

An Chartlann Náisiúnta National Archives

Reference Code: 2018/68/49

Creation Dates: February 1988

Extent and medium: 5 pages

Creator(s): Department of the Taoiseach

Accession Conditions: Open

Copyright: National Archives, Ireland. May only be

reproduced with the written permission of the

Director of the National Archives.

Special meeting of the Conference -What do we press for? The following is a list of possibilities with comments in some cases. (A) A revision of the decision not to prosecute? At maximum we might like to see (i) a new decision to prosecute for (a) the killing of Tighe etc. (b) the cover-up It is virtually certain that the British cannot concede on this. High-level resignations from the RUC? (possibly even Hermon or McAtamney) This is most unlikely at the moment. We can hardly press for specific names. (Query in any case whether we would want Hermon to go?) Stalker/Sampson report itself (C) Publication in full of the Stalker/Sampson report (The Attorney General, confirming earlier statements by King, ruled this out explicitly in the House. The British can hardly back down from this). Publication of a version edited to delete references 2. dangerous to security? Publication of Part III of the Report (RUC structures) or the McLachlen Report thereon 4. Confidential sight of (a) the full report; (b) an edited version or (c) Part III of the Report (dealing with structure and organisation of the RUC)? (This could be politically difficult for us at home if

we could not reveal what we had learned). If not sight of the material at (3) then a confidential 5. briefing on items (a), (b) or (c)? Tom King's forthcoming statement in the House of Commons (D) An announcement of disciplinary proceedings? 6. A strong and explicit statement ruling out "shoot-to-7. kill" policies and putting it on record that it is vital that the security forces be seen at all times to uphold the law? An announcement of some re-organisation of the RUC? 8. (Or of the Police Complaints procedure?) An announcement about publication of the Code of 9. Conduct? An apology to the Irish Government on the cross-border 10. incursion aspect (re-iterating an apology conveyed by the Ambassador in 1984) ©NAI/TSCH/2018/68/49

Possible Demands

Possible/Likely British response

1. Publication of report

Such reports are not published.
There is sensitive security material.
The Secretary of State will make
a statement on the discipline and
organisation of the RUC.

The report is said to be in three parts dealing with (a) the shoot-to-kill incidents (b) the cover-up and (c) corrective measures for the future. This latter is also the subject of a report by McLachlan, Inspector of Constabulary. The British will be less concerned about (c), and will be forthcoming about the language of the Secretary of State's parliamentary statement.

2. Prosecution of offenders

The DPP's decision has been made. It was a matter for the law officers. There can be no question of a rethink on this. Suspects in the shoot-to-kill have been tried.

It is unrealistic to expect progress on this. The British will wish to point to the possibility of disciplinary action.

3. Disciplinary action to ensure that all security forces personnel involved in wrong doing are removed.

Disciplinary measures are being considered/not ruled out. The suspended officers remain suspended. Procedures must however be respected.

If the purpose of dropping prosecutions was to avoid revelations in court, then any infringement of disciplinary procedures may leave them open to suit for wrongful damages with the same result. Procedures (involving yet another outside 'policeman and/or the Police Authority) are likely to

3

4. Action to stand down offending units and reassert proper control of special branch out of special units. McLachlan will be making recommendations on this and they will be implemented. There is no doubt about British determination to prevent such problems in future.

5. Full account of incursion into our jurisdiction as testified to by Const. Robinson. This will be forthcoming, with appropriate regrets and assurances on the future.

Action to ensure independence of DPP in such decisions in future.

Most unlikely to be considered. It is DPP's decision in any case. be slow. While Hermon and McAtamney are both likely to be damaged there is no indication they would be willing to accept personal responsibility (unless Hermon chose to go on grounds of opposition to proposed reforms).

British will be forthcoming at least on presentational aspects and on chains of command. They will probably accept 'mistakes', 'breakdowns of control' etc. in relation to 1982. The standing down of units more problematical.

British have accepted that they owe an account of events which will be forthcoming after investigation completed.

(More a tactical point to highlight disquiet at AG's role?)

7. Release of Binningham 6.

This does not relate to agenda of the Conference. It is a matter for the Home Secretary.

8. Extradition.

This is a matter for the British Attorney General. We know of the difficulties which have arisen. We can perhaps look again at ways of satisfying your requirements. British officials have in any case been exploring possible approaches to bridge the differences between the two sides.