

CONFIDENTIAL



16
 O M 15
 of 25/11/93
 Beta
 Deleted

F)M: Q J THOMAS, DUS(L)
 24 November 1993

Mr McKervill

cc PS/Secretary of State (L&B)
 PS/Michael Ancram (L&B, DENI)
 PS/PUS (L&B)
 PS/Mr Fell
 Mr Legge
 Mr Bell
 Mr Watkins
 Mr Williams
 Mr Wood (L&B)
 Mr Brooker
 Mr Cooke
 Mr Dodds
 Mr Maccabe
 Mr Quinn
 Mr Beeton
 Ms Lodge
 Mr Archer, RID
 Mr Caine

*Mrs McKervill
 Framework Doc.*

THE IRISH LEAKED DOCUMENT: COMMENTARY ON TEXTUAL HIGHLIGHTS

Many thanks for sending me a copy of your minute to Mr Cooke about this. I have also read with interest Mr Dew's account of his discussion with Mary Holland and his comment that it appears to be the general view in Dublin that the paper was leaked by the Spring camp worried at the green tilt of the Irish government.

2. Perhaps I could make one comment on your point concerning paragraph 16 of the leaked document. You say that you would prefer to talk of the "two major traditions that exist in Northern Ireland". The language used in the leaked document of there being two major traditions in Ireland is taken from the Anglo-Irish Agreement.

3. You suggest that it might not have proved easy to bridge the gap between our own draft and the leaked document. I suspect that is right. But in many ways the document was nonetheless encouraging. There was a reasonable chance that we could have

CONFIDENTIAL

DUSL/SMJ/43509

CONFIDENTIAL

I produced a single text though with some crucial passages in square brackets. My guess is that at least two of these: that inviting the British government to acknowledge the legitimacy and value of the goal of Irish unity, and that giving the successor IGC a role of guaranteeing and monitoring would only have been surrendered by Ministers, and perhaps only in a multi lateral exchange with the parties, as well as with the British government. If the Irish government ever does submit its proposals, whether in the form of the leaked paper or, as I assume, in some other way we may be able to test this. Sadly this may not happen for some time.

(Signed QJT)

Mr Dodds - 3
Mr Marshall - 3
Mr Lodge - 3
Mr Boston - 3
Mr Archer, BID - 3
Mr Caine - 3

Q J THOMAS
OAB 6447

THE IRISH LEAKED DOCUMENT: COMMENTARY ON TEXTUAL HIGHLIGHTS

1. Thank you for sending us a copy of your commentary on the Irish document leaked to the Irish Press on 19 November. We would not argue with your assessment of the document save to say that it might not be as easy to bridge the gap between our own draft and this one as you might imagine. In general, the substance of the document has received little criticism within the Republic of Ireland, and indeed even the Progressive Democrats leader welcomed it because it presented a balanced approach, taking account of our two traditions. There is little procedure, at the moment therefore, for the Irish to give too much away in future negotiations on the paper, if they take place. Until we know more about the circumstances of the leak, it is difficult to estimate how much room for negotiation the Irish have left themselves in the text. We must assume there is some - they would never all stake out their bottom line at this stage. But it may be that some of the constitutional language is closer to a deal or at least a basis.

2. I look forward to your next version of your discussion with Michael Anderson on 19 November. In the meantime can I ask you to see further changes to the text. Paragraph 16 contains

CONFIDENTIAL