

Minutes - Jan 24

Chair - intro - ~~interested~~ only in blackmailable people - hard to relate to in any way - Have to consider whether reason to change attitude of year ago, based on exp. of other services - haven't yet felt we should change basic policy - more prevalent now - may have to transfer more - can we brief persons in posn of modest risk, & transfer with their knowledge - PCMP must use some discretion in investg. -

Robertson - double value of statistical approach - Kenzie best we have - does not go to the problem - inv has moved from mainly inv to sociological survey - far from original purpose - proportion put some here as elsewhere, but social attitude stem - invest, cases reported promptly - no exploitation - on paper, no need for PCMP to not tell interviewees reason - K&A has always told the employee - worked well - All becomes matter of record - bound to affect attitudes - must be responsible pooling of judgement - accept some risk - PCMP concerned only w security -

RCMP - need for guidance from govt - prob. increasingly widespread - only conc. w security - only experienced men - concerned w practicing his in definition - languages - social attitude determine exploitability - if he sees answer, man less exploitable - also better if dept doesn't know - but not RCMP intent in withholding info, do not want that resp. - NB to continue inv not to take action stopping inv - must have clear directions -

OSC - concern at momentum of investigation on basis of suspicion - may be safety in numbers - no exploited case as yet - must carefully assess warrant we give him in determining risk - (rel) RCMP continue in x & a few other sens depts, but not others except when necess to follow up previous - Now sens. emp's, as should not be told - Keep inv to bare min to ensure security & not by me - must consider as a matter of degree - Police not entitled to decide on scandalous potential of appointments -

Sec - destination -

24 June 60 - Sec. Panel (Quorum) PCER 11^{am}

- Bryce, Robertson, Harverson, Hughes, Pelletier, Bell

REMP paper - "Homosexuality in Fed. Gov't Service"

Chair - ask Comm if anything to add to Memo -

- took init w/ agt of PM + Fulton to look at unpleasant prob. Thought might exchange memos + women today, see what ideas arise - must keep to smallest circle poss - few men know what is going on - Fulton standing w/ 4 men ^{6 mo ago} no need to go to bat yet -

Comm - had agt of 4 men to talk to Camps - none wanted reports -

- can't add much to memo - prob now is guidance as to where we go - more widespread - must know now where govt wants us to go - several more names added every time - only one w/ security

Ch - What is legal prob? - no oblig to prosecute - if did result, wd be for Oth city police - see no reason for leak in press -

RE - wd be diff. to make a case - but if publicly, prob wd arise -

= wd it not be better to g. thru paper first, then look at prob of inv - appraise results, then come back and see how a prop. pres. direction is - to deal with this prob.

Hughes - no gen pts - examine paper + direction - diff in allowing ^{immunity} inv to proceed on basis of suspicion.

Comm - rate of names dep on interview rate - use only exp. men - Rob - NB precautions -

Rob - if logically followed, come back to Kinsey / statistics - this study has been crit, but is most

- though, well backed study done -
- Ch - we are looking for people subj to blackmail - doesn't mean currently being exploited - hard to relate to no of homos in society
- Rob - but pres crisis began for security job men, but has inevitably gone on to be far away for security situation which started it - CD go a great deal further on statistical basis if we pursue it - but profit from human service -
- Com - we depend on def of homos -
- Ch - what def implied in these figures? what is lost
- Com - makes a pattern, not just one episode
- Rob - but one episode can provide means of blackmail -
- Kel - wd be diff to relate circles for sec stpt to exp which have no rel trace
- Rob - but episode -
- Com - however, knowing figures - (shd not regard large nos as lessening the prob) it -
- Rob - (but does help to realize nature of prob) $\rightarrow$
= none here can make gen crit of knowing report - the best scientific attempt to analyze figures -
- Ch - Points out it is common enough -
- Kel - may be a less of a prob - more prevalent, more acceptable - also, our experience in Canada - this has not given trouble - 3rd, old indifference could make man's life unbearable - but she looks very carefully at weight we give to the prob. with
- Sill - sec. prob has diminished - no successful expt. that we know of - cases have been reported -
- Com - we are suggesting he is socially acceptable - if so, removes grt part of prob. - probs are raised don't exist
- Rob - two sep pts - social feeling varies greatly in time

- place - more discussion in UK, eg - here, we have
 got prob - likely same proportion in Can which takes
 very serious view - more diff than in UK or Sweden -
 in phys & psych terms, shd expect same prob -
- Ch - is the chance still blackmailable
- Kel - regardless of what is seen in other countries -
 shd ^{not} by country make it blackmailable - RI 5 must
 relate approach acc to state of country -
- Ch - less blackmailable in Norway than among other
 officials - still most people wd keep it dark
- Hay - but at lowest form - illegal -
- Rob - In past exper - have 2 cases - 1 home, another
 wife in extreme affair - in both cases, indiv
 reported promptly & fully -
- Kel - 3rd case, where advice sought for friend -
- Rob - but not
- Ch - not a question we have to wrestle with - now,
 shd we take diff attitude now than Panel a
 year ago - used to feel we shd stick to policy &
 regard as real risk - based on exp of
 other seniors who had more experience -
 haven't yet felt we shd change basic policy -
 Prevalence makes me feel we may encounter it
 more freq - shd perhaps transfer more
 freq to remove risk - or try to safeguard
 ourselves where risk is modest - now have
 many in posn of minor sec HCC - can we
 to brief them & remove risk, or shd we
 transfer with their knowledge -
- Rob - Central pt in paper - diff approach under pre
 rules - quite uness, restriction - in these
 cases, must admit reason for concern -
- Corr - if man knows, he is less exploitable -
- Rob - has always been quite frank w / people moved -

- have mentioned risk of both sex & scandal - XA has unique prob - stiffer -

Kel - if we approach more dir to index - less chance of someone outside knowing Pol are making inquiry

Rob - making a kind of social official inquiry instead of sex. with bad results -

Ch - are we agreed there is no objection to going dir to man?

Rob - ident. collapse in recent case - for better not to have questioned the man - if he had, may have been grave result - shd not be inhibit by sex worry, but other

Cal - very NB pt -

Kel - time wd come for decision as to approach - shd not now be matter of record

Rob - yes - but inevitably every thing said is a matter of record - cannot have orbit cut off depts - may have a bearing eventually - bound to affect all studies -

Conn - how can this be avoided? What do we do w/ info?

Ch - can we agree no obj to minority then approaching man himself - but undesirable to approach until done what can be pre-interview -

Conn - some good news -

Rob - must be responsible for policy of judgement - relates to prob of depts staying away -

Kel - if we give dept names, they won't decision on more info -

Rob - other pt is separate - other names do come in - association, etc -

Hughes - on suscep - para 23(b) - all informing dept - does not informing dept lessen prob of fm? - depts if know may fire -

Conn - wd not withhold confirmed info for dept - not intention of 23(b) -

Ch - suppose man in non-sens prison? -

Kel - feel strong { - report to dept certain info which may have bearing on sec spec sens prison - but depts want in 10 -

Com - but have already put black mark on the man - bearing on promotion

Ch - just better that to give info to dept - {unless danger of scandal}

Com - we not like force to withhold info - in case of scandal

Kel - if we withhold, man is likely to be placed in sens prison - do we propose dept, or other - tell them to transfer

Ch - must warn dept carefully to clear before moving into sens prison - we shd be checking with Kent about govt appts -

Rob - is this a part of you can deal with in abstract? - almost every prison in XA - annex showed figs we did not have - 19 cases not passed on -

Kel - 84% of people interviewed admitted, after in many cases had very vague info -
- on 23(b) - for info stpt, desirable to continue with source without dept's action -

Pal - I sugg - Kent shd be allowed to continue work in XA & a few other depts, but not into other depts or outside except when ~~needed~~ to find out re those in sens prison - Shd they line up a confirmed one in non sens prison - not tell. Shd keep to have man to ensure sec, & do not go beyond - only line up when he goes to sens. prison -

Ch - see no alt to pal having some discretion - we are just agreed -

Com - not sure we cd be resp. for holding this info -

Ch - matter of degree of judgement - man in line for promotion - see not yet a prob - scandalous matter for concern -

6
Rel - must consider this a matter of degree -

Rel - every move of sec nature w/ have to be processed by police -

Rob - assess scandal in terms of order & errors - ^{of} court bring these to rules - matter of judgement & discretion -

Ch - Depts must have a practice & Point must -

Rel - shd be strictly secure, for Police view - we must ~~not~~ accept some risk of scandal -

Rel - NB to keep this entirely to security & go not one step further

Hughes - Pol not entitled to decide on scandalous nature of appointment -

Com - agree - don't want Pol to make these decision without clear direction -

Ch - now agreed where sec not a factor, Pol does not report - ^{app.}

Hughes - shd provide for check w Police -

Ch - When Pol know man in sens pos - when do they report, & what action shd dept take -

- not wise to go to dept with 1st suspicions -

- Shd Pol ask dept to hold action? - already happens in XA -

- Cd combine (b) (6) -

Rel - if have something confirmed, but not crucial, we ask dept to hold file - ^{off}

Com - in non-sens depts or posns, hold info? - Yes -

Rel - if ~~undisputed~~, he will be fired anyway -

Com - OK, but on what auth do we withhold this info -

Rob - will have to meet again, but have to look at direction - more experienced now -

Ch - PM & Fulton shd agree that it can be withheld - not duty to pass on - may even meet w/ Fulton & PM - ^{off}

Wall - says - distinctions between sens & exp. posns -

Ch - how far do you have to say to ~~interviews~~ that other means - names?

Ch - are into such that is necess to confront him with names?

Com - if so, try not to use names - may use pictures,

Kel - wd like to keep net to go out some -

Bill - have had to show names, photos etc? - Yes -
- are these suspects, or all & sundry - random selection

Com - See to prepare paper for next entry - O.K.