



YOUR NO.  
VOTRE N°

OUR NO.  
NOTRE N°

IP 155-Q-66

January, 1977

S E C R E T

Mr. D.W. Hall,  
Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet,  
(Security and Intelligence),  
Privy Council Office.

Dear Mr. Hall:

Re: Homosexuality, the Public Service, and  
National Security

I refer to your letter of 14 December 1976 which forwarded to me for comment a preliminary draft of a document, "Homosexuality, the Public Service, and National Security", and a related draft memorandum.

Copies of these papers have been distributed within the Security Service, and a copy was sent to the RCMP Deputy Commissioner (Administration).

The Security Service has proposed a number of amendments to the draft memorandum, which are outlined below for your consideration.

Page 1, para. 2, line 9 - ... affect reliability should the person be indiscreet, and thereby become vulnerable to ...

Page 2, para. 6 - From the point of view of security clearance, the main reasons for exclusion from access to classified information on grounds of homosexuality are that the person may be indiscreet or vulnerable to blackmail or coercion. Other factors, eg., the level or potential level of employment and access involved, the potential adverse effect on the individual (eg. arrest abroad), the nature of the homosexual relationship(s) must also be considered. Obviously,

- 2 -

S E C R E T

the homosexual who is frank about the characteristic may not be as vulnerable to blackmail or coercion as would otherwise be the case.

Page 3, para. 8 - Experience indicates that many homosexuals prefer to keep their homosexuality secret from family and friends, and when the characteristic is raised with them, are receptive to understanding the security implications of their orientation and the fact that their own interests are involved. (NB. This is a combination of paras. 8 and 9).

Page 4, para. 2 - delete.

Page 4, para. 5 - Where denial of security clearance is decided upon, the individual should be told the reason to the fullest extent possible, and the considerations involved should be explained. Maximum possible frankness ...

Page 5, para. 7 - delete.

The 12 page introductory draft entitled "Homosexuality, the Public Service and National Security" is acceptable as a general, philosophical statement and we have no changes to suggest.

Comments have been provided also by the RCMP Director, Organization and Personnel, and by the Deputy Commissioner (Administration); these are outlined below. While it will be noted that the Director, Organization and Personnel has offered an amendment to paragraph 7, under "Guidelines", it remains the view within the Security Service that this paragraph should be deleted in its entirety.

The RCMP is generally in complete agreement with the draft memorandum to Cabinet, but would like to highlight a few points which may require further thought.

Director, Organization and Personnel

While we agree that a homosexual who has disclosed his orientation is not as subject to blackmail or coercion as one who has not, it is suggested that such disclosure must be quite broad, not just to the interviewer or a few close associates. If the homosexual wishes to hide such practice from anyone of importance to him, he is just as subject to blackmail as if he were trying to keep his orientation completely concealed.

- 3 -

S E C R E T

It is therefore suggested that para. 6 under the title "Considerations" should be amended as follows:

"...the homosexual who has made broad public disclosure about the characteristic cannot..."

and that para. 7 of the section headed "Guidelines" be similarly adjusted

"In cases where homosexuality is common knowledge, denial of..."

Consideration should be given to the promiscuous homosexual. I suggest that such a person is even more subject to compromise or blackmail than a promiscuous heterosexual. This, of course, is connected to some extent with the tendency of some of these people to proselytize. It should also be noted that there has been some indication over the years that a homosexual who achieves a position which exerts some control over hiring, will tend to populate his sphere of influence with people of similar bent.

We would be somewhat reluctant to grant even low level security clearance to covert homosexuals or to accept any homosexual in the government services. Though in theory their mobility can be restricted, in practice, once in the public service, they can enter competitions for more senior jobs anywhere and, if successful in the competition, force management to show cause for refusal. This could repeatedly place the government's very valid stand on homosexuality on trial, which will undoubtedly delight "Gay Lib" groups.

While in emphatic agreement with para. 8 under the heading "Guidelines", thought might be given to providing firmer guidance by adding one sentence at the end of that paragraph:

"Homosexuals shall not be employed in these areas".

While it is probable that we have not raised anything entirely new, it is hoped that the above points will be considered.

Deputy Commissioner (Administration)

I support the comments made above by the Director, Organization and Personnel. To put it in its simplest terms, if we were not permitted to reject either homosexual or lesbian recruit applicants there would be virtual revolution within the

- 4 -

S E C R E T

ranks of the Force, to say nothing of the public reaction should it be thought that persons with such tendencies might be posted to "youth or juvenile" details, to be used for guarding prisoners or employed in almost any other investigative role in the Force. Surely nothing more need be said, and surely we need not shrink from making our views and policies known to the public, "GAY" groups included.

It is hoped that the foregoing will prove useful in the preparation of a final draft on this complex subject.

Yours truly,



M.R. Dare  
Director General  
Security Service