

**OGC HAS REVIEWED.**

OGC 74-1334

5 August 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Inspector General

SUBJECT: Office of Security Assistance to and Arrangements  
with USIB Agencies and Departments

1. While we have no legal objections to the recommended action, two points do suggest further consideration. The first is that Mr. Kane advises that the activities he is referring to now are being carried out pursuant to instructions to him from the Director. For these, obviously, no additional approval is necessary. It might be well, however, for the Office of Security to maintain some sort of a log of such activities which would also cite the authority for them.

2. It may be that not all activities are covered by existing instructions. If so, the blanket authority sought obviously would provide ample authority. On the other hand, it also would deprive the Director of the protection and assistance now afforded him by the senior level consideration and approval, or disapproval, which is intended by [REDACTED]. Indeed, a major purpose of that Notice was to provide just such reviews. It might be appropriate for the Director of Security to seek the approvals required by that Notice, but on a case by case basis, of those activities not authorized by existing instructions and not falling within one of the categories which do not require approval under that Notice. See paragraph 6 of [REDACTED] STATINTL It should be noted also that [REDACTED] does not require approval of new activities before they are undertaken. The Notice apparently contemplates that responsible officials may undertake activities in accordance with their best judgment, with reporting, and subsequent approval or disapproval of continuance, to follow. This would seem a useful and hopefully not too burdensome mechanism to provide the management consideration the Notice contemplates.

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

[REDACTED]  
Associate General Counsel

cc: DDM&S  
D/Security ✓

CLASSIFICATION  
0540450

PPB 91-2  
 8 AUG 1974

UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
--------------	--------------	--------

OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	D/Security - 4E60 Hqs.		<i>[Signature]</i>
2	<i>C/PP and Ad</i>	8 AUG 1974	<i>[Signature]</i>
3	<i>C/PP Br.</i>	8 AUG 1974	<i>[Signature]</i>
4	C/PP&AD	9 AUG 1974	<i>[Signature]</i>
5	DD/P&M	9 AUG 1974	<i>[Signature]</i>
6	<i>C/PP &amp; Ad</i>	12 AUG 1974	<i>[Signature]</i>

<input type="checkbox"/> ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/> DIRECT REPLY	<input type="checkbox"/> PREPARE REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/> DISPATCH	<input type="checkbox"/> RECOMMENDATION
<input type="checkbox"/> COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/> FILE	<input type="checkbox"/> RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENCE	<input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> SIGNATURE

Remarks:  
 3-5! Almost as soon as I received the attached, [redacted] telephoned me about it. In his opinion, it has been overtaken by our commitment to canvass the office to prepare a "data base" of [redacted] activities. He confirmed that the original IG memo to the DCI had been returned by OGC without allowing it to go to the DCI for the "blanket approval". [redacted] feels, and I agree, that we should take no action on the attachment other than to continue to canvass for the purpose of submitting a related response to [redacted].

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
Office of General Counsel	8/6/74