

Public Service Commission
Commission de la Fonction publique
Staffing Branch
Direction générale de la dotation

PE
files
PSC
comments
S-1-6

SECRET

WFB
Jan. 31/77

January 31, 1977.

Mr. D.W. Hall,
Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet,
(Security, Intelligence and
Emergency Planning),
Privy Council Office,
Langevin Block,
Ottawa, Ontario,
K1A 0A3.

Dear Mr. Hall:

Re: Draft Memorandum - Homosexuality, the
Public Service and National Security

I sincerely apologize for my delay in responding to your memorandum of December 14, 1976, concerning the above subject. The Public Service Commission is concerned with this matter and I hope that the delay in forwarding our comments will not be interpreted as a lack of interest in this very serious and important subject.

I have discussed the Draft Memorandum with Mr. John Edwards, Commissioner and Mr. Tom Morry, Director General, Anti-Discrimination Branch and we offer the following general observations:

Page 6 - Under the heading: "Public service employment practices"

"The phrase "personal suitability" is normally included in competition announcements as a requirement of employment". Presumably this area can be, has been, and is used to exclude homosexuals in some cases".

I urge caution here. We cannot find any evidence on this nor are we convinced that this would be an appropriate use of the selection standards.

Page 8 - Item (3) - Blackmail

We question whether this point applies to all Homosexuals or only to "closet" homosexuals.

Page 10 - Middle paragraph

"CD 35 requires departments to make periodic reports ..."

Would it not be prudent to require Departments to identify the feature of character involved?

... 2

- 2 -

Guidelines - Item 3

This item is too broad from our point of view especially where a homosexual openly states his/her homosexuality. Also, how does one predict the need for "future access" when such access is based on promotion through merit. In effect, homosexuals (even self-declared homosexuals) could be denied promotion based on possible (not even probable) events.

Guidelines - Item 5

We strongly support the statement that *"where denial of security clearance is decided upon, the individual should be told the reason, and the considerations involved should be explained"*. This concept should be expanded as much as possible throughout the security clearance area.

Guidelines - Item 7/8

We believe that a clear reference to Prison Guards (Correctional Officers) should be made here. The issue would be the personal safety of the homosexual.

Guidelines - Item 8

With respect to *"schools, employment involving the young"*, it is relevant (or bias) that not all homosexuals proselytise nor are attracted to minors.

We are of the opinion that security and employment attitudes with respect to homosexuality must be brought into step with the times. The Draft Memorandum indicates a definite step in this direction and has our support. However, we would urge that every possible step be taken to ensure that employment opportunities for homosexuals not be jeopardized for reasons of social or personal bias alone. There should be conclusive grounds for the barring of employment/promotional opportunities to homosexuals who, in every other respect, may be gifted, competent and effective resources.

Should you wish to discuss the foregoing in further detail, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Yours sincerely,

K.A. Sinclair

K.A. Sinclair,
Assistant Director General,
Operations.

Don't distinguish?

*- yes!
- how?*