

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM

1745-42-9 (DWP)

26 Sep 86

DG Charter

CHARTER TASK FORCE - DRAFT
FINAL REPORT

Refs: A. 1745-42-9 (Chart TF) 24 Sep 86
B. Draft CANFORGEN 039 CANRESGEN 011 ___ Sep 86

1. I regret that in the time available, I have been unable to provide an in depth analysis of the content of Ref A. In particular, without access to the Annexes listed in Part 3, it is difficult to determine if their content has been interpreted judiciously in the main body of Part 3 of the report.
2. Part 1 succinctly outlines the mandate. Part 2 flows well and sets the stage against which the reasonableness of policies for the CF must be measured. While strongly upholding the overriding criteria of operational effectiveness, as written it nevertheless indicates a willingness to contemplate change.
3. Part 4, in my opinion, effectively presents the CF case for continuation of the present policy on homosexuality. There is sufficient documentation and data from surveys etc contained within the paragraphs under the main headings to come to a logical conclusion that maintenance of the current policy is a reasonable limitation under Section one of the Charter. The case for the CF is clearly enunciated. It remains to be seen if it will gain political acceptance or if the government will choose to have the matter resolved through a challenge in the Courts.
4. My general overall impression of Part 3 (presuming acceptance of the draft CANFORGEN (Ref B) and the recommendations of Part 3) was favourable. That is to say, I believe that it has shown a genuine concern to balance the individual rights against the operational requirement. While there could be valid argument for immediate opening of all occupations (with the proper selection standards/criteria in place), the phased approach provides a commitment to expand employment opportunities commensurate with capabilities while at the same time taking necessary action to address issues (such as pregnancy) which may have a detrimental effect on the integration process in the workplace.

.../2

CONFIDENTIAL

A0140862_1-003285

CONFIDENTIAL
-2-

5. However, I had difficulty with the flow of Part 4. Much of the data that is presented or where data does exist suggests that women would not be a negative factor. However I note where data is acknowledged not to exist, the speculation is that women would be detrimental. I have some difficulty with the logic of being prepared to place women on board AOR's and subsequently conducting trials on destroyers, but not being prepared to open the hard sea trades, particularly where it is acknowledged that small numbers (as would be the case for only support occupations in a DDH) impede integration/acceptance within a unit.


6. While Ref B states implementation will proceed methodically, there is not great emphasis of this critical aspect in Part 4. The recommendation for the set up of a PMO appears to relate primarily to subsequent trials. If all aspects of the employment of women in units mentioned in Ref B are not carefully planned and executed, the mistakes of the SWINTER trials will be repeated to the detriment of all in the CF.

7. The rationale/basis for the time frame outlined for additional trials is not clear nor is the criteria for the selection of "suitable" female aircrew specified.

8. There is a separate heading within the paper addressing spousal concerns ending up with a statement that an educational "might" be required whereas the recommendation (flowing from the conclusion of para 98c) is definitive that a programme is required. No cross reference is made to SWINTER reports which also advocated this requirement.

9. Specific comment on other areas of Part IV of the paper has been pencilled in on the attached copy.

10. Ref A did not include parts 5 and 6.


D.E. Toole
Col
DWP
992-6033

CONFIDENTIAL

A0140862_2-003286