

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE MAIN BUILDING WHITEHALL LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone 071-21 82216 (Direct Dialling) 071-21 89000 (Switchboard)

MINISTER OF STATE FOR Charles/ I shought we were Com 57;

D/MIN(AF)/AH/12/1 wa fidul that we one 4 January 1991

will break into the

Dear Juint, congrete?? Toologs love is not combridge (Pat).

As you will know, on 17 December 1990 three briefcases containing documents classified up to TOP SECRET, personal effects, £1,000 in cash (part of an imprest) and a laptop computer were taken from the locked boot of a Service car which was being used by the Principal Staff Officer to the CinC Strike Command and Joint Force Commander British Forces Middle East. He had been returning these items to Strike Command Headquarters in High Wycombe, following a briefing given to the Prime Minister in London. The car had been left unattended for a period while the Staff Officer and the driver visited a car showroom. There is no reason to suspect the theft was anything other than an opportunistic criminal act. The documents were recovered later that day, in circumstances which make it unlikely that they were photographed; it is believed that all have been accounted for.

Most disturbingly, the laptop computer is still missing. It has a hard disc which we believe holds sensitive information related to the Gulf crisis and other matters. The documents of which the hard disc holds the text are believed to include the SECRET text of a presentation by the CinC Strike Command to the Joint Services Defence College (about mainly non-Gulf matters); a SECRET UK EYES A record of a discussion between the Joint Commander and Prince Khalid; CONFIDENTIAL briefing notes from the Joint Commander's visit to the Gulf in early December; CONFIDENTIAL briefing notes on other Gulf matters; the first 24 pages of a TOP SECRET presentation by the Joint Commander to the Prime Minister about the Gulf (although it is assessed that these pages are no more than CONFIDENTIAL in isolation); and a report by the Joint Commander to CDS on his visit to the Gulf in late October (classified TOP SECRET at the time but now only SECRET). Some of these documents are highly sensitive in terms of UK/US and UK/Saudi relations. Although their impact on military security in the Gulf may not be as serious as might have been feared, their loss to the Iraqis - or indeed any publication of their contents in the media - would

certainly be highly damaging. It is not inconceivable that other sensitive documents could be held on the laptop computer's hard disc. We would be ready to consider legal action to prevent disclosure of the laptop computer's contents.

The story of the theft broke in the media last Saturday evening. We used the D-Notice procedure to request that the loss of the laptop computer should not be disclosed; and so far this line has held - although it has been widely reported that some of the missing items (including highly classified information) have not been recovered. Yesterday, however, the bublin edition of the Irish Times reported the loss of the laptop computer, that it was still missing, that it contained 'high level military information' and that the D-Notice procedure had been applied to it within the UK. The story now looks set to break in the British papers.

When it does, Mr Hamilton proposes that MOD and the Metropolitan Police should arrange to brief the Press more fully about it; (the precise arrangements have yet to be decided). We would stress the national importance of recovering this laptop computer and we would publicise a description of it (but not its serial number). Anyone finding himself in possession of it would be asked to take it at once to a police station or to the Ministry of Defence, in the public interest.

 $$\operatorname{Mr}$$ Hamilton anticipates that there might then be two difficulties:

- The person concerned might well expect a reward, especially if (as is most likely) he had purchased the laptop computer in (as he would claim) good faith. have been advised that Section 23 of the Theft Act prohibits the payment of a reward which in its terms implies immunity from investigation or compensation in respect of monies paid by the individual to obtain the stolen goods. But otherwise we understand that the offer of a reward is not prohibited. In my Minister's view, despite the distastefulness of offering a reward in these circumstances and despite the risk that doing so might lead others to offer a counter-reward, the public interest is very strongly in favour of making such an offer. Mr Hamilton would not propose that the amount should be publicised; and it might of course become the subject of negotiation. He thinks that we should be prepared to make a payment up to the sum which MOD paid for it (just under £1600).
- b. If, as is perhaps rather unlikely, the thief still has the laptop computer, he might require an assurance of immunity from prosecution if he returned it. My Minister would not propose that any such offer should be publicised, but, if such an assurance was to be requested, he believes that it would be very strongly in the public interest that it should be given without delay. There is no reason to believe that the thief was anything other than an ordinary criminal; and he was probably horrified to find what sensitive materials

SECRET - UK EYES A

he had stolen. He seem to have lost little time in disposing of the classified papers; but he had presumably not realised what might be held on the laptop computer's hard disc.

Both these questions are, of course, matters for the Attorney General. Mr Hamilton would be most grateful for his help in resolving them. A very early reply would be extremely helpful, since it looks as if the story is about to break. We might, of course, wish to take either of the proposed steps in advance of the story breaking should we receive an approach from the person who holds the laptop computer.

The Attorney General should be aware that last night an unknown person rang the Daily Mail, claiming to have the laptop computer. He said that he wanted to return it to the police; but wished to be accompanied by his lawyer and to have an assurance of immunity from prosecution. He did not ring again (as he had said he would do). He may well, of course, have been a hoaxer or someone fishing for further information (perhaps to enable the story to be released from the D-Notice); but if, by any chance, he has the genuine article in his possession the urgency of my Minister's proposals are still further increased.

I am sending copies of this letter to the Private Secretaries to the Prime Minister, the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, the Home Secretary, the Lord Advocate, the Director General of the Security Service, the Director of Public Prosecutions and Sir Robin Butler.

Yun aur,

JULIAN MILLER Private Secretary

Juliet Wheldon Attorney General's Office te had stolen. He seem to have lost little time in disposate of the dissolited papers; but he had presented on the presentable not the dissolited papers; but he had presentable not the seem disection and disection of the proper control on the large control of the seem disection of the property would be exceeded for his property would be extraorable to break. We not control to be seed to be seen to break whe has be take sites of the proposed steps in the state of the proposed steps in the state when he seem to be seen the restore an approach for a large who made the large prompter.

The state state who has been and as sware that last minks when he would not restore and to have an an additionally and to be a state of the large the large to be exceeded by his lawyer and to have an and the said to be exceeded by his lawyer and to have an and the said has varied to be a state of the large to be a state of the large to t

ARLELS HALLS COUNTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO

Attorney General's Office