

Sir Ninian opened the meeting by saying that, in these discussions we should accept each other's beliefs and views rather than ignoring them as irrelevant or non-existent. Even though our views will be different at times they must be looked at constructively and start from the point that we all agree that the present situation is totally inadequate. We must recognise the obstacles and try to resolve them. He concluded with the saying "One man's heresy is another's beliefs".

Ken Maginnis agreed and said that if we are dismissive of each other we will get nowhere. He said there were two possible ways of going on-- either for each delegation to prepare a list of obstacles for discussion or to appoint 1 member from each, then adjourn while this group bring together a composite list and we then move forward.

David Andrews felt this would be new departure from that already agreed by Plenary. He went on to say that he himself had addressed the question of an "obstacle list" and he would be ready at any stage to articulate on them. Maybe others could do this over the lunch-time break, he further said that he would not be happy with another committee being formed.

K. M. --said he meant that a series of conflicting lists would be confrontational and would not help progress. He cited the precedent of Strand One being conducted this way.

Ian Paisley said that they had also given consideration to obstacles and suggested a short paper from each delegation. Although, he said, they could not get any institution that would satisfy Seamus Mallon's feeling of alienation, he felt we should go down the road of identifying obstacles as we were addressing constitutional relationships. He would not be happy with another committee. We will be confrontational, consensus was almost impossible.

John Hume said that he agreed with drawing up obstacles list but he felt a positive list should be drawn up as well. He proposed that it could be drawn up by Wed., prepared on Thurs. before being presented to Plenary that evening. We should not waste any more time.

Seamus agreed that time was of the essence. He said the one of our greatest problems was that there was still a carry-over of unsolved "reservations" from Strand One. He concluded by saying that a list would be a useful exercise but he hoped that today would be more constructive than yesterday and the sooner we got into negotiation the better.

Padraig Flynn said that obstacles would be put forward constantly but it was necessary that we all express alternative points of view and try to understand the underlying

reasons for the obstacles then try to remove them and move forward.

Sir N.S. agreed that it was better to discuss than try to convert the differing points of views.

P.F. said that he agreed with J.H. that we should look at the obstacles then present proposals.

Peter Robinson said that he was the one that originally proposed in list but was concerned that when they mentioned certain obstacles they were told that they were not obstacles at all.

J.H. said that the committee hadn't discussed anything in detail yet.

I.P. said the Articles 2&3 were justified but that any change must be part of an overall package therefore obstacles raised were not dealt with properly. "we cannot accept this, we must face our problems as fears to be recognised and dealt with.

P.F. "I am prepared to accept that the UDDP have fundamental fears but the Nationalists also have fears which flow from history, legislation such as the Govt. of Ireland Act.

Sir N.S. then said that this was the sort of discussion needed.

J.H. said agreed with P.F. that we all have our own obstacles and priorities, Arts. 2&3 are not the only points of discussion. Strand 1 did list all obstacles and this was constructive. we identified each identity and showed recognition and awareness that they mattered to each. he did not want another committee but we all should draw up a list and the Chairman could suggest that we take each, in no fixed order of priority and deal with it. They don't have to be completely agreed but at least we could make some progress in removing some of the obstacles. We do have problems left over from strand 1 but these were partly due to the question of the North/South relationship and this could be dealt with here.

D.A. said that they were willing to do this and articulate in general form and later put the finer analysis on paper.

P.F. "The greatest fear is fear itself and we are currently engaged in removing these fears. I listened to Mr. Mallon and Mr. Robinson talking about obstacles but we shouldn't allow any of this to impede progress. Mr. Robinson said that people were looking for better relationships with the Irish Republic so we can look at each other's problems.

P.R. said that, in the terms of Agenda item 6 we were all looking for an improvement in relationships.

I.P. " I absolutely repudiate that anything we see as an

C

obstacle is a pre-condition. we have made it clear that we have an obstacle in the territorial claim and any attempt to justify that claim scares me. The SDLP reserved their position in Strand 1 and we now say that we all have that right. This obstacle is basic--- The Union is not negotiable at this table.

Sir N.S. said that we were all agreed that we draw up a list. It would just be a simple statement, nothing more. D.A. hoped that we could then articulate them and get down to political realities.

I.P. said that the list should only be fundamental, obstacles in terse sentences.

S.C. said the obstacles that are in the way to progress would also relate to the Strand 1 reservations.

P.F. said the list would not be exhaustive or limited but could be expanded as necessary. It would not be a paper but a list to be articulated and discussed within the committee.

I.P. the presentation must be simple.

Sir N. S. agreed.

MEETING ENDED AT 11.15, TO BE RESUMED AT 12 noon.