

S-1-1 (6)-M

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the First meeting of the Cabinet Committee on Security and Intelligence, held on Wednesday, October 16th, 1963, in Room 340-S of the House of Commons at 5:00 p.m.

PRESENT

The Prime Minister
(Mr. Pearson) (in the Chair)

The Minister of Justice
(Mr. Chevrier)

The Secretary of State for External Affairs
(Mr. Martin)

The Minister of Citizenship & Immigration
(Mr. Favreau)

The Associate Minister of National Defence
(Mr. Cardin)

The Secretary of the Security Panel
(Mr. Wall) (Secretary)

ALSO PRESENT

Mr. R. G. Robertson
(Secretary to the Cabinet)

Mr. R. B. Bryce
(Deputy Minister of Finance)

Mr. N. A. Robertson
(Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs)

Mr. J. J. McCardle
(Department of External Affairs)

Commissioner C. W. Harvison
(Royal Canadian Mounted Police)

Mr. T. D. MacDonald
(Department of Justice)

Mr. J. S. Cross
(Department of Citizenship & Immigration)

Mr. D. Beavis
(Privy Council Office) (Asst. Secretary)

005501

AGC-1248_0001

- 2 -

I. Revised Cabinet Directive on Security

1. The Committee had for consideration a revised draft Cabinet Directive on Security together with a covering memorandum describing proposed changes of policy and procedure.

(Cabinet Committee Document S&I-2 entitled "Revised Cabinet Directive on Security", dated October 4th, 1963, refers.)

2. The Prime Minister said that in his view the revised Directive would provide a satisfactory solution to the difficult problem of security screening, and expressed the hope that it would help to meet the worries and criticisms which had been expressed. While the Directive did not provide for a system of appeal as such, it did embody the reality of an adequate system of review.

3. The Minister of Justice said that the draft Directive was much better than that in effect at present, but still fell short of what he had hoped it would be possible to achieve in the way of an outside system of review such as that in effect in the United Kingdom. Mr. Chevrier felt that the revised policy, even though improved, would still be subject to severe criticism, and did not consider that the Directive should be made public.

4. The Secretary to the Cabinet pointed out that neither the United Kingdom nor the United States provided an appeal system as such, but rather a formal system of review to assist the responsible Minister in arriving at a decision. The Security Panel considered that the procedures in the proposed Directive were more in accordance with the realities of the matter than any system which provided the "trappings" of an appeal without its substance.

5. During further discussion the following points arose:

- (a) While there might be immediate advantage in showing the Directive to leaders of the opposition parties on a confidential basis, such action would inevitably lead to the tabling of the document;
- (b) therefore it seemed most appropriate that the Prime Minister make an explanatory statement in the House of Commons embodying the substance of the Directive without referring to it directly;
- (c) that some difficulty must be anticipated concerning the requirement to consider associations and family relationships in connection with an individual's security status; and
- (d) on the whole, the new Directive would ensure fair treatment of individuals as a result of its requirement for at least three stages of review.

.. 3

005502

AGC-1248_0002

- 3 -

6. The Committee therefore recommended:

- (a) that the Cabinet approve the policies and procedures set out in the draft Cabinet Directive on Security for implementation by all departments and agencies;
- (b) that a statement be made by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, setting out the substance of the changes in security policy and procedure; and
- (c) that, if necessary, the Minister of Justice would make a further, more detailed statement concerning security during the consideration of the estimates of his department for 1963-64.

II. Questions on Security Raised by Mr. Orlikow

7. The Committee had for consideration a series of questions concerning security which had been asked in the House of Commons by Mr. Orlikow, New Democratic Member for Winnipeg North on September 30th, 1963, together with draft replies prepared by the Security Panel.

(Cabinet Committee Document S&I-3 dated October 11th, 1963, refers.)

8. After discussion, the Cabinet Committee recommended:

- (a) that the replies as drafted be made in the House of Commons, after a general statement had been made about security policy; and
- (b) that the member of the government making the replies be informed, in relation to part 1 of question 1,162, that while a number of security officers were for various reasons listed in the Government of Canada telephone directory, their being so listed did not vitiate the arguments against listing all departmental security officers as a general practice.

III. Security Screening: Revised Personal History Form

9. The Committee had for consideration a revised Personal History Form used as a basis for security investigation, together with a covering memorandum explaining how it differed from the form presently in use.

(Cabinet Committee Document S&I-1 entitled "Security Screening: Personal History Form", dated September 17, 1963, refers.)

.. 4

005503

AGC-1248_0003

- 4 -

10. After discussion, the Committee recommended that the revised Personal History Form be approved for use in all departments and agencies, subject to a minor modification of wording in one of the questions on the form.

D. F. Wall,
Secretary.

Privy Council Office,
October 22nd, 1963.

005504

AGC-1248_0004