

SECRETÉRIE PARLEMENTAIRE
DU
MINISTRE DE LA JUSTICE ET
PROCUREUR GÉNÉRAL DU CANADA



Ottawa,
September 23rd, 1964.

The Rt. Hon. Lester B. Pearson,
Prime Minister of Canada,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

SEEN BY THE
PRIME MINISTER

Dear Mr. Pearson:

Further to the discussion today, I believe you would like a report on the circumstances surrounding the debate which took place last Thursday, September 17th, on the Notice of Motion of Mr. Orlikow to produce the directives with regard to security review procedures.

The original debate of this motion took place on July 9th, as a result of which Mr. F. A. Brewin, M.P. for Greenwood, spoke to me about the possibility of withdrawing the motion if the government would produce a second memorandum to be delivered to department heads and employees' organizations setting out the procedure which is to be followed in security review cases. The suggestion seemed entirely reasonable to me and I arranged for the motion to stand while I put this suggestion to the responsible officials.

As you may recall, Jack Davis, M.P. originally had carriage of the debate on the motion, but at the last minute he was advised to turn his notes over to Mr. Favreau who actually spoke on it. Jack gave it to me as his understanding that Mr. Favreau would continue the carriage of the matter. At the time that the matter arose, I was unable to get in touch with Mr. Favreau so I followed it up with Mr. T. D. MacDonald, Assistant Deputy Minister of Justice. Mr. Tom MacDonald in turn referred me to the Privy Council office and, in particular, to Don Wall who is, I believe, the Secretary of the Security Committee. I had discussions on this both with Don Wall and Don Beavis and as a result of these I believe that the Security Committee considered Mr. Brewin's suggestion and rejected it on the assumption that even the type of information that Mr. Brewin was requesting involved

. . . 2

005553

AGC-1290_0001

- 2 -

dangers. While not expressly told that this was the case, I suspect that the R.C.M.P. were behind that negative attitude.

I would like to make two comments on this particular chain of events. Firstly, it seemed to me incredible that the Review Board would not be in a position to actually confront the employee in question and that he, in turn, would not be entitled to the benefit of an advocate before the Review Board for the purposes of putting his best case forward and meeting such of the case against him as he could be advised of. When on July 9th Mr. Douglas asked me if he would have those rights, my immediate reaction was that he would and it was only when Don Beavis advised me to the contrary that I realized that an employee would not have such rights. I protested that decision to Don Beavis, but I gather that this too was turned down by the Security Committee.

The second matter which greatly concerns me is the general demeanour of the R.C.M.P. on security cases. I have had some experience with them on not a few of these matters in connection with immigration applications and otherwise and have found them completely unwilling to give any other response to representations than that security matters are involved and they are not at liberty to tell me. I am not at all sure that the elected representatives do have any ultimate control over the Police force in this respect. If, and when, an ombudsman is appointed, I would like to make certain that he does have specific authority to require the R.C.M.P. to report directly to him on abuses of security procedure.

As I mentioned this morning, it seems to me that the advantage which was gained by our public announcement last November has now been entirely dissipated by the response which we made to this particular motion. I hope we can find a new opportunity to restore this situation.

Yours very truly,

Don Macdonald

Donald S. Macdonald, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary

005554

AGC-1290_0002