

five

Those of you who have contacts or experience in the medical world will know that, particularly in the past, there was a qualification that young doctors had to achieve if they wanted to jobs that might be called "The Consultants". They had to start of course by getting their basic medical qualifications and then they had to study for a while to become a member of a Royal College of Physicians or Surgeons or General Practitioners or whatever. Then they had to do a little bit more study and research and finally there was one more qualification that they had to get. It was called the BTA - "Been To America". Because everybody knew that when you had been to America, you had achieved a degree had very much idea of what you learned when you were in America. It was called the "BTA" and if you had been there you were undoubtedly one of the worthies who could become a Consultant.

"BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE"

SPEECH DELIVERED BY

DR JOHN ALDERDICE

PARTY LEADER

AT THE

ALLIANCE PARTY CONFERENCE 1994

AT BALMORAL CONFERENCE CENTRE, BELFAST

THE SPEECH WAS DELIVERED UNSCRIPTED, THIS IS A SUBSEQUENT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORDING.

If we go right away back to the early 1920's Dr Valera cited himself in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York. (The name hotel by the way

Those of you who have contacts or experience in the medical world will know that, particularly in the past, there was a qualification that young doctors had to achieve if they wanted to join that august band "The Consultants". They had to start of course by getting their basic medical qualification and then they had to study for a while to become a member of a Royal College of Physicians or Surgeons or General Practitioners or whatever. Then they had to do a little bit more study and research and finally there was one more qualification that they had to get. It was called the BTA - "Been To America". Because everybody knew that when you had Been To America, you had arrived. No-one had very much idea of what you learned when you were in America, but it was some "swell place", and if you had been there you were undoubtedly one of the worthies who could become a Consultant.

Many of you will have read the OPSAHL report last year. One of the recommendations was for increased training and professionalism amongst politicians. It would appear that the Political Leaders in Northern Ireland have accepted, this recommendation. And they haven't gone for an NVQ (National Vocational Qualification). They have gone for a BTA. And so we've all been to America.

Some of us realised from the start to have a BTA means you have to have been in America. One of the Party Leaders seem to think it meant 'Bellow to America'. Other Unionists thought it could have been done by a correspondence course. But now even they have recognised that it is important to go to America. Some people wonder why should we be involved with America at all? But apart from the enormous influence the United States President and the United States Administration has on affairs in these Islands and in Europe generally and of course throughout the world, America has always had an important part to play in the politics of this Island.

I think most people accept that whilst the Anglo Irish Agreement was negotiated between the British and Irish Governments, the pressure from the United States of America was a very important part of that process.

If we go right away back to the early 1920's De Valera sited himself in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York. (The same hotel by the way

that Mr Adams, Mr Hume and myself spoke at in early February) It was there that he was able to accumulate the financial backing to his campaign, which eventually led to the establishment of the Free State, Partition and all that has come since.

If we go back much further you know the IRA didn't first appear in Northern Ireland. In fact the IRA didn't first appear in Ireland. In 1866 a number of young people with a Fenian background attacked Canada across the border from the United States. It wasn't a very successful encounter, but they styled themselves the Irish Republican Army.

If you even go back much further than that. Go back to the event which undoubtedly, in this city of ours we will be celebrating in a few years time, the bi-centennial of the 1798 rebellion. Even there we find the influence of the United States was very significant. Whilst it was the case that the influence of the French Revolution on the United Irishman was very great, one cannot forget that the influence of the American Revolution was enormously important for those who were embarking on that particular venture. The 1798 rebellion of course is still of importance, because those who use physical force today in Republican circles trace their ancestry back to the use of physical force in the 1798 rebellion. It was there I suppose, if we can place it anywhere, that the horrible myth began to flower that violence could bring the people of this Island together. That physical force, coercion and violence would bring, Protestant, Catholic and Dissenter together. That terrible myth is still with us today. And of course as I say America played its part in things at that time.

I suppose these things influenced me as I began to think about what I might say to you today - how I might couch our thoughts about the political situation. I find myself particularly thinking about the life and experience and the views of a very great Irish American President who died on February 3rd, 70 years ago this year. Woodrow Wilson died in Washington DC on 3rd February 1924. No President before and no President since, apart from Andrew Jackson the 7th President of the United States (who was also of Scotch Irish dissent) had his family roots so recently planted in the soil of the new world. Woodrow Wilson's mother and all four grandparents came

from Scotland and Northern Ireland, and so he is someone with whom I think we find ourselves having considerable fellow feeling and perhaps myself, no less than anyone else, since he first saw the light of day in a Presbyterian Manse in Staunton, Virginia. I suppose I feel a sort of a personal feeling towards that great man who achieved very great things. There were a number of important principles which guided his life and political views.

One of them was the **Rights of the Individual**. He was passionately opposed to the notion that people should have position or privilege in society by nature of their birth or background, rather than on the basis of what they did and who they themselves were.

He was also convinced that the future of the world lay in the **Family of Nations working together**, and he wore himself literally to death trying to create the League of Nations after the First World War.

He was committed to a view that **violence is not the way to solve the problems** of the world, and he held the United States out of the First World War until a late stage, only bringing the US into the war, in order to end it as soon as possible.

He was committed to the idea not only of self-determination and rights for individuals, but also **Self-determination for all States** particularly the small States. He was an anti-imperialist and an Internationalist. And it seems to me that these are extremely important things in the world today, and no less in Northern Ireland.

This question of the rights of all the individuals in our community is terribly important. If we look back to 1798 and set aside the tragic myth that physical force can bring the people together, there is one positive element that came from it. Out of the radical dissenting tradition which was part of that movement, came and developed a view that a Bill of Rights and the recognition of Human Rights was a critical part of a democratic society. That idea was of course part of the Revolution in France; It was part of the new Constitution of the United States of America; and I think we can be encouraged that over the past 40 or 50 years this notion of rights as well as responsibilities has developed more and more fully in our

world. We in Alliance are very committed to the idea of a Bill of Rights - justiciable Rights for all our people in Northern Ireland. It is therefore with some impatience that we note yet again that whilst all the Constitutional Parties in Northern Ireland want to see a Bill of Rights the Government continues to drag its feet. Not just today, but as we move on through the rest of this year, we will continue to press the Government and press it increasingly heavily to implement what we all want to see - the opportunity for all our people to guarantee their civil rights justiciable through our own courts, and appealable right through to higher levels throughout Europe.

There are however two sides in the approach to a Bill of Rights. On one side are the rights which are justiciable and can be recognised through the courts. But there are now many other things which we regard as rights but which are social and economic rights. Things like the right to a job. These are very important rights, and I think our whole appreciation of how we value individuals is influenced not just by the question of civil rights but of economic and social rights. We have begun to apply these over the last 30 or 40 years throughout our world and of course, as a party right from the very beginning and in our first principles we recognised how important it was to have these rights recognised for all our people.

The question of the rights of women has been to the fore, and in Northern Ireland few people have played a greater part in ensuring equality of opportunities than our own Mary Clark-Glass in her work in the Equal Opportunities Commission.

We have also been committed, as one would expect, to Rights for Protestants, to Rights for Catholics, to Rights for everyone whatever their religious or racial background. We have also been concerned more recently about the rights of those who are disabled, handicapped or ill. We have been concerned too, and I have been very glad to see it as a motion on our Agenda, about the concerns of the Elderly. This party must be prepared to stand for those who are young, and for those who are older too. There should not be any discrimination on the basis of age, and we had this brought to our attention in the Year of the Older People and Solidarity between the

Generations. These are all important rights. We want to build a fair society - a fair future for all our people.

But we have to recognise that this makes enormous changes in our society. Sometimes unpredictable changes, but very real changes. Let us take for example the Rights of Women. Now it is possible for women to work in all sorts of jobs, not always as well paid as men even yet, but it has meant a major change in the opportunity available to women. That has changed the situation in our society. In 1951 only 20% of married women were in paid employment. In 1991 over 60% of married women are in paid employment. This has meant major changes in the relationship between men and women, and in the structure of the family. In the past men, not only through their physical position, and through their economic hold on life, were able to ensure that women had to stay within often unhappy marriages, from which they could not escape because they were economically tied. That situation is changing and it is changing the relationship between men and women, and within the family.

There are other ways in which there have been changes. We are not just experiencing a culture of rights, that looks for everyone to have a fair chance, we have experienced enormous changes economically. These happen so slowly that we hardly recognise them. If we go back two or three hundred years the only real industry was agriculture. If you had land or property you had economic power and political power. If you were going to work, in the main you worked on the land. In this context, the family was a very extended family, with a whole systems of relationships and with supports that we recognise still in the rural community.

In the last century we experienced an Industrial Revolution. People came off the land, into towns and into industry and commerce. More than any other part of this Island we in the North experienced the Industrial Revolution and the change that that made to society as a whole, sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. Now it was not those with land but those with industrial and commercial muscle, that were able to make the decisions in society. The family became less an extended family and more a nuclear family.

More recently we experienced another quite extraordinary Revolution in Information, Communication and Technology, and that is changing things even more dramatically. One might expect that, as we have more information and as we are able to communicate with each other right across the world, it might help bring us together. In some ways perhaps it does, and there are many ways in which it can. But there are other ways in which it is in danger of splitting us apart.

Take the question of marriage and family relationships. There are those, particularly in the run up to a European Election who will tell us, that the problem is a great moral decline. That European values are coming, in and wrecking Holy Ulster. All this family breakup and illegitimacy, and all manner of wickedness are because of the European Community. And as Mary Clark-Glass reminded us last night, Ian Paisley maintains that this is especially because it is a "Roman Catholic" European Community. When Mr Kohl, Mr Delors and Mr Mitterand get together, you may think they are getting together to talk about secular European Politics but as we were reminded last night "They are all Catholics! So now you know what they are really up to!" (So says Dr Ian Paisley).

Lets look at the facts. Lets look at the illegitimacy rates. In the early 1980's in Northern Ireland they accounted for about 8% of births, and in the European Community it was actually a little bit less between 7% & 8%. But in Britain it was between 12% and 15%. In the 1990's it has of course increased to around 18% in Northern Ireland. In the European Union it is between 17% & 18%. But in the United Kingdom about 30% of births are outside of marriage. The reality is that there are changes taking place that simply cannot be ascribed to some kind of moral decay because of the European Union. Major changes are taking place in the whole fabric of our life.

In the old days, when people were working on farms, or later working in industrial and commercial concerns, life was hard. People weren't very well fed and that meant that physically they matured a little bit later and got married a little bit later. Now people get married earlier because physically they mature earlier. In the past people had very little leisure life together because they were working hard from morning to night. People had little leisure time, and when they eventually retired, often through illness, disease or

malnutrition they died early. The marriage contact in those days didn't involve you spending too long with your marriage partner. You saw a bit of them from time to time. You didn't have holidays of any great length and the men in particular died early. It isn't like that any more.

Young people mature earlier. They marry or get into relationships much earlier. They have more leisure time. They have more holidays, (some of them in unfortunately enforced leisure in the form of redundancy or unemployment). They live longer and spend more time together than they ever really contracted for in previous generations. Those things are making irrevocable, irretrievable changes in our society. They are creating difficulties in families, in marriages and in relationships between parents and children. Throughout the world 30% of families are one parent families. Professor Dumo has demonstrated recently that in Europe only 30% of families have two parents. These are enormous social changes that are taking place.

This is why the United Nations, having looked at Human Rights, having had a Year for Women, a Year for the Handicapped, and a Year for the Elderly and Solidarity between the Generations, has decided that this year, 1994, shall be the Year of the Family. And rightly so, because the family is an increasingly complex building block for society throughout the world. There are those who tell us that they tell us they support family values. What they generally mean is - the man out working, the woman at the sink; and two children seen but not heard. I hope I have demonstrated to you that there is no point in people pretending that they can turn back the clock to a world that doesn't exist anymore. We now have our right recognition of Human Rights. That means everyone has a right to have their chance, their opportunity, their respect and dignity. We have social, economic and technological changes that influence in a massive way the whole question of relationships. That is why when the United Nations talks about a Year for the Family it does not give us a motto that says lets get "Back to Basics". It gives us a motto that says, the Year of the Family shall be based on "Building the Smallest Democracy at the Heart of Society". Our families should be a place of mutual respect whatever the age, whatever the stage. Whether male or female, young or old, health or disabled, we must

respect each other, and we build a respectful family unit in all its complexity, but with care. Care must be the central feature of relationships within the family. It is the place of caring and if we are to build a society that has any future it has to be a society based too, on caring.

When we talk about Building for the Future in the Alliance Party we talk about building a fair future - Building a prosperous future - future that look towards the future and not towards the past. A future based on families in society, with all the complexity that that involves and families too of communities, and families of Nations. That brings us back to Woodrow Wilson. I said to you that he wore himself out trying to persuade the Nations of the World to accept a League of Nations. And as you know some of those least prepared to accept the League of Nations were his own people in America.

The League of Nations was not successful in preventing a terrible Second World War. But an idea like that doesn't die because it was unsuccessful the first time round, and after the Second World War, the United Nations was created. And the idea went further, because people Monnet and Schumann realised that it was not merely possible to do this at a World level. We should, they said be doing it in different parts of the world. We should be doing it in Europe. This place which was not just a cradle of civilisation, but also the cradle of mass destruction. Such terrible wars must not be allowed to occur again. So the Coal and Steel Community was born and we have moved since then to the European Economic Community, to the European Community now to the European Union - a family of regions, of peoples, and nations. And at times we almost lose sight of the extraordinary and historic process in which we participate when we campaign as we will be doing very energetically for Mary Clark-Glass, in the European Election. It is a historic process and it is our privilege to try to ensure that it has the best possible outcome. And in our own little place a positive outcome would be a new representative for Northern Ireland in Europe - Mary.

Recently another Mary spoke about the United Nations in a fascinating and quite extraordinary speech in Harvard in the United States. President Mary Robinson spoke about our world and

particular about the United Nations. She picked out four principles which must guide the future of that Family of Nations. As I read them, I smiled, because I thought to myself, "Those are Alliance principles".

First of all Connectedness. We live in a world together. We can't separate ourselves off as Sinn Fein 'Ourselves Alone', or as some kind of little Ulstermen or little Englanders. We are all connected up together. We have got to recognise that, we have got to value it, and build on it.

But not just connectedness, also listening. My goodness that's a big new word for Northern Ireland politics - listening to each other, understanding each other's background, culture, civilisation and approach to life. We can't find it out, if we don't listen to the other person. More than anything else in our party, our strength is, that we listen to each other, coming from different backgrounds.

Then, Sharing. That has to be our way forward. We do share this world. We do share this piece of ground. We have no option, even if we wanted to. Our opportunity is to share it in a way that benefits all of us.

And the final Principle after **connectedness** and **listening** and **sharing** is one that is no stranger to the Alliance Party, Participation - everybody involved in working together; not just the politicians and the political classes, but the non governmental organisations, the voluntary organisations, all those who play a part in the community, from top to bottom, from East to West, from North to South. Are those not the principles upon which our Party was founded, and on which we continue to campaign?

As we look to the future we must apply these principles in our own situation. Can we get any guidance from this man Woodrow Wilson. He talked about Rights. He talked about a Family of Nations. He was against violence and against coercion. My goodness if there is one thing that we have got to stand against in Northern Ireland it is violence and coercion. Jim Hendron was saying last night that the big division in our community is not between Protestant and

Catholic, Unionist or Nationalist, but between those who use violence for political ends and those who are committed democrats.

This very month, this very week, this very morning, we find ourselves yet again having to stand out against violence and those who would use it as a political instrument. Let us be very clear in what we say. "Violence is **wrong**". There are those who say that violence is counter productive. There are some who say the reasons for violence are out of date. I say to you that violence was never ever justified and whether or not it is counterproductive, it is wrong.

Some will look to other parts of the world and say "They were violent, there and look at the changes it has made". Frequently these analogies are entirely false as I will point out in a few minutes, but first let me say this. Anywhere in the world where there is a free press where you can express your view and a free ballot where you can express your vote, there is no justification for violence, as a political instrument, not anywhere.

I think that as last night we stood in silence to remember those who have been injured, maimed or killed in 25 years of violence. We should also recognise, and in our hearts pay tribute to those who protect us from the violence. To those who heal our wounds when we suffer from the violence. To those who protect and counsel and encourage and sustain those against whom there has been terrible violence, and whose very names we have forgotten because there have been so many. But especially we want to remember those of the police and other security forces and all those who assist them in Northern Ireland and in the Republic of Ireland and in the United Kingdom.

All of these general principles I have applied to Northern Ireland, and there is one further one. Remember the fourth thing I said about Woodrow Wilson was his commitment to Self-determination. He explained exactly what he meant in 1918 when he was talking about how there should be a settlement. He said "Every settlement, whether of territory, or sovereignty or economic arrangement or political relationship, must be based on the acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned". That is what self-

determination is about and surely if we look at our part of the world, we are the people immediately concerned. The people of Northern Ireland - all of us, both sides, we are the people immediately concerned. There are others in London, who are concerned. There are others concerned in Dublin. There are some others with an interest who look in from afar. But it is the people of Northern Ireland who are **immediately concerned**.

When I met on the first occasion, with Mr Reynolds, the Taoiseach to explore with him how he viewed the future, this was the question I asked him "Who should decide?" and he was clear. He has since made it very publicly clear. These principles of the Rights of the People who live here, all of them, individually and collectively; the importance of economic development and prosperity; the relationship of families of communities in this Island, all of them; the commitment that there shall be no coercion by violence; and the acceptance and affirmation that the people **immediately concerned** (the people of Northern Ireland) shall decide their future is there in the Downing Street Declaration signed in December 1993. That is why this Party is able to give its full and unequivocal backing to this Declaration in a way we have never been able to give our backing to any other joint government declaration in the past. We can be full hearted and clear in our support of the Downing Street Declaration.

It talks about building a fair future, it talks about rights. The right of free political thought the right of freedom of expression and religion, the right to pursue democratically political aspirations, the right to seek constitutional change by peaceful and legitimate means, the right to live wherever one chooses without hindrance, the right to equal opportunity in all social and economic activity regardless of class, creed, or sex. Can you see why I speak of a Bill of Rights, a Human Rights approach, an appreciation not just of Civil and Human Rights but of Social and Economic Rights? This is something upon which we stand four-square, and it is here, in the Declaration. When we talk about social and economic co-operation it is there too, The Declaration talks about the real future for this whole island depending on us co-operating on economic matters together. It talks about the co-operation there can be between all the different participants, the "totality

of relations", as it has previously been described. But particularly it says the people of Northern Ireland must determine their own future, uncoerced.

Now let me concentrate for the rest my time on the whole political dimension. The question in your minds must be, "How can this be put into operation? We have had plenty of plans and principles. Alliance has its own Governing With Consent document. Having a plan is not the problem. The problem is, how to implement it. Of course all the people of Northern Ireland have the right to a say. But I don't believe that any of us should have a veto over political progress. Great efforts were made in this Declaration to ensure that everyones rights were protected. Nobody has to sacrifice a principle that is true or honourable. But it is clear that there are some who do not want to be part of a solution. Can you imagine how the Nationalist community would have felt if, for the last four months, Mr Major and Mr Reynolds had spent their time analysing and concentrating on every peculiar nuance of tne speeches of Ian Paisley? Can you image what people would have thought and said if it had become clear that neither government was prepared to move without the say so of "Big Ian". That every time he stood up to speak all the cameramen were clicking, and all the reporters making historial analyses and references and talking about how to "get him off the hook" and "smooth his path". There would have been outrage, and quite rightly so.

And yet compare Dr Paisley's electoral mandate with that of the man who has had the cameras clicking, and the reporters paying attention. I don't ask any more for one side than I ask for the other. And in the case of Ian Paisley, he at least he says he is opposed to violence for political ends, even if sometimes he acts a little differently. No friends, I don't believe that we should be placing our futures in the hands of extremists on **either** side. I think it is extremely foolish for people to make analogies which don't stand up. All of us want peace. Some of us are even prepared to make real compromises for peace. But there are a number of different analyses of the problem. And I think we beg to differ from some of the strategies for peace which have been outlined in recent months, and which seem increasingly threadbare.

There are those for example who say "Look at the Middle East. Isn't the Israeli Government sitting down with the opposition?" I have often pointed out that Mr Rabin had to turn his back on Jewish fundamentalists and Mr Arafat had to turn his back on extremists amongst the Palestinians in order to reach forward and link hands across that historic divide.

Let me be quite crystal clear about it. Sinn Fein is not the PLO of Northern Ireland. The PLO represents the vast majority of Palestinians. They are prepared to engage in a deal. They were prepared to give up any support for terrorism and violence. Sinn Fein is not the PLO of Northern Ireland - it is the Hamas of Northern Ireland, that absolutely refuses to accept any possibility of moving forward democratically. And it seeks to continue to use terrorism to disrupt any kind of deal between Jews and Arabs. That is the proper analogy (I doubt very much if I have to treat you to an exposition of who are the equivalent of the Jewish fundamentalists!).

Some of you may have been puzzled but that most perhaps you understand, that is why when I decided to take an initiative a month or so ago, I wrote to **two** of the political leaders, not to all. I wrote to Mr Molyneux and Mr Hume. I said to them that the situation is a serious one, and I thought that we should meet and try to find out how we move ahead. As you know Mr Molyneux replied, and we had a meeting quite soon afterwards. It was a very useful meeting indeed. A very constructive meeting. I was encouraged by it and indeed our Parties agreed that three members of his Party's Talks Team and three members of our Party's Talks Team should meet. We have done that, and we will be meeting again in the very relatively near future to pursue our explorations. I have also this week received a positive response from Mr Hume. His schedule does not permit that the two of us meet in the very near future, therefore arrangements are in train with three senior members of his Party's Talks Team and three senior members of our Party to do some preliminary work, after which he and I will come together with them.

We are determined to do everything that we can, and there are others in the more reasonable constitutional parties who also want to do everything they can, to build up the framework, the network, the

fabric of democracy in Northern Ireland. I would like to believe that the Talks Process in which Mr Ancram is engaged would be running along side of this. Indeed if it had been intensified as the Prime Minister had undertaken some months ago, there might have been no need for this initiative on our part. But it was not intensified and that is no surprise; therefore those of us who are prepared to be responsible, will act responsibly.

There is a part that the two governments must play. You will know that this is a subject to which I am returning rather than coming to for the first time. At the Conference last year I called on the two governments to 'kick-start' the talks process by moving into Strand 3 mode. Not very long after that I met with Mr Major and Mr Reynolds and I urged them to pursue an initiative together. If that call and those conversations played any small part in their decision to embark upon the Downing Street Declaration then I am extremely grateful. But I come back to them again this year, because having produced a balanced, thoughtful, historic document in the Downing Street Declaration, I am disappointed that to date they have not built upon it. I believe they have waited too long. I am not saying that anyone should close the door to those on the fringes or extremes. The door should remain open, but it should also be made clear that the price for coming in through the door, is a preparedness to abide by the rules of democracy.

Meanwhile, the peace train should be moving out of the station and if there are others who choose to catch us up at the next stop and are prepared to pay the price of the fare then they will be welcome at that point. But for us, we must move on. The British Government must surely finally produce for us what they have undertaken to produce for months and months - Proposals for the internal government for Northern Ireland. They are quite prepared to tell us how to run the Health Service, how to run the Electricity Service, how to run the Education Service, how to run the Police Service and the Civil Service and the Water Service; but they seem to have a bit of a problem when it comes to the Political Service. I really think it is about time that they put down on paper how they propose Northern Ireland should be governed internally. And then consult with those who are prepared to be constructive, and consult with them.

I would also like to see from the Irish Government some flesh on the bones of the calls for North South Institutions. The notion that there should be some kind of co-operative structures is not a problem for us. We have made our own proposals. But whilst we have heard a lot of calls, we have yet to see on paper what the Irish Government would propose. Why don't the British and Irish Governments get together and produce some joint proposals, some realistic proposals, and consult with those of us who are prepared to work together. That's what we used to call Strand 2. And then London and Dublin have things to work out together on their own part. But let's move **ahead** with the whole thing. Some people in Northern Ireland, (those who are not in danger of being blown to death are in danger of being bored to death) by the failure of the governments to move forward..

There is of course another element to the Downing Street Declaration; the Forum for Peace and Reconciliation. As you know, shortly after the Declaration was published, I met with Mr Reynolds, and when I satisfied myself he was not proposing some simple Nationalist Forum for Nationalist Politicians; that he genuinely wanted something which was more open and broader; I said that the Alliance Party would be prepared to participate. It would be a great disappointment for me if I were to find that such a Forum was really only there for some parties, and was able to be vetoed by other parties.

I don't think that any of the parties on this Island should be vetoing that Forum for Peace and Reconciliation. Empty chairs can be left for those who feel unable or are not in a position to attend, but the rest of us could get on and do useful business, and when others choose to come along they can play their part as well.

So there are things that the two governments can do to help things move forward. Of course, there is a great lack of trust. Nationalists don't trust the British Government. That goes without saying. The Unionists don't trust the British Government either. I recall something that Edward Carson said in the House of Lords in 1933. He said "I belong I believe to a party called the Unionist Party" he actually meant the Conservative and Unionist Party. "I cannot think why it is called the Unionist Party", he said "Unless

it is to convey to the people of this country that it is the Party that betrayed the Unionists." During the Second World War many soldiers from this part of the world and many soldiers from the rest of the United Kingdom fought together and some cases died together and that forged a sense of comradeship.

But the last Westminster election saw all of those who had had that war-time experience, passing on from Westminster, and I believe that those who now tread the corridors of power in the Conservative Party, as in other parties there, have no great emotional attachment to Northern Ireland.

It has to be said that sometimes when words are used, even by our dearly beloved Secretary of State, they do not convey a message that produces confidence. Now I understand that since he has "BIA" as part of his research, he has produced a new slogan for Northern Ireland - one that will help us move along. It is, "No Surrender". I have to say to Sir Patrick, who is a very nice gentleman. "This is not a new slogan. We have heard it before, and it didn't solve our problems then either". Of course I know he will say there must be a surrender of guns and bombs, but "no surrender of principle". I have some sympathy with what he is saying, but I think he is giving the wrong message. When this party was one founded, it was founded on the basis of honourable compromise. Those from a Nationalist background were prepared to give up certain things in return for a united **Northern** Ireland. Those on the Unionist side were prepared to give up some aspects of the Union, particularly the notion of integration, for the sake of a united **Northern** Ireland. I think it would be much more helpful instead of pointing out to people the things they **don't** have to surrender, to point out to those in the sectional parties in Northern Ireland that there will be **no** honourable compromise, **no** resolution unless each side **is** prepared (whether you use the word **surrender** or whether you use the word sacrifice or whether you would rather talk about **giving some things up**, but there will be no compromise) without **giving some things up**. That is the message each side needs to hear. Not the fact that they **don't** have to give anything up. They are pretty strong on that already, on both sides.

I suppose the final question is in all our minds is, "What are the prospects? What are the possibilities?" I have mapped out the background, I have tried to indicate the way forward - the parts to be played by the two governments who I believe are the ones with the levers of power and therefore the highest level of responsibility. But what are the real prospects. I'm not generally regarded as a nopeless optimist. In fact there are some in the media who regard me as a cautious pessimist. As you know in the past at Party Conferences, when I have been trying to describe what the prospects really are, I have been cautious and I haven't over-stated things, when I don't really believe they are going to go anywhere. But I have been looking very seriously at how things have developed. In particular I am aware of enormous pressures. Not the war-weariness. We have been weary of it for a long time. Not just the increasing revulsion and sense of sickening about some of the recent outrages, because truth to tell, we had those before as well. But from outside of Northern Ireland there are major pressures going on. How long we have waited for a British Prime Minister and an Irish Prime Minister, both at the same time, to not only express commitment to resolving this problem, but to show commitment to resolving it, by giving their time and their energy and expending their political capital in reaching agreements together which can form the basis for a resolution. That is an important pressure. A pressure that can be exerted on both sides to bring them to the centre.

And we have Europe, and very importantly we have America. I do believe that these are very important pressures. They are a bit like a steamroller. They may not move quickly but they are powerful, unstoppable and will flatten anything in their path - even the "dreary steeples". And so I say to you, that I believe, having weighed up the realities, some of which I have spelled out to you, and others of which you yourselves are aware, I believe that as this decade moves to a close we are going to find the resolving of our problem. We are going to find the way to rid ourselves of the terrible symptom of violence. We are on our way to putting the ancient feud into the pages of history. I do believe that we are on our way, and not far away. We cannot bind the future, we cannot predict the future, but you can have a sense of the future. And whilst it is always possible for foolishness or malevolence to

thrust peace aside I do believe that as this decade, this century, this millenium draws to a close, it will draw a veil over a tragic past, and open up for our people a bright future.

I have said quite a lot about one great Irish-American politician of the 20th Century, but I leave you with the words of the other great Irish American Democrat politician of the 20th Century - John F Kennedy. He said "It is not our task to fix the blame for the past but to fix the course for the future". That is what our party is about. Building for the future. Building a fair future for all our people. A prosperous future, a future which nourishes our families of individuals, our families of communities, the families of nations. But more than anything else, building a future of Peace. And I believe that if we move in the direction that I have outlined, it is a future that is not too far away.