

2355-9-1-15

10-17-59

Meeting between Deputy Commissioner Harvison and Mr. Robertson

At the meeting the Under-Secretary raised the issue not of how information in the [redacted] case should be conveyed but whether or not [redacted]

2. The Deputy Commissioner pointed out that [redacted] should obtain this information for several reasons:

- (1) [redacted] according to Canadian standards [redacted], was a security risk until otherwise cleared.
- (2) It was our duty as a Security Service and in view of [redacted] to pass this type of information along.
- (3) We would find ourselves in an untenable position if we were faced with this information from some other source two or three years hence.
- (4) If this situation was reversed, we would expect [redacted] to give us this type of information.
- (5) Upon the query being raised by Mr. Robertson, it was stated that we have every reason to believe that [redacted] would give us this information if the cases were reversed.

3. After much discussion pro and con, it was quite clear that External Affairs (Mr. Robertson) was more concerned with keeping the source of information away from [redacted] than anything else.

4. Discussion continued on this line and it was pointed out to Mr. Robertson that it was quite possible we could pass this information [redacted] without revealing our source as this was not uncommon and if we proceeded in this way, we could maintain our position at a later date far better than if we did not send the information at all.

5. At this stage Mr. John Starnes advised the Under-Secretary that he felt the Government would be in a better position if [redacted] were given this information and pointed out that [redacted] would handle it more delicately than any other Service and they could be relied upon to use good judgment.

6. Some discussion then took place as to how this information could be handled and the Deputy Commissioner suggested that if the decision could be made soon enough so that he could notify the Commissioner [redacted] this could be discussed personally by him with [redacted]. The Under-Secretary then stated that perhaps the Commissioner could be asked to stay in France another day as he would be there Sunday night and he could speak to the Commissioner on Monday. The Deputy Commissioner pointed out that if the decision was a ministerial decision as suggested by Mr. Robertson, there would be nothing to talk about and there would be no reason to ask the Commissioner to remain in France. Mr. Robertson seemed to agree with this point. Out of this latter discussion came the decision that as Mr. Robertson had discussed the matter with his Minister who had [redacted]

A0145236_1-000323

seen this problem in exactly the way he had, in that there was [redacted] and also in view of the fact that the Deputy Commissioner had discussed this matter with his Minister and that the two Ministers had some discussion on Wednesday (December 9th), it was felt that the only decision could now be made by the Ministers and perhaps the Deputy Commissioner and the Under-Secretary should be present at this meeting. There seemed to be complete accord that once the decision was made and if the information should be sent [redacted] it should be done through the Security Services concerned. The meeting closed on this point.

7. During the discussions there were some points raised on the strength of the information upon which the Police were working and some lengthy discussion as to homosexuality in relation to security.

Meeting between Deputy Commissioner Harvison, Mr. Gill and Mr. Starnes.

After the above meeting, a further meeting took place between the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. John Starnes and Mr. Evan Gille, both of whom had been present at the previous meeting. It was obvious that both men had large sized chips on their shoulders and the main question was the propriety of the R.C.M.P. raising this issue with the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister. A further point was the propriety of using names in these conversations where the evidence was particularly slim, namely [redacted] Mr. Gille stated that whether or not the [redacted] case developed favourably or unfavourably, [redacted] would not get another posting.

2. Mr. Gille stated that he felt that the purpose of these investigations was to find some proof of a security infraction. It was made clear to Mr. Gille that this was only part of the purpose of the investigation as it was necessary to find out whether a man was, in addition to his point, a security risk as laid down by CD 29.

3. He further criticized the use of External Affairs personnel lists in the course of the investigation and it was pointed out to Mr. Gille that the manner in which the investigation was conducted, was something demanded by circumstances and the Police had to start somewhere. The Deputy Commissioner pointed out that we did not "add names" to a list as being an aim of the Police and which was suggested by Mr. Gille, but that all names on any list had come from the mouth of the homosexual. It was pointed out to Mr. Gille that homosexuals have a propensity for picking out other homosexuals not known to the ordinary individual.

4. A further point which was raised and this was a straight accusation, was that the Deputy Commissioner had told the Prime Minister that Mr. Holmes was getting a job at the University of British Columbia, resulting in Mr. Holmes not getting it. The Deputy Commissioner pointed out quite clearly that Holmes' position in relation to the job in British Columbia was never raised by him. It was raised by the Prime Minister in such a way as to indicate that he had prior knowledge of this before the meeting

.....3

A0145236_2-000324

attended by the Deputy Commissioner and that the Prime Minister must have obtained the information some other way, presumably through the Minister of External Affairs.

5. Mr. Starnes showed a chart listing all homosexuals in the Department showing that they had broken the problem down into three parts:

- (a) Those people who are confirmed homosexuals and who are not now with the Department.
- (b) Those who appear to be in a serious category now as a result of information, and
- (c) Those on whom the information is relatively slight, for example, Moodie and Eberts.

6. Mr. Starnes then made a specific request that the Force not pass names to the Cabinet through the Minister before the Department had decided what was to be done about it. Previously in the conversation, the Deputy Commissioner had pointed out in reply to a statement of Gille and Starnes that this was the first time he had understood that Ministers should not be told the facts of their Departments and that the Minister of Justice by law was the head of the Force and therefore entitled to know the facts as known to the Police and that Cabinet Directives did not take the place of law.

7. This meeting again closed with some discussion on homosexuality in relation to security and the problems involved being fair to all concerned.

8. Further points of discussion in the latter meeting resulted in the following observations being made by Starnes and Gille.

- (a) When information given to Cabinet, it is as good as being made public.
- (b) Danger of publicity: In view of (a), greater in the last six weeks.

9. There was a further discussion on Mr. Holmes going to the University of B.C. and its effect upon the Government if his character weaknesses were made public and whether or not the Department need tell the University of British Columbia of these character weaknesses as it is now their policy not to do so.

ADDENDUM


- (a) In the meeting with Mr. Robertson, it was pointed out quite clearly that the view of the Force was that whether or not the information concerning [REDACTED] should be acted upon by [REDACTED] is one for [REDACTED] and not Canada.
- (b) It was pointed out to Mr. Robertson whose main concern seemed to be protecting the source of the information in the case of [REDACTED] that once the information was passed [REDACTED] any questioning of [REDACTED] as a result would probably reveal the source.

.....4

A0145236_3-000325

- (c) Mr. Robertson made reference to the Kinsey Report and pointed out that in the section dealing with homosexuality, Kinsey had stated that approximately 50% of the population had experienced a homosexual relationship at one time or another during their lives. The Deputy Commissioner stated that this could well be so, but these figures did not in any way diminish the security problem arising from such character weaknesses.
- (d) The Deputy Commissioner in his meeting with Mr. Starnes and Mr. Gill pointed out that an effort was now being made to have the Force controlled by its own Minister and not by policy made for it by the various Departments of Government.
- (e) In the matter of Mr. Starnes' suggestion that names not be passed to the Government or that matters should not be discussed with the Government before it was agreed with External Affairs that it should be done, was not agreed to by the Deputy Commissioner who insisted that the Minister should at all times be in possession of any facts known by the Force and at a time to be decided upon by the Force and not any other Department.
- (f) It was clearly stated by the Deputy Commissioner that in future, all matters relating to homosexuals would be made a matter of correspondence so that what was given to the Department would at all times be in writing.
- (g) Mr. Starnes raised the point that in the case of all homosexuals now being turned up, the Force had given a security clearance on each one. Discussion took place to show that security investigations delved into character weakness where apparent, but due to the nature of this type of character weakness, it was not possible to pursue this channel of investigation unless there was some indication of the weakness.
- (h) In the meeting with Mr. Robertson, it was agreed that the information could be passed to [REDACTED] concerning the character weakness of [REDACTED] without giving the actual source of the information (see item (b)).

The meetings referred to took place in the P.M. of Wednesday, December 9th, in the East Block.


(W. H. Kelly),
Assistant D. S. I.

OTTAWA,
10/12/59.

A0145236_4-000326