Exhibit P
MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Meeting With the
DCI Regarding DOJ's Statement That DOJ Has Rendered No
Legal Opinion on Whether CIA's Use of Interrogation
Techniques Would Meet Constitutional Standards

1. 4(c)
   3.5(c)

   1. 4(c)
   3.5(c)

   This evening, after the 1700 meeting, I attended a meeting in the DCI's office with the DCI,
   DDIC, Director DONC, DCI Chief of Staff, and General Counsel to discuss several issues pertaining to detainees and
   interrogations. One such issue was a recent statement Patrick
   phillips of DOJ made to the GC that DOJ's Office of Legal Counsel
   has not rendered a written opinion that CIA's use of its
   interrogation techniques would meet the Constitution's "shock the
   conscience" standards applicable within the United States. (The
   GC had previously informed DCI and DCI/COS, but not in detail.)
   The fact that DOJ had coordinated on the briefing slides the GC
   used to brief the Vice President, Attorney General, and others;
   that DOJ had approved language in a June 2003 DOD GC letter to
   Senator Leahy; nor the fact that DOJ had coordinated on bulletins
   that CIA had drafted which specifically stated that CIA's use of
   interrogation techniques would meet constitutional standards were
   applicable to aliens overseas, could not be taken as DOJ
   agreement that CIA's use of interrogation techniques would meet
   constitutional standards were they applicable overseas. Rather,
   he advises that DOJ had not opined on that, one way or the other.

   2. 4(c)
   3.5(c)

   In response to learning fully of
   this DOJ position, the GC asked whether CIA was currently using
   interrogation techniques with anyone. Upon learning CIA was not,
   the GC directed an immediate suspension of any use of its
   interrogation techniques unless and until CIA receives from DOJ a
   formal, written legal opinion on whether CIA's use of its
   interrogation techniques would meet U.S. Constitutional standards
   if those standards were applicable to aliens overseas. Should
   DOJ not provide an opinion, or should DOJ's opinion find to the

   ALL PORTIONS CLASSIFIED
   1.4(c)
   3.5(c)

   1.4(c)
   3.5(c)

   1.4(c)
   3.5(c)
SUBJECT: (NS)(SI) Memorandum of Meeting with the DCI Regarding DOJ's Statement That DOJ Has Rendered No Legal Opinion on Whether CIA's Use of Interrogation Techniques Would Meet Constitutional Standards negative, the use of interrogation techniques would not resume without further consideration.

3. (VP) The DCI further directed:

a. A memo from him to the DDO directing the suspension (my action);

b. Talking points for him to speak to the Attorney General about this matter (GC action);

c. A paper from CTC informing him precisely which interrogation techniques (enhanced and standard) have been used on which HVTs, and when they were last used (my action to request from CTC).
This note is being passed for information ONLY.

As Site is well aware, there have been numerous press articles, domestically and internationally, concerning the treatment of detainees in U.S. control. We can happily report that from internal reviews conducted thus far we now are well within the "box" pertaining to detainees under CTX control. That said, the DCI believes it is prudent to suspend the use of STANDARD and ENHANCED measures until we have completed all necessary reviews. Senior managers within the Agency understand we are not currently performing standard or enhanced measures of interrogation, but wishes to highlight the fact there should be no submission of requests for standard/enhanced at this time pertaining to anyone of the detainees that he has under his control. Should we be fortunate and capture one of the truly High Value Targets we are still seeking. Of course we will seek necessary approval to immediately initiate actions, which will allow us to gain the required information.

Please pass this note to all sites and thank them for the hard work and commitment they have given to this most valuable program - it has truly prevented the loss of additional lives within our borders and afforded the same support to numerous allies.

A similar note is being sent to other 1.4(c)