

UNITED KINGDOM

UN Report criticizes emergency law practices in Northern Ireland

Amnesty International welcomes the report by Param Cumaraswamy, the United Nations (UN) Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, on his fact-finding mission to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK) in October 1997.¹ The report highlighted the lack of safeguards for suspects arrested under emergency legislation, including restrictions on access to legal advice, and made a number of recommendations aimed at ensuring respect for the rule of law and human rights. Amnesty International joined other international non-governmental organizations² in urging the UK Government to implement the recommendations of the UN Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers (Special Rapporteur).

The continued abrogation of basic human rights in Northern Ireland has played a central role in the conflict in Northern Ireland. Previous UK governments have hidden behind secrecy and internal inquiries to avoid being accountable for human rights violations by its agents in Northern Ireland. They have ignored the recommendations of international treaty bodies as well as some of their own internal inquiries. The protection of fundamental human rights has been seen as secondary to the maintenance of a high level of security.

The new government has an opportunity to reassert the primacy of the protection of human rights in Northern Ireland. The incorporation of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (European Convention) into national law is a first step towards implementing its international obligations. The government should move swiftly to establish a Human Rights Commission, which would have full and effective powers to strengthen human rights protection.

Amnesty International welcomes the commitments expressed in recent government statements to emphasize issues of fairness and justice in Northern Ireland. The organization believes strongly that the protection of human rights and the strengthening of a human rights culture are central to a lasting peace. Amnesty International also believes that a lasting peace has to be built on the basis of full accountability of the security forces for their actions and redress for the victims of human rights violations.

¹ Report on the mission of the Special Rapporteur to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 5 March 1998, E/CN.4/1998/39/Add.4.

² Amnesty International, the International Commission of Jurists, Human Rights Watch, the International Federation of Human Rights and the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights issued a joint statement on 31 March 1998 on the Special Rapporteur's report (see EUR 45/08/98).

Given the persistence of human rights violations perpetrated in Northern Ireland, there is a particular need for the government to take action on a number of issues, including policing and emergency legislation provisions, with a view to increasing the protection of human rights in Northern Ireland.

One of the striking features about the human rights situation is the fact that there is less human rights protection for people in Northern Ireland than in the rest of the UK. The lower standards in the administration of justice have resulted in a lack of accountability and impunity. The government must take measures to ensure that all laws and procedures throughout the UK conform with international standards.

Emergency Legislation

Amnesty International considers that many provisions in the emergency legislation are in breach of international treaties and standards and urges the government to ensure that all legislation is in conformity with such standards.

1. Special interrogation centres

There is no statutory basis for the existence of the special police interrogation centres in Northern Ireland, which are used for the detention of suspects arrested under emergency legislation – the most notable being Castlereagh Holding Centre in Belfast. They have been the subject of many allegations of police ill-treatment and torture since the 1970s. Although the number of complaints of ill-treatment in the interrogation centres have decreased, in 1995 there were 80 formal complaints of assault lodged against the interrogating officers out of a total of 191 cases of complaint and in 1996 there were 26 out of a total of 85 cases. In many instances people have alleged that they were forced into making an involuntary or untrue confession because of ill-treatment or under duress. Amnesty International also continued to receive complaints of verbal and psychological abuse and of threats of violence, as well as complaints that detectives made comments about the suspects' lawyers which amount to harassment and intimidation, including death threats. Despite the allegations, there continue to be inadequate safeguards for the protection of suspects detained in these special centres.

Suspects detained in the special interrogation centres can be held for up to seven days without judicial scrutiny of their detention. They can be denied access to lawyers for 48 hours and then for consecutive 48-hour periods up to seven days. Interrogations are not audio-recorded and lawyers are not allowed to attend interrogations with their clients. Similar interrogation centres do not exist in the rest of the UK. Suspects arrested under emergency legislation in Britain are detained in police stations and are permitted to have their lawyers present during interrogation.

Amnesty International has urged the government to comply with the recommendation of the UN Human Rights Committee in July 1995 and the Independent Commissioner for the Holding Centres to close down Castlereagh interrogation centre. The government should detain suspects arrested under emergency legislation in designated police stations.³

2. Access to legal counsel

In order to protect the rights of suspects interrogated under emergency legislation in Northern Ireland, suspects must be given immediate access to legal advice and permitted to be interrogated in the presence of their lawyers. The government should guarantee these essential safeguards immediately. Not only would these measures protect suspects' rights, they would also hamper police abuse of lawyers. Full legal assistance is additionally necessary because of legislation which curbs a suspect's right to silence during interrogation and lowers the standard for the admissibility of confession evidence in court.

The European Court of Human Rights ruled in February 1996 that John Murray was wrongfully denied access to a lawyer at Castlereagh interrogation centre in Northern Ireland. The denial violated his right to a fair hearing under Article 6 of the European Convention. The Court said that it was "of paramount importance" that John Murray should have been given access to legal advice as soon as questioning began, because of legislation which curbs a suspect's right of silence during interrogation. The European Commission of Human Rights had stated in the same case:

"Restrictions on an accused's access to his lawyer and the refusal to allow the lawyer to attend during examinations of his client may influence the material position of the defence at trial, and therefore also the outcome of the proceedings. The Court and the Commission have accordingly considered that guarantees of Article 6 [of the European Convention] normally extend to an accused the right to assistance and support by a lawyer throughout the proceedings."⁴

The government has still not introduced legislation in order to comply with this judgment.

³ Both of these recommendations have been repeated by Sir Louis Blom Cooper, the Independent Commissioner for the Holding Centres, in his fifth annual report released 27 March 1998. He also recommended that detainees arrested under emergency legislation should be interviewed under ordinary law regulations.

⁴ European Commission of Human Rights report on the *Murray v UK* case, 27 June 1994.

Recent court judgments have rejected legal challenges to the police's refusal to allow lawyers to attend interviews.⁵ The House of Lords stated: "The differential treatment of persons suspected of having committed offences under the terrorism provisions in Northern Ireland was plainly part of a deliberate legislative policy. It was the clearly expressed will of Parliament that persons arrested should not have the right to have a solicitor present during interview."⁶

The Special Rapporteur recommended that the right to immediate access to legal counsel should be respected and that the emergency power of deferral of legal access for 48 hours should be prohibited. He further stated:

"In the view of the Special Rapporteur, it is desirable to have the presence of an attorney during police interrogations as an important safeguard to protect the rights of the accused. The absence of legal counsel gives rise to the potential for abuse, particularly in a state of emergency where more serious criminal acts are involved. In the case at hand, the harsh conditions found in the holding centres of Northern Ireland and the pressure exerted to extract confessions further dictate that the presence of a solicitor is imperative."⁷

3. Other fair trial safeguards

Further safeguards should be introduced immediately, including the audio-recording of all interrogations. Video-recording facilities are being installed in the interrogation centres, but without audio-recording as well, verbal abuse of the suspects or their lawyers cannot be detected. The government should also end its derogation of the relevant provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the European Convention and provide prompt judicial scrutiny of detentions.

Another vital safeguard is the introduction of a system to investigate complaints of police ill-treatment which would ensure that allegations are promptly, thoroughly and independently investigated and that the perpetrators of ill-treatment are brought to justice. An independent review of the complaints procedures in Northern Ireland, published in January 1997, recommended the appointment of a Police Ombudsman. The duty of the Police Ombudsman would be to investigate complaints against the police by using his or her own staff of independent investigators. The government introduced draft legislation, the Police

⁵Judicial reviews: *In Re Begley's Application*, 1996; *Re Russell's Application*, 1996; *Re: Floyd's Application*, 1997; *Re: Palmer and Palmer's Application*, 1997.

⁶ *R v Chief Constable of the RUC, Ex parte Begley and R v McWilliams*, October 1997.

⁷ See Report on the mission of the Special Rapporteur to the UK, para.47.

(Northern Ireland) Bill, which provides for "formal investigation" by the Police Ombudsman of serious complaints against individual members of the police force. Such a formal investigation involves the Police Ombudsman appointing an officer of the Ombudsman to conduct the investigation. This officer has the powers of a police officer. The Ombudsman also has the discretion to investigate formally any other complaint against an individual police officer, or if there is no complaint, the Ombudsman can formally investigate an incident if s/he believes it is in the public interest. Amnesty International is concerned that the draft bill does not make any provision for the Ombudsman to examine complaints about the "direction and control of the police force by the Chief Constable". There is no provision for the Ombudsman to initiate an investigation into perceived patterns of abuse. This is especially disturbing, given the various issues highlighted by Amnesty International over the years which have not been investigated independently and thoroughly. Such issues include interrogation methods, disputed killings by police officers, allegations of collusion by the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) with Loyalist paramilitary groups, and methods of crowd control including the firing of plastic bullets.

The Special Rapporteur has recommended that the government provide the Police Ombudsman with the necessary financial and human resources to enable him/her to carry out the work.

4. Intimidation and harassment of lawyers

The Special Rapporteur visited the UK in October 1997 to investigate allegations he had received since 1994 of a pattern of police officers making abusive remarks about defence lawyers in Northern Ireland, particularly about lawyers who represent suspects arrested under emergency legislation. The Special Rapporteur described the allegations of abuse as ranging from mild forms of harassment and interference in the solicitor/client relationship, to physical abuse and/or death threats. In his report he cited examples of the harassment and intimidation of lawyers, including a recent physical assault of one lawyer. He also focussed on the killing of the lawyer, Patrick Finucane, in 1989.

The Special Rapporteur stated that he viewed with concern allegations that solicitors acted on behalf of paramilitaries. He illustrated this concern with the following account of his discussion with the Chief Constable of the RUC:

“The Chief Constable alluded to an agenda in which the paramilitary organizations ensured that detainees remain silent and alleged that solicitors may be involved in conveying this message to the detainees. Further, he stated that there is in fact a political divide in Northern Ireland and part of the political agenda is to portray the RUC as part of the unionist tradition. These

allegations concerning police intimidation and harassment of solicitors is part and parcel of this political agenda.”⁸

The Special Rapporteur concluded "that the RUC has engaged in activities which constitute intimidation [of lawyers], hindrance, harassment or improper interference" and that such practices were systematic. He also expressed particular concern that the RUC identifies lawyers who represent those accused of terrorist-related offences with their clients or their clients' causes as a result of discharging their functions.⁹ He urged the authorities to conduct an independent and impartial investigation of all threats to legal counsel in Northern Ireland, preferably through the proposed Police Ombudsman.

On 14 January 1998, 33 lawyers from Northern Ireland issued a statement expressing "grave concern at the failure of the rule of law and the relative immunity from prosecution of members of the security forces who have violated basic human rights and contravened national and international laws". The statement addresses a series of issues, including the "intimidation and abuse of solicitors by police officers via their clients in detention centres. We are all too aware of this continuing problem, which is one we face in our daily lives".¹⁰

The Killing of Patrick Finucane

Patrick Finucane, a prominent criminal defence and civil rights lawyer, was killed in 1989 by a Loyalist armed group, the Ulster Defence Association/Ulster Freedom Fighters. Their assertion that he had been an "IRA member" was refuted by the police.

The killing of Patrick Finucane took place in the context of frequent allegations that police officers made threats against, or derogatory comments about, defence lawyers to detainees held in special interrogation centres. There was evidence that Patrick Finucane was one of several lawyers being particularly targeted by the security forces in the late 1980s. After his murder, strong evidence emerged which suggested official collusion by members of military intelligence with Loyalist paramilitaries in his killing.¹¹ No one has been brought to justice to date.

⁸ Report on the mission of the Special Rapporteur to the UK, para. 21.

⁹ See Report on the mission of the Special Rapporteur to the UK, para. 90.

¹⁰ For the full text of the lawyers' statement, see Appendix to this document.

¹¹ For details about the killing of Patrick Finucane, see *United Kingdom: Political Killings in Northern Ireland*, February 1994, AI Index: EUR 45/01/94.

The 33 Northern Ireland lawyers stated in January: "We remain particularly concerned at the circumstances of the murder of our esteemed professional colleague, Pat Finucane. It is simply unacceptable, that faced with compelling evidence of state involvement in the killing of a defence lawyer, no action has been taken. Serious allegations of collusion between members of illegal loyalist organisations and members of the security forces have yet to be properly investigated."

Amnesty International supports the Special Rapporteur's recommendation that the government initiate an independent and thorough judicial inquiry into the circumstances of the killing of Patrick Finucane. Such an inquiry is inextricably linked to the need for a thorough, independent and wide-ranging inquiry into collusion. Fresh evidence has emerged of collusion between military intelligence officers and Loyalist paramilitaries in the killing of suspected IRA members. Reports in the media¹² revealed that a covert unit of military intelligence, the Force Research Unit, recruited Loyalist Brian Nelson in 1987 and infiltrated him into the Ulster Defence Association (UDA). His role in the UDA was to ensure that "only legitimate targets" (ie. IRA members) were killed. Files which have been disclosed detail accounts of meetings between Brian Nelson and his army handlers, and demonstrate the complicity of the handlers in killings. One account, dated 3 May 1988, stated that the Loyalists' "targeting has developed and is now more professional". The army's records reportedly show that Brian Nelson was involved in at least 15 murders, 15 attempted murders and 62 conspiracies to murder. It has previously been alleged that Brian Nelson told his army handlers that Patrick Finucane was being targeted by the UDA.¹³

5. Diplock Courts

"Diplock Courts" were established under emergency legislation in 1973 to try serious offences linked to alleged terrorist activities. These single-judge and juryless courts do not exist in England, even though people in England are tried for the same offences. There are a number of people who have been convicted in these courts who claim to be victims of miscarriages of justice. Amnesty International has been concerned that lower standards for the admissibility of confession evidence, lack of full disclosure by the prosecution to the defence of crucial evidence, and the curtailment of the right of silence have resulted in unfair trials. The Special Rapporteur recommended that the standards in emergency legislation for admitting confession evidence should be abolished. He further recommended that the "restoration of the jury system, which has been a culture within the criminal justice system in England, would help restore public confidence in the administration of justice".¹⁴

¹² Sunday Telegraph, 29 March 1998.

¹³ See *United Kingdom: Political Killings in Northern Ireland*, February 1994, AI Index: EUR 45/01/94. See also Report on the mission of the Special Rapporteur to the UK, paras. 63-66.

¹⁴ See Report on the mission of the Special Rapporteur to the UK, para. 83.

6. Other fair trial concerns in the United Kingdom

Amnesty International believes that the historically recognized right to remain silent both during initial police interviews and during trial should be re-instated.¹⁵ The organization believes that the current laws which curtail the right of silence violate Article 14(3)(g) of the ICCPR which guarantees the right not to be compelled to testify against oneself or confess guilt and Article 14(2) which guarantees the presumption of innocence. The Special Rapporteur recommended that the right to silence should be immediately re-instated.

New legislation, the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996, reduces defence lawyers' access to information, held by the prosecution, about all the potential evidence in a case and how it was collected. Recent miscarriages of justice, including the Bridgewater Four, the Guildford Four and the Ballymurphy Six, have shown the importance of allowing the defence to have full disclosure of all the evidence. The lack of full disclosure may violate the international fair trial principle of equality of arms to both parties in criminal proceedings. The withholding of information by the prosecution from the defence is contrary to the UN Guidelines on the Role of Prosecutors and the UN Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers.

7. "Closed" visits in England

Amnesty International is concerned that the Special Security Units (SSUs), in which "exceptional escape risk" Category A prisoners¹⁶ are held, constitute cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and deny remand prisoners their right to a fair trial in violation of the United Kingdom's obligations under international treaties.¹⁷ The SSU is a prison within a prison.

The conditions within the SSUs have seriously impeded remand prisoners' right to a fair trial, both because they undermine the defendants' mental and physical capacity to prepare their defence and because they restrict the facilities for the preparation of the

¹⁵ See *United Kingdom: Fair trial concerns in Northern Ireland: the right of silence*, November 1992, AI Index: EUR 45/02/92.

¹⁶ Prisoners, on remand or convicted of serious offences, can be categorized as Category A if their escape is considered as highly dangerous to the public or the police or to the security of the state. Category A prisoners are divided into three sub-categories: standard risk, high risk and exceptional risk (of escape).

¹⁷ For more detailed information, see *United Kingdom: Special Security Units: Cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment*, March 1997 (AI Index: EUR 45/06/97).

prisoners' defence through "closed" legal visits. A "closed" visit means that the defendant is separated from the lawyer by a glass barrier and communication is via a telephone or grill. Lawyers have stated that such legal visits severely hampered their ability to communicate with their clients and to prepare their clients' defence in an effective and constructive way.

The Special Rapporteur found that "in the absence of evidence that solicitors are abusing their professional responsibilities, the closed visits within the SSUs constitute an undue interference with the lawyer/client relationship and create unnecessary impediments for adequate trial preparation".¹⁸

Amnesty International has urged the government to carry out a review of the "security" measures which have been implemented within the British prison regime, in order to ensure that such measures do not amount to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of prisoners.

Amnesty International's reaction to the UK Government's response to the Special Rapporteur's Report

Param Cumaraswamy delivered his report to the UN Commission on Human Rights on 1 April 1998. The government human rights body in Northern Ireland, the Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights¹⁹, and non-governmental organizations all welcomed the Special Rapporteur's report. The UK delegation to the Commission did not make an oral response to the Special Rapporteur's report²⁰. In a written response, which was circulated at the Commission, the government stated that it would: introduce audio-recording in special interrogation centres; introduce a system of independent investigations into individual complaints against the police; and initiate training programmes for the judiciary prior to the incorporation of the European Convention into national law. In addition, the government will be introducing a proposal for permanent counter-terrorism legislation which will address issues of legal access, the lower standard of proof for admissibility of confession evidence, and others.

¹⁸ See Report on the mission of the Special Rapporteur to the UK, para. 53.

¹⁹ In the statement dated 1 April 1998, SACHR said: "Many of the wide range of issues covered by the report have previously been highlighted as matters of concern .. In particular, SACHR's long-standing recommendations for increased safeguards for those detained and prosecuted under emergency legislation."

²⁰ The Irish delegation to the Commission made an oral statement on 2 April which reiterated the government's concerns about the circumstances of the killing of Patrick Finucane and reports of intimidation of defence lawyers. The statement thanked the Special Rapporteur "for his detailed observations and his specific recommendations which deserve very close attention".

The government, however, rejected the Special Rapporteur's call for a judicial inquiry into the killing of Patrick Finucane. In its statement the government denied that the killing of Patrick Finucane was "a matter of urgent public importance" and stated that the past internal inquiries had concluded that there was insufficient evidence to warrant the prosecution of any person for the murder. Amnesty International is concerned that the government rejected the call for a judicial inquiry. The organization believes that the killing of Patrick Finucane raises serious matters of urgent public importance including: the practice by RUC detectives of targeting and threatening defence lawyers; the ability of the legal profession to carry out its work without fear of intimidation or harassment; and serious allegations that there was collusion between military intelligence agents and a Loyalist paramilitary group in his murder.

The government acknowledged that it was concerned about the Special Rapporteur's conclusion that the RUC engaged in activities which constitute "intimidation, hindrance, harassment" of defence lawyers. However, Amnesty International is concerned that rather than ensuring the implementation of systemic changes recommended by the Special Rapporteur to prevent such abuse by its agents, the government limited its undertakings to examining closely the comments, requesting "specific details on which the allegations are made", and looking into "any new evidence" on individual cases. This response lacks credibility given the documentation received by the government from human rights organizations over the years of such abuses²¹ and the detailed documentation set out in the Special Rapporteur's report.

Amnesty International regrets that the government also rejected a number of other important recommendations by the Special Rapporteur. The government did not agree to introduce legislation forthwith to allow immediate access to lawyers and for lawyers to be present at interrogations in Northern Ireland; and did not agree to re-instate the right to jury trials in Northern Ireland. Furthermore, the government refused to end "closed" visits in England, and to re-instate the right of silence throughout the UK.

Amnesty International urges the government to re-consider its initial reaction to the UN report and to implement all of the recommendations of the UN Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers which aim to improve protection of human rights in the United Kingdom.

²¹ In particular, detailed documentation has been submitted by British Irish Rights Watch and the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights. SACHR stated that "on a number of occasions since 1992, SACHR has urged government to take all reasonable steps to eliminate the circumstances which give rise to allegations of intimidation of defence lawyers".

APPENDIX

Statement issued by 33 lawyers from Northern Ireland, 14 January 1998

Equal Protection under the Law

"All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law." Article 7, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

We, the undersigned members of the legal profession in Northern Ireland, wish to express our grave concern at the failure of the rule of law and the relative immunity from prosecution of members of the security forces who have violated basic human rights and contravened national and international laws.

It is a fundamental tenet of the rule of law that all are subject equally to the law and that no-one is above the law. Yet in our professional experience we have witnessed numerous incidents where this basic principle has been abandoned.

We are concerned that this has led to a crisis of confidence in the administration of justice. We believe that it is of the utmost importance that immediate action be taken to address the following issues:

The State has a duty to uphold the right to life, the most fundamental of all rights. Since the conflict began those acting on behalf of the State have illegally denied that right to life in numerous circumstances. The failure of the State to uphold the right to life has led to a widespread belief that the security forces enjoy immunity from prosecution. The relative immunity of members of the security forces from prosecution is perhaps best exemplified by the fact that only four security force members have been successfully prosecuted for murder while on duty - two of whom were released after serving only three years of their life sentences. No member of the RUC has been convicted of the use of lethal force while on duty. The subsequent response of the RUC, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the courts to such incidents has substantially eroded confidence in the legal system. The present inquest system has been proved totally inadequate in relation to disputed killings. In addition, hundreds of thousands of pounds of taxpayers' money has been paid out in compensation for deaths and injuries caused by plastic bullet injuries but no-one has been held accountable. This has contributed to situations as witnessed in 1996 and 1997 where thousands of plastic bullets were used recklessly, overwhelmingly against one section of our community.

We remain particularly concerned at the circumstances of the murder of our esteemed professional colleague, Pat Finucane. It is simply unacceptable, that faced with compelling evidence of state involvement in the killing of a defence lawyer, no action has been taken. Serious allegations of collusion between members of illegal loyalist organisations and members of the security forces have yet to be properly investigated. Similarly no action

has been taken about the continuing intimidation and abuse of solicitors by police officers via their clients in detention centres. We are all too aware of this continuing problem, which is one we face in our daily lives. A working party of the Law Society of England and Wales has reported that "there have been persistent reports that RUC CID officers interrogating detainees in the holding centres routinely disparage and make threats against particular solicitors." Such is the international concern at this issue that the UN Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers visited Northern Ireland to investigate these matters in October.

The continued use and abuse of emergency legislation is a cause of real concern, particularly in relation to detention centres. Hundreds of thousands of pounds of taxpayers money has been paid out in compensation claims to detainees who have been assaulted or falsely imprisoned at the centres. We are aware of no subsequent action, disciplinary or criminal, against the officers responsible. The denial of the right of detainees to have their solicitor present during interrogation creates the circumstances in which such abuse takes place. The European Court of Human Rights has already concluded that not allowing a detainee to have his/her lawyer present in conjunction with the changes in the right to silence, is a violation of the right to a fair trial. This was in February 1996; the government has so far done nothing to comply with this judgment.

In order to begin the process of restoring public confidence we would urge the Secretary of State to address our concerns by ensuring that the rule of law is applied in Northern Ireland. In particular we urge her to:

- * Order an immediate inquiry into the death of Pat Finucane, and release the full Stevens Report.
- * Institute a root and branch review of policing and the administration of justice with a view to creating a framework which is accountable, democratic and representative.
- * Repeal emergency legislation, close the detention centres, restore the right to silence and allow for the presence of solicitors during interrogation of clients.
- * Ban plastic bullets, as the Labour Party promised to do in opposition.

Central to the conflict in Northern Ireland has been the failure of the law to guarantee equal protection of rights. It therefore follows that the application in practice of the principle that all are equal under the law is fundamental to a resolution of the conflict. The rule of law must be observed by all, including the state. The guiding principle of government policy should be the protection of human rights.

Phillip Breen	(Belfast)	Karina Breslin	(Strabane)
Eileen Carlin	(Belfast)	Kevin Casey	(Derry)
Patricia Coyle	(Belfast)	Desmond Doherty	(Derry)

Padraigin Drinan	(Belfast)	John Fahy	(Strabane)
Patrick Fahy	(Omagh)	Michael Fearon	(Belfast)
Michael Flanigan	(Belfast)	Paul Graham	(Belfast)
Oliver Kelly	(Belfast)	Fergus McCafferty	(Derry)
James Mc Cann	(Belfast)	Gregory Mc Cartney	(Derry)
Kevin Mc Corry	(Belfast)	Paddy Mc Dermott	(Derry)
Pearse Mc Dermott	(Belfast)	Barra Mc Groy	(Belfast)
Paddy Mc Gurk	(Derry)	Canice Mc Manus	(Strabane)
Eamon Mc Menamin	(Belfast)	Peter Madden	(Belfast)
Robert Murtagh	(Belfast)	Rosemary Nelson	(Lurgan)
Frank Roberts	(Belfast)	Oliver Roche	(Strabane)
Ciaran Steele	(Belfast)	Tom Tiernan	(Newry)
Patrick Vernon	(Lurgan)	Dermot Walker	(Derry)
Kevin Winters	(Belfast)		