With reference to our conversation yesterday I am setting down briefly my recollection of the discussions in your office on Wednesday, 13th November, regarding the march in Londonderry planned by the Citizens Action Committee for Saturday, 16th November.

The meeting was attended by you, Mr. Greeves, Mr. Hill, Mr. Haggan, myself, Mr. Peacocke, County Inspector Kerr, and District Inspector McGimpsey, the latter two being from Londonderry.

Before going to your office I was informed by Mr. Peacocke that the Londonderry police officers were of the opinion that the march should be permitted to proceed along the full route proposed by the organisers and at the beginning of the meeting in your office they expressed the same views. You produced correspondence including letters from the Grand Orange Lodge and the Apprentice Boys conveying the strong views that the marchers should not be allowed through the Unionist areas of Londonderry, and you also stated that you had other information intimating that there would be strong opposition to the marchers being allowed inside the ancient walls of Derry.

All the police representatives stated that your information and the letters mentioned above put a different complexion on the matter, as it now appeared that opposition which the police had not expected would be offered to the marchers in certain parts of Derry.

In view of what you said the police suggested that they should act under Section 2(1) of the Public Order Act 1951 and re-direct the marchers along a route which would keep them outside the walls and that barriers, etc. would be erected to keep them off portions of the notified route. This was agreed to by all present.

You then initiated a discussion on the question of a ban on all processions and meetings inside the Walls with the object of preventing processions and counter processions such as we had had in Derry recently. This ban was to apply to all organisations and not only to the Citizens Action Committee and their followers. This discussion lasted for some time and various views were expressed about the duration of such a ban and its enforcement. The Londonderry police representatives thought (somewhat hesitantly) it could be enforced although this would require large numbers of police. (Incidentally they now admit they were mistaken and, in fact, the ban was unenforceable as you are now aware.)

In winding up the discussion you asked if the consensus was that a ban for a duration of one month to allow for a cooling off period should be imposed and the only dissident was Mr. Hill who thought that a decision on a ban should not be made until after the 16th November. However, in the long run it was decided to impose the ban for one month and also to re-direct the marchers.
I hope this is a true, albeit brief, record of what took place during the discussions which lasted for about 2½ hours.

From what I have said I think it is clear that the police did not advise you to impose a ban or, indeed, to interfere with the marchers at all but that, in the light of the information in your possession, they accepted the line of action ultimately decided upon.

Yours sincerely,

A. H. [Signature]

The Right Hon. Wm. Craig, M.P.,
Minister of Home Affairs,
Stormont,
BELFAST. BT4 3SU.