. (Did Sperry did note that he
representants - Kerry) *constit*

Page 27

FROM: CLARE CHECKSFIELD
IPL
24 JANUARY 1996

(8/1)

- PS/PUS (L&B)
- PS/Sir David Ball
- Mr Thomas
- Mr Leach
- Mrs Brown
- Mr Stephens o/r
- Mr Lamont, RID
- Mr Pellew, NAD
- Mr Westmacott, HME
Washington
- HMA, Dublin
- Mr Dew, HME Dublin

DESK IMMEDIATE



Mr Watkins - B

1. cc Mr Gibson *neg*

2. Mr Brown

CHICAGO INVESTMENT CONFERENCE

You spoke to Jonathan Stephens about the NIO response to Peter Westmacott's letter of 15 December, recording the NSC view that this conference is already an all-Ireland affair. This is a view which has been given added credence by Chuck Meissner.

2. I passed on to Peter your view that although our firm preference was for a 6 + 6 format for the conference, that on balance, an all-Ireland investment conference was better than no conference at all. Peter's view is still that the pass has been sold, but that we should still try to persuade Washington (and the Irish Government) to change their minds.

3. There is a good case for using Michael Ancram's possible visit to Washington in early February to argue our case in person with Ron Brown, and we should also take this up with the Irish Government. This is apparently to be a tri-partite conference, but there has been no discussion, to my knowledge at least, with Irish colleagues. I should be grateful for advice from the Embassy in Dublin.

EM/TPU/942/

Mr Watkins
you should be in the L.G. The
conference should be
all-Ireland.

ASST 08/17/96
SEC - 2 JAN 1996
CENT SEC

FROM: CLARE CHECKSFIELD
IPL
4 JANUARY 1996

1/2nd

2/1

- cc: PS/PUS (L&B) - B
- PS/Sir David Fell - B
- Mr Thomas - B
- Mr Leach - B
- Mrs Brown - B
- Mr Stephens o/r - B
- Mr Lamont, RID - B
- Mr Pellew, NAD - B
- Mr Westmacott, HME Washington - F
- HMA, Dublin - B
- Mr Dew, HME Dublin - B

DESK IMMEDIATE

Mr Jones 2/1
What happened at
the 16c. mt. ... ?
need to know by
cop. wed. 3 Jan. mt.
2.1

Mr Watkins - B

CHICAGO INVESTMENT CONFERENCE

You spoke to Jonathan Stephens about the NIO response to Peter Westmacott's letter of 15 December, recording the NSC view that this conference is already an all-Ireland affair. This is a view which has been given added credence by Chuck Meissner.

2. I passed on to Peter your view that although our firm preference was for a 6 + 6 format for the conference, that on balance, an all-Ireland investment conference was better than no conference at all. Peter's view is still that the pass has been sold, but that we should still try to persuade Washington (and the Irish Government) to change their minds.

3. There is a good case for using Michael Ancram's possible visit to Washington in early February to argue our case in person with Ron Brown, and we should also take this up with the Irish Government. This is apparently to be a tri-partite conference, but there has been no discussion, to my knowledge at least, with Irish colleagues. I should be grateful for advice from the Embassy in Dublin.

1. cc Mr Gihon 1/21

EM/TPU/942/

2. Mr Jones

Copy of my reply follows.

2
5.

4. If we are to make an effort to regain the format we want, we will need to make a concerted move on the US Embassies in London and Dublin (although as undeclared originators of the plan, not likely to be receptive), with Washington and our Irish contacts. In the first instance, it seems sensible to start from the following position:

- (i) we were not consulted before announcement;
- (ii) in principle, very supportive, but surprised that this should be a different format to previous conference in Washington;
- (iii) the value of balance is incalculable, and 6 + 6 maintains that.

5. In the final analysis, we will probably not want to insist on the format to the point of confirming American worst suspicions, but we could make a determined attempt to unravel the present stitch-up.

all-Ireland conference

SIGNED

CLARE CHECKSFIELD
International and Planning Division
OAB Ext 6503

- if objection is at least partially political (like W's one) will not attract unbiased participation

- if objection economic, then under ~~advantage~~ advantage for NI
- some trade/business dev. on all-Ireland basis (telecoms, tourism), but manufacturing invest. ? How health comp. ? different incentives ?
- wish of calling US meeting into ?

EM/TPU/942/