



An Chartlann Náisiúnta National Archives

Reference Code:	2021/45/292
Creator(s):	Department of Foreign Affairs
Accession Conditions:	Open
Copyright:	National Archives, Ireland. May only be reproduced with the written permission of the Director of the National Archives.

h a R T T - general
Statements
Internal Strand

JOINT UNIONIST POSITION PAPER

(Tuesday 21st May 1991)

1. We are concerned to see some constructive progress in the Talks process. We are already participating in Strand 1 and we see no justifiable impediment to the commencement of plenaries in that strand. We are however aware of the urgency to resolve, in the margins of the Conference, the outstanding issues which will clear the way for Strand 2 leading on to Strand 3.

2. There should be no doubt as to our determination to complete the process in each of its strands as evidenced by our endorsement of the 26th March 1991 statement.

3. In particular while we did not accept the principle of the appointment of an independent Chairman, if the clarifications concerning his identity and operations were reasonable and in view of the understanding that all the parties would need to be content with a particular nominee before the two governments would proceed to make the appointment, we would be willing to work under him. We also understand that the appointment of an independent Chairman does not mean that the issues in Strand 2 would be open to international adjudication.

4. We consider it important to determine the terms of reference for the independent Chairman and the standing orders by which he will regulate meetings in Strand 2. We do not expect these to be bulky, complex or controversial.

5. In terms of venue the difficulty has been considerably narrowed. We agree that the opening plenary meeting of Strand 2 would be held in London and the bulk of substantive discussions in Northern Ireland before a plenary meeting in Dublin. We anticipate that both the London and Dublin meetings will have weighty agendas which may cause them to last for longer than one day. It only remains for the Secretary of State to reach agreement with all participating parties on a precise location for those meetings of Strand 2 which it has been agreed should take place within Northern Ireland.

6. The Secretary of State has outlined how the participating Northern Ireland parties will relate to the Strand 3 discussions (see Annex A). We have noted these arrangements and are willing to work them. In addition we have made clear our wish to have the opportunity afforded by the last plenary meeting in Strand 2 to put to the two governments our views on issues we believe they should address in Strand 3. We also understand that progress in Strand 3 discussions may necessitate further meetings of Strand 1 or Strand 2 as appropriate.

7. We will deal expeditiously with the outstanding issues on receipt of proposals or if it is helpful we are prepared to make further suggestions ourselves. Moreover, as considerable time has already passed and as we would have hoped to have concluded Strands 1 and 2 by the end of June, we are willing to intensify the talks process in an effort to meet the common commitment to the 26 March time-scale.

FOR ATTENTION Ramsey McGLONE

h.c
LTT - St de nent
A

STATEMENT BY JOINT UNIONIST LEADERS

15th MAY 1991

IMMEDIATE

We cannot bind ourselves to work within the Anglo Irish Agreement terms and conditions designed by Mr. Collins and Mr. Brooke at their London meeting on Friday last, and in the course of their further consultations on Monday and Tuesday.

We intend to adhere strictly to the recorded principles agreed with him during the 12 months up to Easter last and the basis of his invitation to us to attend these talks, and the record of understandings arrived at.

We also informed the S.O.S. that we would not comply with today's deadline but would participate in a plenary session on Monday 20th May 1991 and on future occasions where we consider our participation to be in the interests of Ulster as an integral part of the United Kingdom.



JOINT STATEMENT ISSUED BY DR. IAN PAISLEY AND JAMES MOLYNEAUX.
11 MAY, 1991

In our joint statement of 20 April we explained the impossibility of establishing a normal relationship with any Irish Government while the Republic's Constitution retains its illegal claim to the territory of Northern Ireland and that this was a barrier to stage 2 of the talks being held on this island. As Her Majesty's Government and all Unionists rightly refuse to recognise that claim we will be seeking to persuade the Dublin Government to move quickly on the matter when we come to stage 2. Such a movement indicating a willingness to withdraw the claim would transform attitudes to those secondary issues flowing from that claim which have occupied us all during the past weeks.



CC - p 51

LPSM

Mr Nally

LPSB

Mr Broome

Councillor A-1

✓ Secretariat

STATEMENT FROM THE JOINT UNIONIST LEADERS

The present talks process did not come about by good fortune, but rather along a route started by us over three years ago with the then Secretary of State, Tom King. We made the point, only to establish that we wish the talks to succeed. Moreover, it is clearly the desire of the community that success should greet our efforts. We have been concerned that, thus far, Mr Brooke has been unable to obtain agreement among the parties as to a venue for Strand 2 of the negotiations (dealing with the relationship between any new Northern Ireland administration and the Republic of Ireland).

Our minds have been exercised by the dilemma and while we believe that the overwhelming burden of historical precedence and logistical suitability weighs in favour of meeting in London for Strand 2, we have been willing to consider, and have talked with Mr Brooke about, other options.

With parties maintaining confidentiality there has been limited information available to the public so we feel it is useful to review the situation. The position of the parties on the location when the talks would enter the second strand was well known. The SDLP wanted the talks in the island of Ireland, at Dublin or Armagh, while Unionists believed that they should be held in London.

As testimony of our reasonable approach we placed before the Secretary of State a sequence of alternatives:-

1. London.
2. Elsewhere in Great Britain.
3. London for Strand 2, with all but the final stages of Strand 3 (which deals with the relationship between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland) in Dublin.
4. A neutral venue outside the two islands.
5. The opening meeting of Strand 2 in London; moving to a neutral location for the substantive negotiations; concluding in Dublin with a transitional meeting from Strand 2 to Strand 3 and thereafter alternating between London and Dublin.

This latest proposal, we felt, went even further than the suggestion by Archbishop Cacciafady and reflected our preparedness to go the extra mile.

We cannot continue upon an imbalanced and continuous process of compromise - to do so would be to capitulate and that we will not do.

While we will continue to seek a reasonable accommodation, the community will understand that we cannot indefinitely be expected to alter our position in the absence of a reciprocal measure of flexibility by others.

Released Friday 10 May 1991.

7th May 91

h.a

RTT - ~~State~~
general

To The Secretary Of State For Northern Ireland

Mr. Peter Brooke MP

From The Unionist Leaders

Mr. James Molyneux MP - Leader Ulster Unionist Party
Dr. Ian R. K. Paisley MP, MEP - Leader Ulster Democratic
Unionist Party

Your letter is written as if the decisions taken at the meeting with the Prime Minister had not been arrived at.

At the end of that meeting we read to the Prime Minister and all present, the enclosed statement and there was no objection raised that there was anything inaccurate in it about our conclusions.

Note carefully paragraphs two and three of this document which are totally in keeping with our communication to you yesterday.

We accepted the Prime Minister's assurance that we would not be asked to agree the procedures on Strands two and three until we had clarification on:-

(i) The so-called Independent Chairman,

and,

(ii) The location of the proposed venue in Northern Ireland.

So far, these clarifications have not been forthcoming.

We accepted the assurance of the Prime Minister that the independent Chairman would not be appointed without the consent of all concerned. Both you and the Prime Minister acknowledged that it would be 'madness' to appoint such a Chairman on any other basis. Why is this now completely dropped from your understanding of the meeting?

We also accepted the Prime Minister's assurance that clarification of,

(i) The identity of the Chairman,

(ii) The Standing Orders under which he would preside,

(iii) His power to hold meetings, their composition and locations, would be forthcoming before we would be expected to respond. So far, that clarification has not been forthcoming either. Is this because of Mr. Collins' Far East Tour?

Further, we accepted the Prime Minister's assurance that clarification would be given to us of the location of those meetings of Strand two to be held in Northern Ireland. We were not expected to agree until we had this information and considered it. Once again, no such clarification has been received by us.

On our part, we stressed that we did not accept the principle of the appointment of an independent Chairman at all, but if the clarifications concerning his operations were reasonable, then in view of the Prime Minister's assurance about the manner of his appointment, we would be prepared to work under him.

We also intimated to the Prime Minister that the matter of meetings on Strand two in Northern Ireland had been accepted by us in a proposal submitted to you last Monday.

We affirm that all the assurances we gave to the Prime Minister will be fully and faithfully adhered to and we expect that you will carry out fully and faithfully the assurances that he gave to us.

We await the clarifications promised.

In keeping with our assurances we will be attending the plenary meeting on Monday 20 May at Stormont at 10:30 am to continue Strand one of the talks on the basis agreed with the Prime Minister.

Statement 15 May, 1991

The talks were most helpful and encouraging and the Prime Minister showed his dedication to take time to deal with the difficulties that had arisen.

We were glad to have clarified that the word basis used in paragraph two of what had been called an ultimatum referred to the procedures Strands two and three and not to the basis upon which Strand one was being held.

As we made clear before coming here today, we intend pressing on with Strand one.

In regard to the other matters concerning Strands two and three, we intimated that we needed the matters of an 'Independent Chairman' and the locations in Northern Ireland fully clarified before we could have full agreement.

We obtained assurances that an independent Chairman, whatever his nationality, would not result in international adjudication on, for example, the Irish territorial claim to Northern Ireland.

CONF. 12/5.

JOINT STATEMENT TO THE MEDIA BY UNIONIST LEADERS.
MR. MOLYNEUX AND DR. PAISLEY, FRIDAY, 26 APRIL, 1991

"Let it be understood that there is a basic Unionist principle which we are not prepared to breach. Dublin claims, in its Constitution, territorial jurisdiction over Northern Ireland. As long as this is so it is absolutely impossible to have a normal relationship with the Republic such as would exist between two countries which make no territorial claim against each other. That is why talks between the Unionist MPs of Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic have not and cannot take place.

We could negotiate with the Dublin administration only either as a Northern Ireland Government which we are not, or, as part of a United Kingdom team as we will be if the second phase of these talks takes place. Further, it must be emphasised that we will be members of the United Kingdom team but not members of Her Majesty's Government Delegation with whose views we may or may not identify. In other words we will not be putting the Government's view but rather that of a majority of the Ulster people.

Normal relationships between the two parts of Ireland can come about only if Dublin gives up its claim to territorial jurisdiction and rescinds Articles 2 and 3 of its Constitution. Only then can true neighbourliness but not Union come about."

Joint Statement by the Unionist leaders. Rt Hon James Molyneux MP and Dr Ian Paisley MP MEP.

We were both assured by the Secretary of State that there would be one more meeting of the Anglo Irish Conference at which the dates of the breaks between the meetings would be announced so that the talks could take place.

We are very perturbed that instead of one meeting of the Anglo Irish Conference being planned two such meetings are now going to take place and that the talks will not proceed until after the first week of May. Once again Dublin has sought to block the way and impede progress.

The statements made by a Fianna Fail backbencher at the weekend that Articles 2 & 3 of the Irish Constitution would not be changed as a result of the talks further illustrates the attitude Dublin is adopting. Unless the constitutional claim of Dublin over Northern Ireland as expressed in Articles 2 & 3 is deleted there can be no proper basis for real peace on this Island.

As any talks with Dublin to undo the Anglo Irish Agreement affect all the constitutional parties in the Irish Republic we suggest that all those parties might be represented at the second part of the talks aimed at considering an alternative to and replacement of the Agreement. Some of these parties might in the future be serving in a Dublin government, and as all the main constitutional parties in Northern Ireland will be at the talks, surely for a real settlement to come about their voices should also be heard. The time has surely come when the Republic must face up to the encouragement that Articles 2 & 3 have and are giving to terrorism.

We have made it clear today to the Northern Ireland Office that we resent the visit of Mr Collins to Stormont tomorrow to launch another vile attack on the UDR. This is simply adding insult to injury. He accepts the protection of the Regiment to get him safely to Stormont and then kicks them in the teeth when he gets there. Such lying attacks bode no good for the success of serious negotiations. Tomorrow we hope that the Sec Of State will be able to announce at long last the dates of the break in conference meetings so that the talks can proceed within the terms agreed with us.