

G355-9-1-15

August 20, 1962

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Mr. Wall:

This has reference to your letter of 27 July, 1962 concerning a discussion you and Mr. BAXTER of D.O.T., had with Superintendent KELLY concerning [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

To avoid possible confusion each of these cases is being dealt with seperately.

2. In the [REDACTED] case, it is understood that during the discussion Mr. BAXTER was made aware of the information we hold and that no further action is required. However I do feel that some additional comment is necessary on the proposed procedure for handling future cases involving persons with this character weakness who are not employed on duties requiring a security clearance. In reconsidering the proposed course of action it is apparent that it will not help to solve the problems which arise in connection with the dissemination of information from our records.

3. It will be recognized that the passing of information from our records, even in general terms, by means of the telephone is a violation of Security Panel Directives. Even if it were not contrary to policy, the use of the telephone, as a vehicle for conveying information dealing with this character weakness, is not suitable. I am sure you will agree that it is difficult enough for the Departments to make a decision when presented with a factual, evaluated report of this type of information; and that the requirement for a decision to be taken on the strength of a telephone call, dealing only in general terms, is an unnecessary burden. Then too, for obvious reasons, it is our policy to ensure that a written record be kept of all information passed to other Departments from our records. We are particularly concerned about the handling of information dealing with this character weakness because of it's defamatory nature.

4. The [REDACTED] case is an appropriate illustration to support the request we made to the Security Panel in 1960 for specific Terms of Reference within which to conduct our investigation

Mr. D.F. Wall,
Secretary of the Security Sub-Panel,
Privy Council Office,
Room 119, East Block,
O T T A W A, Ontario.

REVIEWED
S.E. ELLIOTT
NO. 3 SEC.
DATE
INITIAL

orig on [REDACTED]


....2

A0053277_1-000956

of this character weakness. Since we have not been given the firm directives we require we can discharge our responsibilities only through our interpretation of the discussions held and recommendations made by the ad hoc committee which has been dealing with this matter. In this regard I would invite your attention to paragraphs (7) and (9, d) of the Security Panel paper "Security Cases Involving Homosexuality" dated 26 January 1961.

5. While concurring in the decision reached in the [redacted] case I wish to re-iterate that the procedure adopted is not considered suitable for implementation as a general policy, for the reasons stated above. In addition, it is anticipated that the basis of the problem in the [redacted] case will be resolved in the near future through other contemplated changes in policy.

Yours very truly,



(J.R.W. Bordeleau),
Assistant Commissioner
Director
Security & Intelligence.

