

s.19(1)

Dec 12, 1962

CONFIDENTIAL

S-1-6

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. [redacted]

R.C.M. Police Briefs

Of the six files that I recalled as being of possible use in your making a case to the R.C.M.P. concerning the inadequacy of a summary as opposed to a more detailed form of reporting, only one, [redacted]'s, is likely to be of assistance. In it the reasons for her discharge from the C.W.A.C. for medical reasons including psychoneurosis were originally omitted; a record of additional marriages and separations under circumstances that bore on her stability was omitted; the reasons for her discharge from a business firm after 9 years' good service were incorrectly summarized initially, but when reviewed were found to bear on her stability; a simple observation as to her being too talkative about both her work with previous employers and with EMO was inadequately stated and required elaboration at our request. In short, had we not gone back twice to the R.C.M. Police on the file, we would have been in no position to make any assessment even remotely approaching good sense.

2. However inadequate the summary was in this instance, it did provide us with the one piece of information which prompted us to question the file: after 9 years' service during which her performance was considered superior, she was released by the firm for reasons which were stated in the brief as "flirting". As this appeared to be an incredible set of circumstances, we went back on the file. Had we had only a chit stating that (in the view of the Police) no derogatory information had been revealed, and were we constrained to accept only such a statement as the basis for granting a clearance to Top Secret, we would not even have had any reason to request that the file be reviewed.

3. On this latter point, I have been told by DL(2) that they recently received a summary brief containing information which they considered sufficiently adverse to preclude employing the subject of the report, and at the same time the Civil Service Commission were sent by the Police the short statement concerning

... 2

005732

AGC-1193\_0001

s.19(1)

- 2 -

"no derogatory information". Both Timmerman and Francis have indicated that a considerable number of similar, but not identical, discrepancies have been noted in External's experience.

4. One other curiosity is the fact that the Police will not send un-summarized reports from DMI or DAFS to requesting departments while at the same time both DMI and DAFS are quite prepared to do so. The only proviso that DMI has made is that, if the department asks the R.C.M. Police to get the information, DMI does not want to duplicate its effort by supplying the same information directly to the department (with the undertone that they prefer not to get caught in the position of being used as a check on the accuracy and completeness of R.C.M.P. briefs); it will, however, pass unsummarized reports directly to the department if so requested and if not previously asked by the Police for the same material. It is, at least, curious that two of the three investigative agencies are not concerned with the hypothetical embarrassment, as a result of confidential information from a neighbour getting back to the file subject and resulting either in a suit or a drying up of sources, that the Police foresee in passing field reports to departmental security officers.

5. I think, rather than pointing to specific instances of incompetence, that we ought to argue on the basis that the Police, as stated in the directive, are finders of fact, acting as agents of government departments to whom the full facts, completely unabridged, must be passed in order for a realistic judgement to be made by the department as to the clearance it can grant to its own employees. If we are to argue on the basis of cases, we will have to get additional information of the sort we have on [redacted] from External and others.

DB

D.B.

Privy Council Office,  
December 12th, 1962.

005733

AGC-1193\_0002