

Q.5 Will not the presence of known homosexuals lead to more disciplinary problems?

A.5 The discipline issue has been studied carefully. The 1986 report of the Charter Task Force quoted a number of statistics about the relative incidence of sexual assault by homosexuals and heterosexuals. The source data have been reviewed and it has been determined that the study giving rise to the statistics was unreliable. The fact is we do not know, and the data are not available to determine, whether or not homosexuals are more likely than heterosexuals to be involved in cases of sexual assault. However, we do know that the CF has its share of both heterosexual and homosexual sexual misconduct and it seems appropriate that the focus be on misconduct rather than on the orientation of the perpetrators. A second dimension of the discipline concern is the possibility of heterosexual members engaging in

physical violence against known homosexuals.
That kind of behaviour is indicative of a
problem with individual heterosexuals rather
than homosexuals and is not acceptable and will
not be tolerated.

Q.6 Is it not true that homosexuals are more
vulnerable to blackmail and consequently are
more a security threat than heterosexuals?

A.6 Security experts do not consider homosexuals as
a group to be any more of a security risk than
heterosexuals as a group. Security risks are
assessed on an individual basis. It is a
security conclusion that maintaining a policy to
exclude known homosexuals from the CF
potentially increases the security risk rather
than decreasing it. As a matter of policy,
specific references to homosexuality were
removed from the mandate of the SIU on
21 November, 1990 by ADM(Per) message 081/90
issued as CANFORGEN 049/90 and CANRESGEN 031/90.