5-1-3

January 25th, 1974.

CONFIDENTIAL

pco file

Mr. M.R. Dare, Director General, Security Services, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1200 Alta Vista Drive, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

Mr. Lemieux has referred to me your letter (IP 371-1) dated January 17th advising us of the discontinuation of summary favourable reports in favour of a stamped certificate on the Personal History Form where no adverse information has been revealed in the course of field inquiries.

The change, in itself, makes good sense, but it does draw to our attention the original report requirement set by C.D. 35 (paragraphs 11 and 12).

You will recall that the Royal Commission on Security criticized the Security Services' practice of submitting "briefs" and qualified it as "wrong in principle". The commission chose not to make a distinction between the non-adverse, marginally adverse or seriously adverse case but rather concerned itself with the decision-making process and authority of each Deputy Minister and Head of Agency to make final determinations of suitability for clearance. The commission recommended that "the Security Service assist (departments and agencies) by providing information on individual cases as fully as possible, rather than in the form of abbreviated reports".

To have proceeded, as required by C.D. 35 and as recommended by the Royal Commission on Security would have created a problem of considerable magnitude for the Security Service and perhaps, as you suggest,

... 2

AGC-1458_0001

CONFIDENTIAL - 2 would have resulted, in the majority of cases, in nothing more than the preparation and accumulation of relatively useless papers. The principle, however, is probably still valid. To act in the spirit of C.D. 35 and the Royal Commission on Security recommendation would it be reasonable to reassure departments and agencies that the Security Service investigation file on any employee requiring clearance is available to the Deputy Minister or his authorized security officer for perusal? If you agree, a memorandum to Deputy Ministers and Heads of Agencies could be prepared by my office in consultation with your officers and tabled for approval by the Security Advisory Committee at an early meeting. This approach might not only underline the principle of departmental authority but reassure those who might have entertained doubts about the legitimacy of this practice. I would be grateful for your views. Yours sincerely, W.R. Luyendyk, Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet (S & I).

005844

AGC-1458 0002