

FPRO : BRFR
R. G. ROBERTSON

SEP 22 1976

SECRET

September 21st, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. ROBERTSON:

Out 257

The next meeting of the Special Security Committee will be on Thursday, September 23rd, at 12:30 p.m., at the Country Club, Aylmer Road.

You will recall that the Committee had discussed, at various times, the secondment of an official from External Affairs to the Security Service to complete a reciprocal arrangement which has seen a Security Service officer assigned to External Affairs. This appeared to have been settled last Fall (according to the notes of the meeting on October 28, 1975) but the R.C.M.P. have still not accepted an External Affairs nominee. Mr. Robinson intends to raise this point for discussion at Thursday's meeting. (I have the impression that the Commissioner, not Mr. Dare, has some reservations about the arrangement and this has caused the delay).

The only other subject left unresolved from previous meetings is the establishing of criteria for handling visa requests from known foreign intelligence officers. The last time this was discussed, disagreement centered around an element of "flexibility" which External Affairs wanted included but which was not acceptable to the Security Service.

Mr. Robinson also intends to raise the following subjects for discussion:

- as Chairman of the Visits Panel, he is concerned about the "managing" of some visits to Canada and also considers that Canada gives a good deal in this area but gets little in return. On this latter point, he has mentioned, specifically, visits to the Arctic where Canada is quite open but the Soviets are considerably less forthcoming;

.../2

A0454371_1-001894

SECRET

- 2 -

- he will invite Mr. Dare to comment on the change in status of the Security Service in light of the decision that it is to be "increasingly separate and civilian in nature" and the implications of this change for External Affairs;
- he will discuss the employment of separatists and homosexuals and the particular problems these people create in External Affairs because of foreign postings. As I understand it, he wants to "flag" these problems and express support for the review this Secretariat is now doing on the security implications of the employment of homosexuals in the public service. (You may recall that you asked me some time ago to re-examine the policy regarding homosexuality. This project was started during the summer. We have had talks with officials in some of the departments with the greatest interest and experience in this area - External, Security Service, National Defence, Public Service Commission and there are a few more areas we would like to explore - e.g. medical opinion, and the situation in penitentiaries. We are also reviewing the debates preceding approval in 1969 of the Criminal Code amendment concerning consenting adults, and material submitted to the Royal Commission. My impression at the moment is that the existing (1963) policy and the pending proposals on security screening continue to be valid - though I think that, in the light of changing circumstances, more guidance might be contemplated for departments, and draft statements might be devised for possible use (e.g. by Ministers) when explanations are required).

.../3

A0454371_2-001895

SECRET

- 3 -

Mr. Tassé will discuss the recent hi-jacking of a T.W.A. plane and its landing at Canadian airports. Since this incident, there have been questions raised about such matters as standing procedures for handling hi-jackings and police jurisdiction at airports.

Robin Bourne is convening a meeting of representatives of all interested departments to analyse this incident and identify weaknesses or failures, if any, in its handling (I will attend these meetings). The matter of police jurisdiction has been raised by Mr. Cloutier (D.M. - M.O.T.). There are two areas in which jurisdiction is not clear - (1) in Ontario and Quebec where the local police forces have criminal code jurisdiction but, in view of the international implications of most hi-jackings, it is considered that federal jurisdiction at federal airports should be recognized and (2) the Aeronautics Act assigns responsibility for the safety of passengers, crew and aircraft to M.O.T. while the aircraft is "in flight" and defines "in flight" in such a way that, for example, the T.W.A. plane had "in flight" status all the time it was at Mirabel (but not at Gander).

I might add that Mr. Cloutier has written to Mr. Pitfield concerning these problems and referring to a draft submission to Cabinet developed by Robin Bourne in 1973 which recommended that the R.C.M.P. be given full jurisdiction at federally operated airports. Mr. Pitfield has discussed the problem with the Prime Minister and Mr. Lalonde, who feel that federal jurisdiction should be recognized as quickly as possible. Mr. Marchand has asked me to follow-up in consultation with Frank Carter, Gordon Smith and Jim Midwinter.

Mr. Tassé will also give a critique of Olympics security arrangements.

Mr. Dare has nothing in particular to raise but will give a résumé of events at last week's conference of Commonwealth security heads.


D. W. Hall

A0454371_3-001896