

BETTANEY REPORT:
MEETING AT 1530 ON WEDNESDAY 1 MAY

The questions which this meeting has to settle are:-

- (i) Should there be a body to oversee the Security Service consisting either of three senior Privy Counsellors or of three non-political persons or of the Security Commission?
- (ii) If not, should we say that the Security Commission would review in six months or a year's time the new Director-General's progress in dealing with criticisms and recommendations in the Security Commission report on Bettaney and in providing internal outlets of complaint for those in the Service? i.e. should the words at paragraph 10 of the draft statement attached to Sir Robert Armstrong's minute be included?
- (iii) Is that draft statement satisfactory? and should it be delivered as an oral statement or as a written answer?
- (iv) What should be done about consulting the Leader of the Opposition on the Security Commission report? (It used to be the convention that reports of the Security Commission were shown to the Leader of the Opposition before publication. In the case of the report on Prime, Mr Foot was invited to put down the written question which you answered announcing publication of the Report. You would have been prepared to show him the report, including the sections withheld from publication, if he had asked. In the event he did not do so. The circumstances were unusual because it was the day before the dissolution of Parliament on 12 May 1983; but you may nevertheless feel that we could follow that precedent).

R.R.B