



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

File No.: 2800-54

**THE
HERITAGE FRONT AFFAIR**

REPORT

TO

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF CANADA

**SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE
December 9, 1994**

JL
86
.S4
S43
1994
C.2

File No.: 2800-54 C.2

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown.
Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for
any intended use.
Les droits d'auteur du présent document n'appartiennent
pas à l'État. Toute utilisation du contenu du présent
document doit être approuvée préalablement par l'auteur.

**THE
HERITAGE FRONT AFFAIR**

**REPORT
TO
THE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF CANADA**

LIBRARY
SOLICITOR GENERAL CANADA
JAN 4 1995
BIBLIOTHÈQUE
SOLICITEUR GÉNÉRAL CANADA
OTTAWA (ONTARIO)
K1A 0P8

**SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE
December 9, 1994**

*Dream furniture is the only kind on which you
never stub your toes or bang your knee.*

C.S. Lewis (1898-1963)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
METHODOLOGY	1-7
FOREWARD	1-2
I. OVERVIEW OF THE EXTREME RIGHT	1-5
1.1 The New Groups	1
1.2 Recent Racism	3
1.3 The 1990's	5
II. TARGETING THE EXTREMISTS	1-5
2.1 Targeting the Extremists	1
2.2 The First Certificates of the 90's	2
2.3 The Second Targeting Series	3
2.4 The Current Certificate	5
III. ALLEGED WHITE SUPREMACIST INFORMANT	1-15
3.1 Background	1
3.2 The Radical Right	3
3.3 Trip to Libya - Founding the Heritage Front	6
IV. THE HERITAGE FRONT EMERGES	1-11
4.1 Events in 1990	1
4.2 The Heritage Front in 1991	2
4.3 Reform Investigation and Clashes with Anti-Racists	5
4.4 The Harassment Campaign Peaks	7
4.5 Leave Taking	10

V.	INFORMATION COLLECTION AND HARASSMENT	1-42
5.1	Overview	1
5.2	White Supremacist Information Highway	1
5.3	The Hate Line	3
5.4	The Rise of the Anti-Racist Groups	3
5.5	Recruiting at High Schools	5
5.6	Machine Busters	6
5.7	The "IT" Campaign	8
5.8	Information Collection on the ARA	11
5.9	Harassment of ARA Members	11
5.10	Harassment and Contact with Jewish Groups	26
5.11	The Morgentaler Bombing	39
5.12	Contacts with the Police	40
VI.	THE FUNDING OF THE SOURCE IN THE HERITAGE FRONT	1-12
6.1	CSIS Payments to the Source	1
6.2	Expenses	2
6.3	Loss-of-Employment Compensation	5
6.4	The Source's Financial Situation	6
6.5	CSIS Assistance to the Heritage Front	7
6.6	Value of Information and Assistance	9
6.7	Conclusions	12
VII.	REFORM PARTY	1-60
7.1	The First Meeting	1
7.2	The International Centre Rally	5
7.3	The Plots Against Reform	11
7.4	Headquarters Instructions and Debates	24
7.5	Final Act	31
7.6	Conspiracies and Plots	37
7.7	Other Issues	54
VIII.	THE REFORM PARTY AND A FOREIGN COUNTRY	1-7
8.1	The Tip	1
8.2	The International Environment	2
8.3	The Targeting Decision	2
8.4	The Investigation	4
8.5	Findings	6

IX.	THE METZGER AND MAGUIRE INCIDENTS	1-10
9.1	The Arrest of Sean Maguire	1
9.2	The Metzger Visit	4
X.	THE SOURCE AND THE LEGAL PROCESS	1-3
10.1	Zundel's Legal Plans	1
10.2	A Discussion about David Irving	1
10.3	Doan Discusses Legal Strategy	2
10.4	Defence Creativity	2
10.5	Solicitor-Client Communications	2
XI.	BRISTOW AND CSIS ALLEGED SPYING ON POSTAL WORKERS	1-7
11.1	Introduction	1
11.2	The Briefing Note	2
11.3	The CBC's Second Offensive	3
11.4	The SIRC Investigation	4
11.5	Summary	6
XII.	SPYING ON THE CBC	1-5
12.1	Did CSIS Spy on the CBC?	2
12.2	Did CSIS Lawfully Obtain the Information about the Possible CBC Program?	2
12.3	What Did CSIS Know Prior to Reporting the Information?	2
12.4	Can CSIS Collect Such Information?	3
12.5	CSIS and the Minister	4
12.6	Strictly Necessary	4
12.7	Conclusion	5

XIII. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	1-15
13.1 Source in the Heritage Front	1
13.2 Leadership of the Heritage Front	1
13.3 Recruiting and Funding	2
13.4 The Harassment Campaign	3
13.5 Infiltrating the Reform Party	5
13.6 The Reform Party and a Foreign Government	9
13.7 Maguire and Metzger	9
13.8 Spying on the CBC	11
13.9 Spying on the Postal Workers/Union	11
13.10 The Media and the Heritage Front Affair	11
13.11 Ministerial Direction - CSIS and Policy Concerning Sources	12
13.12 Overview	15
ANNEX A: HOW THE TARGETING PROCESS WORKS	1-3
GLOSSARY	1-3

METHODOLOGY

The Review Committee has provided a large number of reports to the Solicitor General of Canada. Some of them have been voluminous, some quite brief. This report on "*The Heritage Front Affair*" comes somewhere between those extremes.

In order to describe what we set out to achieve in this investigation, we feel that we can do no better than quote from our Chairman's statement to the Parliamentary Sub-Committee on National Security on September 13, 1994. Only the readers of the report can judge whether we achieved the goals we set for ourselves.

"First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me explain what we are doing.

As soon as the press report appeared in the Toronto Sun on Sunday, August 14 , we commenced an investigation to find out exactly what CSIS was doing in this area.

We had already looked at CSIS activities regarding "extremist groups" in 1990 to early 1991 and reported on the problems we found in our 1990-91 and 1991-92 Annual Reports.

That review looked at all investigations underway at the time. It was designed to make sure that: only leaders who could reasonably be described as "threats to national security" were being investigated; that the intrusiveness of the investigations was proportionate to the possible threat; and that there was no intrusion on innocent people's privacy. Our review focused on the legality of investigative techniques used by CSIS, including human sources.

The review we have underway now will examine every aspect of all allegations that have been made; down to the smallest detail and including everything even remotely relevant to the case.

The law gives us absolute and complete authority to look at every file, examine any document (except Cabinet Confidences), or interview any person we consider necessary. Contrary to the impression you may have received from the news media, there are no limitations whatsoever on our access to information held by CSIS. In this case, we are exercising to the full the extraordinary powers given to us by Parliament.

But, as you know, Parliament also decided that the results of our reviews should be passed to the Solicitor General pursuant to section 54 of the Act. The Minister must then decide how much of our report can be made public without endangering national security. Only in our Annual Report can we decide what to make public.

We are seeking answers to the following questions:

1. Possible CSIS Source in the Heritage Front

- a. Was there a CSIS human source or sources in the Heritage Front and/or associated organizations? If so, what was the reason for this?
- b. Did a CSIS source either alone or with others prompt the creation of the Heritage Front?
- c. Did CSIS allow a source to establish or become an executive member of the Heritage Front? If so, what limitations did the Service place on his or her

participation? What were the reasons underlying the CSIS decisions?

- d. If there was a CSIS source in place, what is the likelihood that the Heritage Front would have been established if that source had not been present?
- e. Did a source direct the development of the Heritage Front computerized hate-line?
- f. Did a source help to create and sustain the Heritage Front by providing it with substantial funding directly (donations) or indirectly (paying for accommodation, transportation, etc.)?
- g. Did a source actively promote the Heritage Front in a non-financial manner? How?

2. Infiltration of the Reform Party

- a. Did the Heritage Front provide security for Reform Party meetings in 1991? In 1992?
- b. If so, how did this come about?
- c. Did a CSIS source play a role in arranging Heritage Front security for Reform Party meetings in 1991 and 1992? How many rallies and when?
- d. Did CSIS authorize a source to collect information on the Reform Party? If so, did CSIS receive political direction in that regard?

- e. Did a source attempt to infiltrate the Reform Party and, if so, was it to discredit Reform by publicly revealing a connection to the Heritage Front?
- f. Did a source "track" Preston Manning? Did a CSIS employee "track" Preston Manning?
- g. Did CSIS know about a source's security duties prior to the rallies? When did CSIS learn about the activity?
- h. Did a source provide any information on the Reform Party? If so, what did CSIS do with that information and what was the rationale for the CSIS decision?
- i. If a source took part in any of the activities listed above, what was the CSIS Toronto Region and Headquarters response to that information?
- j. When and how did the Reform Party learn about the racist security group?

3. Spying on the CBC

- a. Was CSIS spying on the CBC or anyone working for the CBC? If so, what were the reasons underlying the CSIS decision?
- b. How did CSIS obtain information that the CBC program, The Fifth Estate, was doing a story about white supremacists in the Canadian Forces?

- c. Did the Service comply with legislation and policy in (i) retaining this information, and (ii) providing this information to the Minister?

4. Provision of Information to Racists about Jewish Groups

- a. Did a source try to obtain information from the Canadian Jewish Congress by impersonating a reporter, or by any other means?
- b. Did a source try to obtain information from the Jewish Students Network by impersonating a Citizen reporter or an associate of author Warren Kinsella?
- c. Did a source initiate the above himself/herself or was he/she directed to do so and by whom? If directed to do so, what was the rationale for this decision?
- d. Did a source provide white supremacists in the USA and Canada with money and detailed intelligence on Jewish groups or individuals in Canada?

5. Harassment Campaign Against Left-Wing/Anti-racists

- a. Did a source instigate breaking into voice-mail systems of left-wing persons or anti-racists to acquire information?
- b. Did a source teach others in the racist movement how to do so?

- c. Did a source directly or indirectly harass or direct the harassment (including death threats) of anti-racist activists?

6. Solicitor-Client Communications

- a. Was a source present and did that source report on privileged information exchanged between Wolfgang Droege and his lawyer?
- b. Did a source provide legal advice to Wolfgang Droege in judicial or quasi-judicial fora?

7. Assessment of CSIS Human Source Handling

- a. Did CSIS management of a human source, if any, comply with legislation, ministerial direction and policy?
- b. What supervision and management control did CSIS exercise, and was it adequate?
- c. Is ministerial direction and CSIS policy adequate to address the situations encountered in a human source operation?"

In addition to the points made in the Chairman's statement to Parliament, we have addressed the questions posed by the Sub-Committee on National Security, and the questions posed by the Reform Party through the Chairman of the Sub-Committee. The allegation that CSIS spied on Post Office workers is also addressed.

During our investigation, we examined every CSIS file, every internal memo, all reports, threat assessments, reports to the Minister, reports to Police forces and other government agencies, and all other documents having anything whatsoever to do with the *"Heritage Front Affair"*.

We interviewed or contacted one hundred and twenty-one people, many of them several times. We also held five full days of formal Hearings under oath, during which we questioned the principal players in the affair. In the vast majority of cases we received full co-operation from the people we wished to interview. In particular, we received considerable help from members, former members, or supporters of the Reform Party and the Conservative Party.

We regret that despite our best, indeed incessant efforts, we were able to interview very few members or former members of the Anti-Racist Action group. We asked members of this group, both orally and in writing, on many occasions to cooperate with our investigation. We also tried to alleviate their concerns about providing us with information about their experiences at the hands of the Heritage Front. We thought that we had reached an agreement with them in late November, but they did not call us back, as they had promised to do, and we learned from the media that they had decided not to cooperate. We sent a final written request on November 23, 1994 but have received no reply.

FOREWORD

Conspiracy theories endure. There are hundreds of examples of this, the most poignant and well-known being the many conspiracies believed to be behind the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. There is a simple reason: it is impossible to prove a negative proposition.

Several independent groups of well-qualified people have concluded that the Loch Ness monster does not exist. But, for true believers, these conclusions simply show that the investigation was not sufficiently thorough, or that the people involved were biased from the start.

Our report faces the same obstacles. That is why we described under 'Methodology' the efforts we made to ensure that nothing remotely relevant escaped our attention. We realize that even this will not prevent some people from demanding another "independent" investigation, because our conclusions may not match their preconceived convictions. There will undoubtedly be others who, based upon the facts set out in this report, come to conclusions that differ from ours; we certainly have no quarrel with them.

The Review Committee took the decision to investigate the Heritage Front affair on Sunday, August 14, 1994. The investigation commenced the following day. Sometime later, at the request of the Reform Party of Canada, we expanded our usual investigative mandate to include an examination of allegations concerning the infiltration of the Reform Party. We followed a variety of leads in this area. Almost all our staff, and we ourselves, have been pre-occupied with the inquiry ever since.

What sets this report apart from all the other reports we have sent to the Solicitor General is the fact that most of it, perhaps all of it, will be made public. This will occur because the allegations against CSIS were so serious that the Security Intelligence 'system' established by Parliament in 1984 was in danger of losing the public's trust. Readers of the "*Heritage Front Affair*" will be able to judge for themselves the effectiveness of the accountability procedures put in place by the *CSIS Act*, and the Review Committee's role in that structure.

The report contains quite a mélange of information. Much of it is objective fact based upon a thorough cross-checking of sensitive information, Source reports, CSIS files, and interviews. Some of it is presumed fact because of the preponderance of evidence. Some of it is what we believe to be the most likely correct version of events based upon our judgement of the weight to be given to each individual's evidence.

We have consciously limited the report in two areas only:

- we have tried to avoid providing too much

information about CSIS' methods of operation so as not to endanger the Service's effectiveness in the future; and

- we have not broken the law, section 18 of the *CSIS Act*, by identifying the CSIS Source who was active in the white supremacist milieu.

Because of the vagaries of our two official languages, the personal pronouns "he" in the english version and "she" in the french version are used when referring to sources. These pronouns are used without regard to the actual sex of the sources.

The last chapter of the report contains our findings. We took great care in reaching these conclusions and, for our part, are confident that they are well-founded.

Finally, because there are passages in this report that could be construed as impugning the characters of certain individuals, we have attempted to contact all of them, given them the nature of passages which refer to them, and taken full account of their comments. In some cases, their comments have led to changes in the text, in others, a footnote puts their objections or clarifications on the record.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE EXTREME RIGHT

The information in this report covers several groups and individuals associated with the extremist right in Canada. To give context to the persons, groups and events which are described in the other sections of this report, we have provided a brief overview of how the leadership and members in the extreme right promote themselves and their ideas under different names at different times.

We have not tried to be all-inclusive, nor have we tried to offer the reader an in-depth examination of how extremist groups have evolved. There are several texts on the market which do this.¹ Rather, we offer a short "primer" on the antecedents of the Heritage Front.

Differences do exist between the extremist groups, largely as a function of how drastic their remedies are for the problems they perceive to exist in Canadian society. Common to most of the organizations listed below are their doctrines, whether clandestine, to attract a wider range of support or, as is increasingly the case, blatant. Their fundamental agreement is the conviction that whites (aryans) are an endangered species. These beliefs lead, in turn, to their attitudes which are: anti-Semitic; anti-non whites; anti-immigration/refugee; anti-democratic; pro-free speech for racist or anti-Semitic ideas; anti-human rights; and anti-gay. The members tend to drift from one group to another and then back again in order to realize their xenophobic aims.

1.1 The New Groups

Hate literature, racially motivated crimes, and the rise of political organizations dedicated to a racist ideology are not new phenomena in Canada. The Ku Klux Klan, for example, took root in Western Canada in the 1920's.

Canadian Fascist and Nazi movements replaced the short lived Ku Klux Klan in the 1930s and 1940s. Adrien Arcand's Parti National Social Chretien² advocated that Fascism was the only solution to the "Jewish invention" of our system of liberal democracy. Arcand promoted Hitler as the saviour of Christianity.³

¹ See Stanley R. Barrett, "Is God a Racist. The Right Wing in Canada", Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987; Warren Kinsella, "Unholy Alliances", Toronto: Lester Publishing Limited, 1992; Warren Kinsella, "Web of Hate. Inside Canada's Far Right Network", Toronto: Harper Collins, 1994.

² The Party expanded into Ontario as the National Christian Party of Canada and was renamed in the post-war period as the National Unity Party.

³ Barrett, 1987, p.22.

In the period immediately after the Second World War, racism and anti-Semitism lost their popularity, but the concepts did not die. Arcand, for example, ran for federal election in 1949 under the National Unity Party, an extension of his previous organization.

Two of the more recent seminal groups in this country's radical right were the Canadian Nazi Party and the Edmund Burke Society. Together they "*paved the way for the rush of right-wing organizations that would march across the nation in the decades to follow.*"⁴

In 1965, John Beattie formed the Canadian Nazi Party, which marked the re-emergence of the neo-nazi political movement in Canada. The group promoted Hitler and his ideas, prompting no fewer than a "*dozen organizations to spring up to do battle*" with it.⁵ Violent confrontations took place and Beattie was eventually sent to prison for six months for public mischief.

In 1967 the Canadian Nazi Party became the National Socialist Party, again with Beattie as its national leader. He set up a recorded telephone message line "*stating among other things that blacks were being manipulated by Jew-communists.*"⁶

Paul Fromm and Donald Andrews (Vilim Zlomislic) founded the Edmund Burke Society in 1967. This Toronto-based organization, described as "*fringe right*" by Stanley Barrett, covered the gamut of right-wing issues, although anti-communism started out as the main focus of its attack. The Society openly opposed "*immigration, sex education, welfare, homosexuality, abortion, big government and Pierre Trudeau.*"⁷ Their activities included the distribution of a newsletter and battles with left-wing groups.⁸ But in practice, "*their group was little more than a repository for mean-spirited racists and anti-Semites.*"⁹ Eventually, some members of the

⁴ Barrett, p.41.

⁵ Barrett, p.45.

⁶ Barrett, p.47.

⁷ Kinsella, 1994, p.207.

⁸ Stanley Barrett speculated that the group might have been started by police agencies seeking to undermine the left wing and to engage in agent provocateur activity (p.70).

⁹ Kinsella, 1992, p. 103.

Society became involved in criminal activities including vandalism, arson and assault.

1.2 Recent Racism

There was an explosion of right-wing activity in the 1970's and 1980's. According to Barrett, in 1987 there were close to 130 different groups functioning in the right wing milieu.¹⁰ As the author stated, the radical right started out as anti-communists, but over time, they adopted the politics of racial purity and anti-Semitism.¹¹

In February 1972, the Edmund Burke Society became the Western Guard. Under Donald Andrews, the group's orientation changed from countering communism to vilifying Jews and non-whites. Those who were non-violent, such as Paul Fromm, left the Western Guard,¹² and were replaced by overtly racist members who pushed the group towards a more aggressive white supremacist and anti-Semitic platform.¹³

In 1973, the Western Guard set up a telephone hotline. Six years later, the line was "cut" by the Canadian Human Rights Commission which deemed it discriminatory. The same scenario would be repeated two decades later, this time in regard to the Heritage Front. Andrews had the dubious distinction of being the first person in Canada charged with wilfully promoting hatred.¹⁴ In 1975, he faced offenses ranging from plotting arson, possession of weapons and explosives, and mischief. He was sentenced to two years in jail for conspiring to bomb a visiting Israeli soccer team. Consequently, the leadership fell to John Ross Taylor in 1976.

Ordered by the Courts to stay away from the Western Guard, on his release in 1977 Andrews created the Nationalist Party of Canada. The Party's activities and beliefs were similar to those of the Western Guard. The Party appealed to the basest instincts of those who joined it: anti-immigrant, anti-gay, fearful of the disappearance of the white race around the world,

¹⁰ Barrett, Appendix.

¹¹ Barrett, p.30.

¹² Fromm spoke at the Western Guard's founding meeting, attended by a leading American Ku Klux Klan leader. Barrett, p. 75.

¹³ Kinsella, 1994, p. 208.

¹⁴ Kinsella, 1994, p.239.

anti-affirmative action, anti-Black, and anti-Jewish. In the mid-1980s the Toronto membership varied between 150 to 300 persons depending up on who was cited.¹⁵

Paul Fromm went on to form two new fringe right wing organizations: Citizens for Foreign Aid Reform (C-FAR) and the Canadian Association for Free Expression (CAFE). C-FAR attacks Canadian foreign aid and immigration policies. CAFE, founded in 1981, focuses on issues of free speech. The individuals and groups defended by this organization are generally from the radical right, and include such Holocaust deniers as Ernst Zundel, Jim Keegstra and Malcolm Ross.

In Alberta, a white supremacist umbrella group started to take shape in the early 1980s. In 1984, Terry Long's Aryan Nations (AN) finally received official recognition from the American leader of the Church of Jesus Christ Christian - Aryan Nations.¹⁶ The AN advocates violence to establish an all Aryan state and is vehemently anti-Semitic and anti-Black. Associated with the AN was another militant group called the Aryan Resistance Movement (ARM). ARM, based in British Columbia, supports the extreme right-wing philosophy of the superiority of the white race and violently opposes those considered to be "non-white". ARM's Nazi publications are the "*amongst the most venomous in the country.*"¹⁷

Wolfgang Droege was a member of the Western Guard in the mid-seventies before switching his efforts to the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) in 1979. Droege, along with Alexander McQuirter, was instrumental in increasing the membership in the group to an estimated 2,500 in 1980.¹⁸ At this time, the KKK and Don Andrews' Nationalist Party of Canada formed a temporary merger. But Droege was convicted and imprisoned in the United States for his part in the plot to overthrow the Government of Dominica and on several drug and weapons charges. McQuirter quit the Klan at the same time and, soon afterwards, was facing conspiracy to murder charges. In their absence, the KKK slowly disappeared.¹⁹

¹⁵ Barrett, p.106.

¹⁶ Barrett, p.172.

¹⁷ Kinsella, 1994, p.53.

¹⁸ Kinsella, 1994, p.217.

¹⁹ Kinsella, 1994, p. 220.

1.3 The 1990's

The early 1990's belong to the Heritage Front and racist skinheads. Disgruntled members of the Nationalist Party formed the Heritage Front in the Fall of 1989. In a few short years, the Heritage Front became the most prominent white supremacist group in Canada. The Heritage Front also became embroiled in a series of legal actions by the Canadian Human Rights Commission and the Federal Court involving their telephone "*hateline*". Currently, a number of HF members are facing assault, robbery, contempt of court and other charges.

The Heritage Front worked closely with other groups such as the Church of the Creator (COTC), which was led by George Burdi. He was said to be the second in command of the Heritage Front. The militant and action-oriented COTC disbanded in 1993 with the leader making racist recordings in the wake of arrests and criminal charges laid against Eric Fischer and Burdi. The members remain active, nonetheless.

COTC followers have joined the Heritage Front and the Northern Hammerskins, a racist skinhead group which is potentially more violent than its predecessor. Other neo-nazi skinhead groups such as the Aryan Resistance Movement and the Alberta-based Final Solution Skinheads are organizing and finding a place in the extreme-right network in Canada.²⁰

To avoid prosecution and violation of bail or release conditions, many white supremacists in North America are re-organizing under the concept of "*individual leadership*". Members of extremist groups are conducting "*business as usual*" but they are trying to do so as individuals. The trend is away from identifiable groups whose leaders can be charged for the criminal acts of those they influence.

²⁰ Kinsella, 1994, pp. 266-281.

II. TARGETING THE EXTREMISTS

This chapter outlines the reasons why CSIS decided to target the leaders of the white supremacist movement. The general process by which CSIS decides *whether* to investigate a particular individual is described in Annex A.

2.1 Targeting the Extremists

The targeting of the white supremacist movement, since the establishment of CSIS, has been reviewed continuously since 1985. The individual targets have changed, and the scope of the investigations has narrowed and then recently expanded again. Over the years, a considerable number of people in positions of authority, both in government and the judiciary, have known of and approved the Service's operations in this area.

The list of those who have scrutinized the targeting of individuals in the white supremacist movement since the creation of CSIS includes: seven Solicitors General; four Inspectors General; twelve members of the Security Intelligence Review Committee; and four Directors of CSIS. In addition, judges of the Federal Court have granted warrant powers to the Service to investigate in this area.

In this section of our report, we examine how the Service targeted the individuals in the white supremacist movement. We review:

- * the grounds upon which white supremacists were targeted; and
- * who was targeted.

CSIS has never issued a targeting authorization specifically against the Heritage Front *per se*.

CSIS began to investigate members of the white supremacist movement from the creation of the new civilian agency, although targeting took place earlier, under the RCMP Security Service.

The most significant change to the targeting process during the period was that the scope of the investigation narrowed. Recent targeting certificates, however, show that the Service has again expanded its information collection efforts to include those who participate in acts of serious political violence.

The Targeting Approval and Review Committee (TARC) minutes of February 1988 state that *"although no concrete acts of violence have taken place yet, it is seriously believed that these organizations have the capacity to perform such actions."*

After five years of investigating the extreme right, CSIS concluded in the 1990-91 TARC submission, that the *"investigations since 1985 have documented the violence and petty criminal activity by skinheads and others but nothing that could be considered a threat to the security of Canada."* CSIS continued to investigate the extent to which the extreme-right constitutes a threat, by *"focusing on the leadership"*.

2.2 The First Certificates of the 90's

Targeting the *"extreme right"* in 1990-91 took place under sections 12, 2(b)¹ and 2(c)² of the CSIS Act. In 1991-92, targeting was only under 2(c). Counter-terrorism investigations are, of course, under 2(c), *"political violence"*.

The 1990-91 targeting submission defined the extreme right *"as racists, fascists and anti-semites who are prepared to use violence to achieve their political objectives."*

The leaders were said to:

"plan and direct the advancement of a white-supremacist philosophy which includes the use of serious violence as a tactic to achieve their stated political objective."

¹ Threats to the Security of Canada, Section 2(b) of the CSIS Act:

"foreign influenced activities within or relating to Canada that are detrimental to the interests of Canada and are clandestine or deceptive or involve a threat to any person."

² Threats to the Security of Canada, Section 2(c) of the CSIS Act:

"activities within or relating to Canada directed toward or in support of the threat or use of acts of serious violence against persons or property for the purpose of achieving a political objective within Canada or a foreign state,"

CSIS' aim was to provide preemptive intelligence of the

"leaders capabilities in gaining support for their extremist political doctrine in 1990 and beyond. Financing, offshore direction and support as well as the connections to other groups will be included as objectives of our investigation."

The Service also sought to develop human sources close to the extreme-right in order to ascertain the white supremacist strategy. CSIS sought to differentiate its investigation from criminal investigations.

In March 1991, TARC added a significant condition:

"The range of investigative techniques to be deployed under this authorization will be subject to consultation with the Minister."

From this point on, the Service was required to send an aide-mémoire to the Solicitor General - prior to implementing the TARC Certificate.

2.3 The Second Targeting Series

The 1992-93 submission to TARC against the white supremacists was approved, pursuant to s.2 (c) of the CSIS Act. The rationale was:

- * the increased coordination between extremist groups in Canada and internationally;
- * the use of "modern technology to compile data on individuals considered to be threats to their racist ideology"; and
- * the operation of three hotlines to "propagate a racist ideology and recruit followers".

The Service stated that the racists had taken "a more pro-active stance to further their political objectives." Proof for the statement was "the increasing presence of hate literature and racist hotlines, as well as a number of high profile criminal cases."

In what appeared to be a return to broader and more preemptive information collection, TARC approved an authorization against *"Serious Violence Associated with Racist and Anti-Semitic incidents"*. The investigation collected information on racist and anti-semitic

"incidents that have the potential to manifest themselves into acts of politically motivated violence. Occurrences, that involve circumstances reasonably suspected of having a politically motivated intent, will be the subject of Service enquiries with local authorities."

The 1993 TARC submission highlighted two developments:

* *"a noticeable shift towards more violence-prone groups on the part of a growing number of white supremacists, particularly within the ranks of neo-nazi skinheads³";*

and

* *the "growing emergence of sophisticated weapons within the white supremacist milieu".*

The Service added

"We continue to differentiate hate crimes and incidents of racially motivated violence from activities which are directed by the white supremacist leadership in pursuit of their political objectives."⁴

³ * Leader of the Church of the Creator, George Burdi established a security team for the COTC and Heritage Front.

* A COTC member was arrested on weapons offenses.

⁴ * July 1992 visit of Americans Tom and John Metzger (head of White Aryan Resistance). Deported.

* 1993 attempt by Dennis Mahon (Ku Klux Klan Leader from Oklahoma) to enter Canada to support Wolfgang Droege at his Canadian Human Rights Tribunal hearing. Stopped at the airport.

* Fall 1992 - David Irving, British revisionist historian visits Canada. Deported by CEIC.

As in the previous year, the submission expressed concern about the links forged within and between the Canadian white supremacists and their foreign counterparts.

The 1993 submission acknowledged that the Heritage Front had become *"the most prominent white supremacist organization in the country,"* prominent enough to inspire the creation of a counter group called *"Anti-Racist Action"*. The latter was *"allegedly preparing to use violence and 'direct action' tactics to counter the white supremacists."*

2.4 The Current Certificate

The most recent TARC Certificate sought to show the stronger links between incidents of racial violence and the political objectives of the white supremacists.

"The supremacists, said the Service, have demonstrated an ability to plan and direct groups to carry out acts of violence on behalf of their ideals. More importantly, they had shown a propensity for violence and are prepared to resort to violence to achieve their political objective of establishing a whites-only 'Aryan' homeland."⁵

⁵ Criminal Incidents cited:

- clashes between anti-racists and the Heritage Front in Ottawa (May 93) and Toronto (June 93);
- Wolfgang Droege and several supporters charged with assault, armed robbery, kidnapping and forceable confinement; and
- both George Burdi and Eric Fischer face criminal charges.

III. ALLEGED WHITE SUPREMACIST INFORMANT

3.1 Background

3.1.1 Counter-Intelligence Work

The Source first came to the attention of CSIS through his contact with diplomats from a foreign country in 1986. On January 29, 1986, CSIS learned that a diplomat from a foreign country had been in contact with two people *"who were in a position to provide information of interest to that country."*

The Source's employer had been passing low level tidbits of information to the country's Vice-Consul in Toronto for the past three years without remuneration. The employer had developed a contact who was involved in the opposition community in Toronto.

The Toronto Consulate official referred the Source and his employer to an Intelligence Officer who was posted to the Embassy in Ottawa. The foreign Intelligence Officer *"assessed the Source's claims as being valid"* and he *"wanted to develop the Source into an access agent into the Toronto"* movement.

A Security Officer for the foreign country's Embassy met with the Source and his associate and said the Embassy needed a security firm to advise on security devices. The Security Officer also asked the Source to register him (the Officer) for university sessions on terrorism and videotape any opposition demonstrations. The Toronto Region Investigator recognized that the firm wanted the security contract despite the advice from CSIS that they back out of the relationship.

CSIS approached the Source on March 6, 1986 following his meeting with the foreign government diplomat and he agreed to cooperate with the Service. The Source explained to the Toronto Region Investigator that he had a *"contact"* with access to those Toronto groups which opposed the foreign government.

The foreign government representatives were developing the Source as an agent when the Department of External Affairs, on August 20, 1986, expelled one diplomat as *"persona non grata"* and did not permit the second to return to Canada on the same basis. The next month, the First Secretary at the Embassy renewed contact with the Source to continue to develop him as an access agent. Despite this contact, it appeared that the foreign Government lost interest in the Source. CSIS HQ suspected that a friend of the Source may have been an asset of the embassy and informed them that the Source was responsible for the *"persona non grata"* actions.

3.1.2 The White Supremacist Assignment

In February 1987, the Source was re-directed to another target.

One factor which aided the decision to re-direct the Source was the fact that he was acquainted with an individual who worked with a right wing extremist. After the Source was introduced to the individual in February 1987, he contacted the CSIS handler *"and provided unsolicited information about Aryan Nations involvement (and) indicated that he would be willing to infiltrate the right wing on behalf of CSIS."*

When the Source met a CSIS Investigator from Toronto Region on February 26, 1987, the CSIS mandate on right wing targets was explained to him. *"He was also instructed that he could not break the law, regardless of how petty an offense might seem (e.g. spray painting right wing slogans or signs)."*

3.1.3 Problems Develop

The Source offered to recruit his friend, a former police officer. The Investigator told the Source to keep the association with CSIS confidential. On March 5, 1987, a police force contacted Toronto Region and said that their informant received an offer by the Source to be introduced to a member of CSIS.

After the first disclosure, the Source denied informing anyone of the CSIS association and was informed *"in no uncertain terms that his relationship with CSIS must remain entirely confidential for his own protection."* The Investigator was uncertain if the police source was told about CSIS by the Source or took an *"educated guess"*.

At CSIS HQ, in April 1987, a Unit Head stated that *"this file is starting to smell a little funny"* as he didn't like the way the Source and his friend may have teamed-up. But as the Service's relationship with the police was excellent and the source was under development, the operation would continue under *"tight control."*

Toronto Region Managers concluded that the source operation was *"not seriously undermined"* and they hoped that *"rigid control and direction will prevent any further breaches of security by this source."* CSIS Headquarters supported the continued development of the Source with certain reservations, among them: *"The source appears to be somewhat overzealous, which may have compromised his confidentiality. Security precautions should be reinforced and his progression in this field should be carefully monitored and directed."*

On June 11, 1987 the Toronto Region Investigator met with a police representative. CSIS was told that a police source was again advised by the Source that he was "*currently working for the CSIS in a long-range operation.*"

CSIS HQ suggested and Toronto Region complied with the recommendation that the Source be told that the Service's priorities had changed and that it was no longer interested in his assistance. Contact with the Source ceased at that point.

3.2 The Radical Right

3.2.1 The New Beginning

The Source next contacted the Toronto Region office over a year later on November 4, 1988. He had met an individual with close contacts in the extremist milieu. The Source felt that he should contact Toronto Region to apprise them of the situation.

The Source told an Investigator that he had no personal interest in the radical right. He was told by the Toronto Investigator to notify him of any contacts with extremists.

In view of the Source's past indiscretions to the police source, the Investigator offered no encouragement to the Source who, nevertheless said he would "*identify as many of the individual cell members as possible.*"

The Region worried about growing recruitment activities, particularly among Skinheads. The Region's investigators thought that the violent right-wing philosophy of the Identity Movement provided an excellent vent for the frustration expressed by the 'Skinheads' and that they may, by fortunate happenstance, have identified an acceleration of the violent activities of the right-wing movement in Toronto in its embryonic stage.

The Region was not prepared to "*let this developmental situation go unmonitored*" and the Source was "*clearly the best equipped to keep us abreast of developments.*"

3.2.2 The Old Problem

On December 12, 1988 the Intelligence Branch of a second police force contacted Toronto Region to advise that during the course of a criminal investigation, a police source reported that the Source claimed to have CSIS contacts.

The Regional Investigator commented that directional control had not been a problem with this individual since he always ran any ideas past the investigator prior to implementing them and

was receptive when advised not to proceed with a given plan. The Source was said to be an outgoing gregarious individual who was easy to get along with, and a positive relationship existed between him and the investigator.

In May 1989, the Source reported that a Nationalist Party leader attended a party at Alan Overfield's house. Overfield was to become a prominent figure two years later when he linked the Heritage Front to the Reform Party.¹

3.2.3 Infiltration of the Right Wing

In the fall of 1988, the Source was invited to the residence of Don Andrews, the leader of the Nationalist Party of Canada. Seeing him for the first time, Andrews was precisely what the Source had expected: he was obviously a radical; he acted as a cult-like figure.

Seated around Andrews' table with him at the weekly gathering were five people who had jobs. The rest of those present stood around the table; numbering about 10 people, Andrews called them his "Androids"²: unemployed persons who lived in Andrews' rooming houses. We were told that Andrews took the cheques they received, subtracted the rent and other expenses, and gave them the rest of their money, making a big production at his meetings of having them come up and get their money from him. Among other behaviours, Andrews berated his people for not remembering certain acronyms, such as OMS (one man show), during the tests that he administered.³

Among others in Andrews' coterie was David Maxwell French. He used to spend his money on articles, especially uniforms, that belonged to dead Nazis. Souvenirs of Nazis who were still alive were not acceptable. Consequently, within the extremist movement, French had the nickname, the "Necro-Nazi".⁴ French said he never heard the term "Necro-Nazi".

¹ In the 1970's Alan Overfield had been an active member of the right-wing Edmund Burke Society and the violence prone Western Guard Party. During 1972, Overfield was one of the Western Guard members who received firearms training at a camp north of Kaladar, Ontario. In the 1980's Overfield became associated with the Nationalist Party of Canada. Mr. Overfield denies being prone to violence.

² SIRC interview of source.

³ SIRC interview of Source.

⁴ SIRC interview of Source.

Like a "floating crap game", people gravitated from hate literature⁵ publisher Ernst Zundel to high school teacher Paul Fromm to Don Andrews and back over time.⁶

3.2.4 Droege Arrives from Prison

A significant event took place in April, 1989. Don Andrews conducted a special meeting. His "Androids" were invited to his mansion. The people present were introduced to a friend who had been in Toronto for just a few days: Wolfgang Walter Droege.

Droege had been released from Lompoc Prison in the United States on April 21, 1989 four years after his conviction on drugs, weapons and illegal entry charges. He went to Toronto where he wanted to obtain money to establish himself before he moved on to join his girlfriend in another province.

Droege was considered to be the senior statesman of the extreme right movement and, as a privilege, he sat at the table in Andrews' house. Droege had arrived in Canada with nothing, and so a considerable number of people helped him by providing accommodation, food, and shelter. Droege fairly quickly went to work as a part-time bailiff for Alan Overfield, a long time friend and one-time associate of the Nationalist Party.

In July 1989 the Source reported that "Droege has mentioned an interest in starting a group called 'Society for the Preservation of the White Race' (SPWR)" and the Source opined that "any group set up by Droege would almost certainly be action oriented." CSIS told its Source to monitor the situation.

The next month, in August 1989, CSIS learned from the Source that Droege had further developed his concept of a group separate from the NPC. The name had changed to the "White Heritage Foundation" (WHF). Droege described the proposed WHF as "a group of dedicated white nationalists whose interest it would be to force the government to include their (WHF) mandate in the government agenda. The WHF would also act as a lobby group to protect the rights of white people." This would be the public side of WHF.

The WHF would also have a covert side to it. One of the covert activities would be to set up an all white enclave. The WHF, under Droege's direction would target a specific county or

⁵ Mr. Zundel indicated that he published "truth literature", not "hate literature", and that he has never been convicted of publishing hate literature.

⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

area and then use "whatever persuasive methods or inducements necessary to convince non-whites to leave the area."

But within the covert side would be still another level, an inner clique to be known to a select few as the "Brethren". It would be this group which would actually "control all aspects of the WHF." This clique was to be unknown to regular WHF members. Two other defecting members of the Nationalist Party of Canada, Gerald Lincoln and Grant Bristow were being considered by Droege for positions in this group.

Rumours were circulating in the NPC that another member and Grant Bristow were "RCMP 'snitches'" and so Andrews suggested that Droege should take Bristow around to meet people so that Droege could then vouch for him.

3.3 Trip to Libya - Founding the Heritage Front

3.3.1 The Start

The Source was among a group of seventeen people invited by Andrews to travel to Tripoli to attend the 20th Anniversary Celebration of the Libyan Revolution, from August 26, 1989 to September 4, 1989. Don Andrews claimed that he could not go himself because he was involved in a Court case and could not leave Ontario.

The Source believed that most people were chosen because they would not embarrass Andrews and his Party. Those who owned luggage were also favoured. Another criterion was money. There was to be a stopover in Rome for a plane change and Andrews wanted people who had enough money to pay for their own accommodation there.⁷ Andrews paid for most of the rest of the trip by using money advanced by Libya; this was likely arranged through a Libyan agent.

The "anointed deputies" in the Andrews group were Nicola Polinuk, June and Max French, Wayne Elliot, and Anne Ladas who was in charge of the delegation, having been to Libya previously.⁸

The travel itinerary called for a plane change in Rome on the way to Libya and a one day stop there on the way back. The 17

⁷ SIRC interview with source.

⁸ SIRC interview with Source.

representatives of the Nationalist Party of Canada shared accommodation.⁹

In Rome, on the way to Libya, the group would await their flight for a couple of hours. Asked to present passports in Rome, most of the NPC group experienced no problems. Wolfgang Droege, however, was pushed to the side along with James Dawson, Max French and June French. These four people were on the same ticket and the Rome anti-terrorist squad wanted to interview Droege and possibly dissuade him and the others from going to Libya. An Italian agent was reported as saying: "*its too hot in Libya*" and Max French said: "*we'll put on shorts*". Droege then told Max to "*shut your mouth*."¹⁰

3.3.2 Malta to Tripoli

The NPC group flew from Rome to Malta. There they were placed on a boat later described by the group as a "*converted prison ship*" which went from Malta to Libya. Gerry Lincoln, James Dawson, Wolfgang Droege, and Grant Bristow roomed together in what was called a "*bottom-dungeon*". The right wing racists had to be separated from the left wing anti-fascists for the former's protection.¹¹ After the ship docked, the NPC group were not allowed to disembark and only after several days of complaining were they allowed to reside in Camp Kadhafi some miles from Tripoli.

At the Camp, the Nationalist Party group was told that there would be a parade in a stadium; anyone who participated had to wear Muammar Kadhafi's green uniforms. If her group complied, Anne Ladas would get to sit near Kadhafi. Max French, always preoccupied with wearing uniforms, desperately wanted to wear one in the parade.

Droege, and the others were told of the plan to wear uniforms and march in the parade. Droege stood up and said he would not do it. At first, it was sixteen to one against him. However, the Source did not want to be videotaped in a Libyan uniform and so he stood up and supported Droege. Ladas then said she would tell the Libyans and they would give the Source and Droege a hard time.

⁹ SIRC interview with Source.

¹⁰ SIRC interview with Source.

¹¹ SIRC interview with Grant Bristow.

These words stimulated a groundswell of support from those who agreed with the two dissidents, including Lincoln and Dawson.¹²

Max French called the two dissidents every imaginable name and was most disappointed with the decision, but he eventually received his uniform.¹³ French denies this account.

Droege had defied the Party line and created a division between himself and Andrews. Droege told the Source that he had realized that Kadhafi's government supported the African National Congress which was killing whites in South Africa. This made the regime anathema to him, from a racist ideology point of view.¹⁴

3.3.3 Landing in Chicago

On the return flight from Rome, some members of the delegation examined their tickets and saw that the return route was: Rome-Chicago-Toronto. When Anne Ladas was asked about this, she was reported to have said that the Chicago stop only involved waiting in the international transit lounge. Droege was not allowed to enter the United States as a condition of his release from prison there. He had served four and a half years of a thirteen year sentence and he was prohibited from re-entering the United States for five years.¹⁵

On the airplane to Chicago, Droege sat beside Grant Bristow rather than James Dawson who was a very large person. The stewardess handed out the customs declarations and it was evident that Droege and his group would formally enter the United States. Droege asked "what are we going to do" and Bristow responded, "we'll probably get arrested".¹⁶

Droege protested to the Alitalia staff on the plane. He told Bristow to instruct the others to clear Customs and Immigration and then call Andrews when they landed. Droege wondered whether Andrews had conspired to have him arrested, given the

¹² SIRC interview with Source.

¹³ SIRC interview with Source.

¹⁴ SIRC interview with Source.

¹⁵ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁶ SIRC interview with Grant Bristow.

routing. Droege could have been reincarcerated for another nine years in jail if things had gone badly for him.¹⁷

Droege wanted to stay on the plane and fly back to Rome, but the aircraft Captain told him either to get off or be charged with piracy.¹⁸ The NPC members were arrested and some received threats from US officers. They were strip-searched and had their body cavities probed for contraband.¹⁹

The entire group, including the Source, were detained by US Customs for several hours and subjected to interviews. The Nationalist Party of Canada people, except Droege, were then allowed to go through passport control and clear Immigration.²⁰

Anne Ladas and Nicola Polinuk telephoned Don Andrews who instructed them to come back to Canada. Andrews told Bristow to retain a lawyer for Droege while the rest of the group returned to Toronto as soon as permitted.

Andrews then spoke again to Ladas and Polinuk. They left for a short time and then returned with \$1,000 which they gave to Bristow for Droege. The funds were Libya's gift to the Nationalist Party of Canada. Lincoln, Dawson and the rest of the group contributed \$250 to pay for a hotel for Bristow. A member of the group called the Canadian Consulate to inform them of Droege's arrest.²¹

Following Andrews' instructions, Bristow contacted a lawyer for Droege in Chicago. He then contacted a representative of the Canadian Consulate. The diplomat informed Bristow there was no point in waiting around and he could return to Canada. Bristow took the advice.²²

Prior to Bristow's departure, he gave the lawyer \$1,000 as a retainer, and a list with the names of the Alitalia Airline employees who were present when Droege made his protest. The German lawyer who began the case was not available when Droege was

¹⁷ SIRC interview with Grant Bristow.

¹⁸ SIRC interview with Grant Bristow.

¹⁹ SIRC interview with Source.

²⁰ SIRC interview with Source.

²¹ SIRC interview with Grant Bristow.

²² SIRC interview with Grant Bristow.

to appear in Court. A Jewish lawyer from the same legal firm represented him. Droege was quite "seized up" when it happened, but would laugh about it later with his Heritage Front associates.²³

The lawyer told Droege that for an extra \$2,000, he could get Droege out immediately. Otherwise, he would languish in prison for some time before release. Droege was freed after forty-eight hours.

3.3.4 The Return

Droege was released and driven to Niagara Falls by the American authorities at night. At the border, he took a bus which arrived at 6:00 in the morning in Toronto. Droege called Don Andrews to inform him of his arrival and Andrews invited Droege to come over for breakfast.²⁴

When he arrived, Droege found a policeman with Andrews. The officer told Droege that Andrews had nothing to do with the arrest and placed the blame on an Andrews "Schlep." This person, it was said, had tried to make a deal that if he were given a passport, he would be the eyes and ears of the OPP for what happened in Libya. The OPP did not accept the offer.²⁵

Tensions were high in the NPC after the trip to Libya, particularly among those who had gone there. The entire group had worried about being attacked in Libya, they were arrested in Chicago and they were subjected to humiliating interviews and body cavity searches; people were generally tired and fed up.

James Dawson was turned back in a subsequent attempt to enter the USA and the Source reported that all who went to Libya felt that they too were on the Watch list. Several in the group (Dawson, Lincoln, Wayne and Donna Elliot) were thinking of breaking with the Nationalist Party and "throwing their support behind Droege."

The general consensus was that Don Andrews' actions and, in particular, the Libyan trip, did the most to cause people to leave the Nationalist Party of Canada.

²³ SIRC interview with Grant Bristow.

²⁴ SIRC interview with Source.

²⁵ SIRC interview with Source.

3.3.5 The Founding

On September 25, 1989 the Heritage Front was formed by Wolfgang Droege at a meeting attended by Gerald Lincoln, Grant Bristow and James Dawson. These people were foils to Droege, according to the sources we contacted. Gerry Lincoln would be the president while Droege and Bristow would work "behind the scenes as 'silent' executives."

Wolfgang Droege, under oath, told the Review Committee that:

"I already had this idea for a number of years myself, but I said to them basically, 'Fine, but I'm not going to be the one who is going to do all the work. If I have the support of others, I am willing to form an organization, and if I don't, I'm not going to do it myself.' So, especially Gerry Lincoln and Grant Bristow assured me that they would be totally supportive if I were to start an organization".²⁶

The precipitating event was the trip to Libya, Droege stated that the Nationalist Party people challenged him and

"So, that is what then really led me to say, 'When we get back, we will start an organization'... and some time in October of 1989 that's when I said, 'Okay, let's do it.'²⁷"

Droege said that he suggested the name for the Heritage Front and *"I was the one who most people tended to follow because most people felt I had put myself on the line a number of times."²⁸* He also said that even if Bristow and Lincoln had not supported the idea of the Front at that time, *"I felt eventually it would happen because I totally disagreed with Mr. Andrews' positions or his views."²⁹*

As the person with the most contacts in the extreme right, he said that *"I wanted to go to these people and say, 'Okay, the intention is to form an organization which is to be national*

²⁶ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

²⁷ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

²⁸ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

²⁹ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

rather than just regional, an organization which an average Canadian can identify with."³⁰

James Dawson registered the Heritage Front on October 2, 1989. During that week, Droege held a meeting with Lincoln, Jim Dawson and Bristow where he said the HF will have a "Kosher-Conservative" line publicly but will use the group to "clandestinely forward the white supremacist movement." Lincoln said there was no clandestine agenda.

In CSIS' Toronto Region, the Acting Regional Director General confirmed the tasking of a source against Droege on October 4, 1989 for six months. Droege became a Level 2 target on that date. The handling of the Source was reassigned to a more senior Investigator on October 3, 1989.

The original concept for the Front, as defined by Droege, was that there would be two "wings": a political wing and a military or direct action wing. The political wing would be made up of people who were not suitable for activist work; that is to say, they would engage in political propaganda work. The people in the military wing would work at demonstrations and they would distribute leaflets. We learned that Droege also formed the October 2nd Committee, "an active measures commando unit to be run by him and to use selected skinheads."

To distance the new Heritage Front from the NPC, Lincoln would publish a newsletter, based on USA material with "no hate material, just pro-white."

The Heritage Front was to have, in theory, four levels: the first would be "the Brethren": Droege, Lincoln, and Bristow. The second would comprise the Executive Council: James Dawson, the Brethren and rising stars in the HF. The third would be the HF membership and the last level would comprise supporters and subscribers to the new newsletter.

We learned that Droege intended to unite under the Heritage Front those persons in Canada who were associated with The Order, the Ku Klux Klan and the Aryan Nations. The Front would be the primary vehicle for "furthering the white supremacist movement in Canada". Droege was going to contact white supremacists in the United States to get their mailing lists of Canadian supporters.

Droege's plan was not only to unite the white supremacists under the Heritage Front banner. When that was accomplished, Droege wanted to buy land in the Peterborough area,

³⁰ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

control the town council and try to legislate racist views into the by-laws.

Droege wanted the Heritage Front to be a more focused version of The Order in the United States. The group would attack armoured cars and black drug dealers for funds. The Front, according to the Source, would not target minorities but rather, it would use selective violence against "race-traitors": those Christian whites who disagreed with white supremacist views.³¹

Droege hoped to get cash from the Libyans in return for information on Jewish groups in Canada. To this end, Droege asked Bristow to accompany him to Montreal to learn which Libyan officials he should contact in Canada. Droege hoped to obtain major funding from the Libyans.

Droege decided to include the other people assisting him as equals: Dawson registered the Heritage Front and all four would pay for its start up: Droege paid one half and Lincoln and Bristow each paid a remaining quarter of the start up costs. These comprised a \$50 registration fee, letterhead stationary and several other expenses for a total of approximately \$300 to \$350. There was no office and no staff to pay.³² The Up Front magazine would cost \$1,000 an issue to print but it would come out only in 1991. A description of financial issues is provided in chapter VI.

Droege needed people to take action on his ideas and someone to put these ideas on paper: he used Lincoln for that purpose. By October 2, 1989, Gerry Lincoln was writing all the materials and all the propaganda. In addition to propaganda, the Source reported that Lincoln later gave large amounts of his money to pay for the publication of Up Front Magazine, the Heritage Front's major propaganda outlet and, eventually, "cash cow".³³ Lincoln said he did not provide a great deal of money for the magazine.

In regard to the 'active measures' cell called the 'October 2nd Committee', the Source was initially tasked to be a member and assist in this cell's training and operations. The Source was able to decline the offer, indicating to Droege that it

³¹ Mr. Droege does not agree with the expression "more focused". He says that he learned from the mistakes of the Order and stated that that was not a way of successfully promoting the ideas of the Heritage Front. He denies all that is said in the paragraph.

³² SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

³³ SIRC interview of Source.

was not his style. The Source had been instructed by the CSIS Investigator *"to remove himself from any potentially criminal endeavour being planned by the HF or its commando cell."*

Droege generated some ideas for making money to pay for the Heritage Front.³⁴ Among them were *"taking down"* drug dealers to get the money. The Source raised the problem of their having guns, and used other arguments to try to dissuade Droege from pursuing this and like ideas.³⁵

Droege made Grant Bristow his assistant because he could *"take the heat"*.³⁶ In 1989 and afterwards, there were two security chiefs in the Heritage Front: Eric Fischer and Grant Bristow. Bristow had floating responsibilities as Droege had various visions of what he wanted to happen. Grant Bristow was also appointed as an office manager (of sorts) to supervise the administrative requirements of the HF.

Mainly, however, Bristow was there to help Droege find cars for his bailiff duties. Droege was working for Al Overfield, repossessing cars. But before they were repossessed, they had to be found. Bristow was good at locating cars.

Droege said that Bristow was important to him because Grant *"showed him the ropes"* after he (Droege) began working for Accurate Bailiff Services run by Al Overfield. For this initial help, Droege owed Bristow a lot, and a strong friendship developed. He continued, in part, to shield Bristow from attacks by other members, who often alleged that he was an informant, because of this initial friendship.³⁷

3.3.6 CSIS Knowledge

Toronto Region reported to CSIS HQ on October 10, 1989 that Droege was founding the Heritage Front based on the September 26, 1989 meeting.

CSIS continued to have considerable concern about the Source's association with Droege: *"in view of Droege's background, source should be advised to avoid any involvement in illegal activities"*. Nevertheless, the Source was instructed to report on

³⁴ SIRC interview of Source.

³⁵ Mr. Droege denies promoting robberies to fund the Heritage Front.

³⁶ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

³⁷ SIRC interview with Wolfgang Droege.

him.

The Service stated that due to Droege's record of criminal activity and his stated intention to conduct robberies in order to gain funding for the HF, a brief on their interest in his activities would be provided to the RCMP³⁸ HQ said that ...Toronto Region's cooperation and judgement would be relied upon to ensure that the Source's association with Droege did not become a matter of police responsibility.

The Service watched the development of the HF with great interest. The Source and Droege attended the Northern Foundation Conference where the former's presence *"was beneficial in allowing the Service to monitor Droege's launching of the HF."*

As 1990 began, the Source was targeted against Wolfgang Droege by virtue of his increasingly lead role in the white supremacist movement in Canada. The Service acknowledged that Droege had included the Source in the top level of his new organization and continued to trust the source and utilize his talents in an effort to further his political aspirations; others were added later.

The fundamental reason that CSIS kept the Source targeted against Wolfgang Droege was to give the Service time to assess the greatest threat and adjust accordingly. Their main concern was that if Droege becomes the leading Aryan movement personality in Canada his organization would be harder to penetrate due to his past experience and security consciousness. If this scenario were to materialize they would be fortunate to have a source in on the ground floor.

³⁸

Mr. Droege denies promoting robberies to fund the Heritage Front.

IV. THE HERITAGE FRONT EMERGES

4.1 Events in 1990

At the beginning of 1990, discussions were underway in both the Nationalist Party of Canada and Wolfgang Droege's Heritage Front to "*garner more American support*". With neither Andrews nor Droege welcome in the United States, the Source thought that Grant Bristow might have had to be their emissary, but he actually travelled little on their behalf during that year.

We learned that, on March 18, 1990, Droege, Bristow, Lincoln, Donna Elliot and others were responsible for disrupting a television broadcast. The program was aired on TV Ontario and dealt with racism issues. During the telephone-in portion of the program, the Heritage Front group was able to partially tie up the telephone lines, and they "*were also able to start a number of arguments with the guest panel and state their white supremacist views.*"

From time to time, Droege wanted action, and the Source would have to manoeuvre to maintain credibility, and yet not divulge information. He created a series of imaginary events to demonstrate that he was active, fictitious events he would recount to Ken Barker, Elisse Hategan, Wolfgang Droege and other Heritage Front member. Wolfgang Droege would allege to the Review Committee, on the other hand, that it was Grant Bristow who got a kick out of harassing people, and keeping track of them, but no laws were broken and it did not concern him.¹ Our assessment of Wolfgang Droege's testimony is described in chapter XIII.

Both the Heritage Front and the anti-racist groups sought out disaffected youth in Toronto. In June 1990, Droege told Bristow about plans to distribute leaflets at schools. They also discussed "*spray painting (anti-white slogans) and vandalism operations*" to discredit anti-racists, but we saw no information to show that the latter activities were carried out by the Front.

In November 1990, Ernst Zundel asked Droege to provide security for David Irving's visit to Ottawa. Irving is a British writer and Nazi sympathizer who denies the Holocaust took place and is a favoured speaker for anti-Semitic and white supremacist groups. Droege, in turn, directed Grant Bristow to accompany him.

On December 8, 1990, a secret Heritage Front rally was attended by Edmund Burke Society founder, Paul Fromm. The meeting, a "*Martyr's Day*" rally, was held to honour the memory of Robert J. Matthews, leader of the violently racist extremist group, "*The Order*" who was killed in a shootout with US officials in 1984. Wolfgang Droege had been on the periphery of that group, known to its members as the "*Bruders Schweigen*", or the "*silent*

¹ SIRC interview of Droege.

*brotherhood."*²

In 1990, Stephen Andrew Hammond was arrested on a Canada wide Immigration Warrant for which the Source provided the information. Hammond, a white supremacist from the United Kingdom, had been deported twice before from Canada and the USA. He was associated with the Ku Klux Klan and had been jailed in Dominica for threatening to kill a cabinet minister, and after attempting, with Wolfgang Droege, to overthrow that island's government.

4.2 The Heritage Front in 1991

In January 1991 Droege tasked Grant Bristow to meet Al Hooper in British Columbia and Terry Long in Alberta to solicit support in an attempt to unify the white supremacist movement in Canada. Droege wanted Hooper's list of 180 names of persons who supported the movement. Droege also wanted an assessment of the split in the Aryan Resistance Movement (ARM); its leader, Al Hooper had pledged his support to Droege.

When Bristow visited Terry Long in Alberta at the request of Wolfgang Droege, Long spoke of setting up a Canadian Aryan Computer Network. Long was the head of Canada's Aryan Nations white supremacist group and told Bristow that he was developing a list of targets (see Chapter V, 5.2).

Droege instructed Grant Bristow to accompany him on a trip to Munich on March 20, 1991 to a neo-Nazi conference sponsored by Ernst Zundel. Zundel had asked the two to accompany him to the conference which he promoted. The rally was broken up by German police and Zundel was arrested.

April 1991 saw two events. Droege established a "*computer link*" with Terry Long, although this means of communications was short-lived. Of greater significance that month, Wolfgang Droege and Ernst Zundel, the Holocaust Denier and prolific publisher of

2

"The Order" was an American terrorist organization which espoused a white supremacist ideology and was affiliated with the Aryan Nations. It was active during the early 1980's.

hate literature,³ appeared together publicly at a Heritage Front meeting.⁴

In May 1991, Terry Long, Wolfgang Droege and Grant Bristow met to discuss, among other issues, the establishment of a bulletin board (BBS) hate line similar to one in the United States.

On May 27, 1991, Alan Overfield's security group, including several people from the Heritage Front, provided perimeter security at a Reform Party information meeting in Toronto. Bristow was part of the team that waited outside the church, presumably to repel members of CARP - Coalition Against the Reform Party. The role of the CSIS Source is described in chapter VII concerning the Reform Party (7.1).

Also in May, Alan Overfield associated with the Heritage Front, was involved with the interim board of the Beaches-Woodbine riding association of the Reform Party.

The next month, on June 12, 1991, the Reform Party of Canada held a massive rally in Mississauga, Ontario. The event, which drew some 6,000 people to hear Preston Manning, marked the first high profile event for the security group directed by Droege's employer, Alan Overfield. During the June Mississauga rally, Grant Bristow served as an escort/bodyguard for Preston Manning, at the direction of Al Overfield and Wolfgang Droege.

The security group impressed some local Reform organizers who attended the event and they drew upon the group's free services to protect other meetings until January 1992. Details about the security group and the Reform Party of Canada are provided in chapter VII (7.5).

On June 13, 1991, several Heritage Front members attended a meeting of Paul Fromm's Canadians for Foreign Aid Reform (C-FAR) where Overfield from the Reform Party set up a table to sign people up for the Party. The dates on the membership forms for Droege, Polinuk, Dawson and Mitrevski, however, show that they had joined the Party before that meeting.

On June 19, 1991, Droege's racist agenda was profiled in a "Toronto Star" article. He stated then that "Preston Manning has

³ Zundel said that he produces "truth" not "hate" literature.

⁴ The Heritage Front Report: 1994, pp. 5-6, prepared by the League of Human Rights of B'nai Brith, Canada.

given us some hope."⁵ In that month, violent United States white supremacist, Tom Metzger came to Canada at the invitation of Droege to attend a Heritage Front rally.

Wolfgang Droege and Terry Long requested that Bristow attend the Aryan Nations Headquarters annual meeting at Hayden Lake Idaho in mid-July. He also received a verbal invitation from USA white supremacist Louis Beam to attend the function. Droege wanted Bristow to make contact with other white supremacists and, possibly, to deliver correspondence to Louis Beam. Bristow stayed with Sean Maguire at a hotel near the campground.

In July 1991, the Source intercepted and provided to CSIS a listing of personal information which the Front received from Terry Long. The list was presented as an intelligence file in which the recipients were to contribute material when required.

In early July, the Overfield security group provided security for the founding meeting of the Beaches-Woodbine Reform constituency association. Bristow was outside the meeting with the Overfield team and, with Wolfgang Droege, paced the street in front of the Legion hall. Overfield was elected to the executive at the end of the month.

The fact that Droege was an avowed racist was revealed to some Ontario Reform Party officials in July and August 1991 (see chapter VII, 7.3.4).

The Heritage Front's telephone Hate Line was established by the Fall of 1991. It was to be the target of legal actions by the Jewish and Native communities, and was to be stopped, and then restarted seven times over the next three years.⁶ Eventually, the hotline was mainly Gary Schipper's project, see chapter V (5.3).

In the autumn, Nicola Polinuk and James Dawson became associated with the Beaches Woodbine riding executive.

September 1991 saw the first public meeting of the Heritage Front to which the media had been invited. Bristow, according to the Heritage Front, had set up a media room to facilitate interviews with those who spoke at the meeting. Grant Bristow was among those who spoke there.

⁵ Rosie DiManno, "Ex-mercenary aims for country uniquely white", Toronto Star, June 19, 1991.

⁶ The Heritage Front Report: 1994, pp. 5-6, prepared by the League of Human Rights of B'nai Brith, Canada.

That month, Toronto police, in a coordinated operation with several other agencies, arrested American racist Sean Maguire in Bristow's car. Maguire was arrested and deported on an Immigration warrant. Details of the case are provided in chapter IX (9.1).

On September 24, 1991, Heritage Front members attended the Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations. At the meeting, Paul Fromm yelled out "*scalp them*" at an anti-racist leader, when the latter said that halls should not be rented to racists. Fromm and 15 supporters were ejected.

In December 1991, American racist Dennis Mahon entered Canada to speak at a Heritage Front meeting. The month also marked the first appearance of the Heritage Front newsletter "*Up Front*" prepared by Gerald Lincoln.

4.3 Reform Investigation and Clashes with Anti-Racists

In 1992, the Front branched out. In January of that year, Bristow was sent to Montreal by Droege "*for the purpose of feeling out the White Supremacist movement there*". The CSIS Source would later learn the outcome of this trip and advised the Service. CSIS, in turn, forwarded this information to the police and to several federal government agencies.

Also in January, the Reform Party held its second biggest Ontario rally, this time in Pickering. As with the previous massive rally, the Overfield team provided security. Grant Bristow was once again the bodyguard for Preston Manning in the hall. We describe the situation in chapter VII (7.5).

On February 28, 1992, the "*Toronto Sun*" published an exposé which showed that the Heritage Front had infiltrated the Reform Party of Canada in Ontario. The article resulted in a decision by the Reform Party to form a Special Committee of the Executive Council to investigate the problem. Through the Spring of 1992, the Special Committee contacted the 22 people that Al Overfield had signed up for Reform and expelled five persons: Wolfgang Droege, James Dawson, Nicola Polinuk, Peter Mitrevski and then Alan Overfield. Later that year, others would follow.

Five days before the Pickering rally, according to a magazine article, the militant anti-racist group, Anti-Racist Action appeared in Toronto.⁷ While the Heritage Front held a meeting in Toronto's Ristorante Roma Restaurant, Anti-Racist Action

⁷ This Magazine, February 23, 1992.

demonstrators tried to confront the estimated 40 skinheads inside. The issue is described in chapter V (5.4).

On April 13, 1992, the "*Canadian Press*" revealed that high school English teacher, Paul Fromm, spoke at a secret Heritage Front rally in December 1990. He also, said the article, addressed another Heritage Front meeting in September 1991.⁸

On May 18, 1992, the Morgentaler abortion clinic in Toronto was firebombed. Graffiti identifying the Heritage Front was found on a nearby wall and the police received unsubstantiated allegations that the Heritage Front had knowledge about the incident.

Recruiting at high schools led the Heritage Front into direct conflict with the ARA, and the two groups collected information on one another. The ARA started holding their meetings at high schools, and putting their position forward. The first discussions took place at this time in the Heritage Front on whether to monitor or infiltrate the anti-racist groups.

In 1992, the "*Klanbusters*" group was established. They had discovered a method of gaining access to Droege's answering machine. As a result, they could change the message he left on his machine, and they could learn who had called him. The practice, Droege would later tell the Review Committee, was adopted by a number of Heritage Front opponents and, ultimately, the Heritage Front itself.⁹

The Heritage Front and its opponents in the ARA adopted similar techniques of breaking into each others' hotlines in order to disrupt each others' activities.¹⁰ To CSIS' Toronto Region, the information indicated that the potential for confrontations between the racists and the anti-racists would likely increase. We discuss the issue in chapter V (5.4).

In July 1992, Tom and John Metzger of the White Aryan Resistance were arrested after they left a Heritage Front meeting. They were deported several days later (see chapter IX, 9.2). This was also the year that David Irving, a British author and Nazi sympathizer, was arrested and deported from Canada.

⁸ Canadian Press, "*Teacher fingered at rally of racists*", April 13, 1992.

⁹ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁰ SIRC interview with Wolfgang Droege.

The allegation was made in 1992 that Front members circulated the unlisted telephone number and address of a prominent Vancouver Canadian Jewish Congress leader, Dr. Michael Elterman. The charge proved to be unsubstantiated. Details are provided in chapter V (5.10).

By the winter of 1992, Heritage Front efforts to recruit students at Toronto's East End high schools were well underway.¹¹ In early 1993, the Heritage Front attended an anti-racist demonstration held by the students at Riverdale Collegiate. No violence took place.

Two persons from the Church of the Creator helped Grant Bristow perform security duties for the Heritage Front. On December 15, 1992, Bristow was asked to show the Fischer brothers how to trace telephone numbers using the reference books available in the public library. The result is described in chapter V (5.8).

In 1992, the Heritage Front members, on the instructions of Droege, were using the telephone numbers they had acquired to make increasingly violent threats against anti-racists. To reduce the threatening nature of the program, an information collection campaign, the "IT" campaign, began at the end of 1992 and continued through 1993. The campaign drew on the information which the Heritage Front obtained by breaking into answering machines.¹² Chapter V (5.7) in this report describes the campaign.

In November 1992, Heritage Front activities were described in the media and Grant Bristow was mentioned incidentally. Some time later he set up a course in security training.

Tom Metzger, the avowed American racist, would state in 1994, on "*The Fifth Estate*", that Grant Bristow visited him in California in December 1992, bringing lists of Jewish leaders and a considerable amount of money. His statements were fabricated; we describe the issue in chapter IX (9.2).

4.4 The Harassment Campaign Peaks

On January 22, 1993, American white supremacist Dennis Mahon, of the White Aryan Resistance movement was arrested on his arrival at Toronto's Pearson International Airport and then deported.

¹¹ SIRC interview with Riverdale Collegiate teacher.

¹² SIRC interview with Source.

On January 25, 1993, as police escorted 30 Heritage Front members into a courthouse for a Human Rights Tribunal hearing, a protest organized by the Anti-Racist Action group, which attracted 500 demonstrators, turned violent with two protestors being arrested on assault charges.¹³

In February 1993, Wolfgang Droege was told that the Klanbusters and the International Socialists were going to hold meetings. Eric Fischer sent two Church of the Creator members to find out what was going on.¹⁴

In the Spring of 1993, the Native Canadian Centre filed a complaint against the Heritage Front's hate line. Droege and others would later receive prison time for contempt of a Court Order in this connection.

In March 1993, the Source reported that the Church of the Creator had been successful in attending anti-racist meetings. CSIS files showed that the Source obtained information from members of the Church of the Creator who had penetrated the anti-racist meetings. This information indicated the degree to which anti-racists were preparing to confront the white supremacists; the file information indicated that Klanbusters organizer Rodney Bobiwash encouraged direct confrontation as the best way to defeat the neo-Nazi groups.

Bristow provided some names to Alan Overfield, under instruction from Droege. These were names obtained from numbers which had appeared on Droege's answering machine. The Source consulted with the Toronto Region Investigator, who said to go ahead if the information received from the answering machine was specific and well-known.

In March 1993, racist posters were produced which listed the names and addresses of anti-racists.¹⁵ In October 1993, Elisse Hategan was charged with disseminating defamatory libel and wilful promotion of hatred for her involvement with the posters. She would later affirm that she was informed that Al Overfield produced the flyers that she was arrested for distributing (see chapter V, 5.9.4).

¹³ Moira Welsh, "2 arrested as racism protest turns ugly", Toronto Star, January 26, 1993.

¹⁴ SIRC interview with Source.

¹⁵ Toronto Sun, October 4, 1994.

From April through June 1993, Grant Bristow was involved in several incidents with members of the Jewish community. In April, Bristow was said to have intimidated a B'nai Brith lawyer at the Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations.¹⁶ The next month, he approached the President of the Jewish Students Network at a demonstration outside the Ontario Attorney General's office in Toronto. These and other events which took place in June 1993, are described in chapter V (5.10).

On May 29, 1993, an estimated five hundred anti-racist supporters demonstrated outside a Heritage Front recruitment concert in Ottawa. The racist band, RaHoWa¹⁷, was playing to a crowd of about 60 skinheads. After a near-riot, four Heritage Front members were charged with assault. The Heritage Front then became more militant as Droege wished to increase the confrontations with his opponents. CSIS routinely provided threat assessments to the police on the potential for violence arising from the confrontations between the racists and the anti-racists.

In May 1993, John Gamble, former Conservative and Reform Party nominee in Don Valley West riding, was expelled from the Reform Party. Also expelled were several officials who supported him from various riding associations. Wolfgang Droege had attended Gamble's March 31, 1993 nomination meeting. Later that month, Droege received \$500 to embarrass Reform Party leader Preston Manning by attending a meeting in Oshawa. The events are described in chapter VII (7.6.7, 7.6.8).

Droege and Ernst Zundel wanted the telephone numbers and the addresses of both anti-racist and Jewish community leaders. Had the Source wished to do so, the numbers and the addresses could have been provided quite easily; but the Source did not do so.¹⁸

Bristow, in his position with the Heritage Front, carried out Droege's instructions in regard to a harassment campaign and also informed the anti-racists that a Heritage Front event was planned (see chapter V, 5.7, the "IT" campaign). When the Source could not avoid this type of task, he informed the Toronto Region Investigator who said that he then notified the police.

The harassment calls made by the Heritage Front started abating in June 1993, and finally stopped in November 1993. The campaign was viewed as a major victory by the Heritage Front. The

¹⁶ SIRC interview with Marvin Kurz.

¹⁷ Racial Holy War.

¹⁸ SIRC interview with Source.

Source stated that most of the harassment calls ended in the Summer, and that no physical harm resulted from the program.¹⁹ CSIS believes that its work with the Source during this period was very successful in that a potentially explosive situation, with a great deal of anger on all sides, was defused without any physical violence occurring. We analyze the situation in chapter V (5.7).

On June 11, 1993, an estimated 200 ARA members headed from downtown into the East End of Toronto by street car. By the end of the day, Gary Schipper's house had been vandalized and Droege and others had been arrested and charged for various offenses. We describe the issues in chapter V (5.9.6). After the media allegations which started in August 1994, Droege and his associates would blame Bristow for instigating the battle.²⁰ The Source, however, said that Bristow was not involved in the incident and the Source had, in fact, passed information to the police on where some of the attackers had fled to.²¹

Also in June, three members of George Burdi's Church of the Creator (Drew Maynard, Eric and Elkar Fischer) were charged with kidnapping, forcible confinement and assault in an attack on Heritage Front member, Tyrone Alexander Mason. They believed that he had stolen a COTC computer. Eric Fischer was a former corporal in the Canadian Airborne Regiment. That month, a Tamil refugee was viciously beaten and partially paralysed in an attack by a racist skinhead, considered by Droege to be a low level "*hanger on*" of the Heritage Front.

In late October 1993, the CSIS Source learned about a threat of serious physical violence against leaders in the Jewish community by a Heritage Front member. The threat was evaluated by CSIS, and the police were notified. Ernst Zundel wanted information on the Jewish community's leaders during this time and was provided with publicly available information (see chapter V, 5.10.6).²²

4.5 Leave Taking

In March of 1994, the Source decided that he could no longer abide the stress of living two separate lives, or of continuing his association with the Heritage Front.

¹⁹ SIRC interview with Source.

²⁰ SIRC interview with Wolfgang Droege.

²¹ SIRC interview with Source.

²² SIRC interview with Source.

CSIS and the Source created a story which allowed him to leave the Heritage Front on good terms. CSIS wanted to be able to re-introduce the Source at a later date if the situation required it.

In June of 1994, Wolfgang Droege and two other Front members were convicted of defying a Court Order to close the racist hotlines.

In August 1994, the *"Toronto Sun"* alleged that Grant Bristow was a CSIS informant. Jewish groups and anti-racists expressed their concern. Heritage Front leaders, members, and their American associates were provided with unparalleled media coverage. They used their unprecedented access to the media to allege that CSIS, through Grant Bristow, was responsible for everything that had taken place during the previous five years; including, as Wolfgang Droege put it, some *"unethical or immoral"* behaviour.

SIRC began its investigation of the *"Heritage Front Affair"* the day after the article appeared.

V. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND HARASSMENT

5.1 Overview

In order to avoid, where possible, taking part in confrontational activities between the Heritage Front and others, the Source chose to become the "information gathering" expert within the group.

From time to time, when Droege demanded action, the Source would have to manoeuvre to maintain his credibility, and yet not divulge information. He created a series of imaginary events to show that he was active, events he would recount to Ken Barker, Elisse Hategan, Wolfgang Droege, and other members of the Heritage Front. The Source's reports allowed the Service to intervene if there was a likelihood of actual violence occurring.

Information gathering kept the Source away from the front lines, and actual confrontations. He was not well known to police forces. The police, for example:

"considered the Source to be an information gatherer. He was known but not seen as an integral member of the Heritage Front."¹

According to the Toronto Region Investigator, Holocaust denier Ernst Zundel sometimes asked for information to be collected and, after approval by Droege, the Source would appear to carry out the request. The Source would have to appear enthusiastic, and active. In the end, however, he would only provide information from public sources, and the handler was always aware of what was passed. Sometimes the Source would degrade his information before passing it on by transposing telephone numbers. And sometimes the Source would stall, or indicate that information was too expensive to acquire.

5.2 White Supremacist Information Highway

In early 1991, the Source found out that Terry Long was proposing to set up a Canadian Aryan Computer Network. Long stated that American racist Louis Beam enthusiastically supported the idea. Long also indicated that he was developing a target list. Target lists were to be a main feature of the network once it was established.

According to CSIS files, on April 21, 1991, Droege established a computer link with Long, and the first successful test message took place between the Aryan Nations and the Heritage Front. That month, Wolfgang Droege and Ernst Zundel, Holocaust denier and prolific publisher of hate literature, met publicly at

¹ Letter from P.

a Heritage Front meeting.²

Ernst Zundel sometimes provided information, at Droege's request, to be forwarded to Long. The information concerned various "enemies". One piece of information, for example, was the licence plate number of Meir Halevi, Leader of the Jewish Defence League (JDL) in Toronto.³

Droege is not a computer person, Lincoln was the computer expert. Louis Beam was said to be the brains behind the United States Aryan Computer Network, which the Canadian supremacists were trying to emulate.

In July 1991, the Source obtained and provided to CSIS a listing of personal information which Droege received from Terry Long. The list was passed promptly to the RCMP. *"The list was presented as an intelligence file in which the recipients are to contribute material when required"*.

Droege told the Source that the list was created so that the movement has the required intelligence on targets when the 'Day of the Rope' arrives. The Source believes that Droege was referring to a target 'hit list' which would be used when the 'Race War' begins.

The list included 22 names of Canadians, some Jewish, some just plain enemies (e.g., people who had fired Heritage Front members).

CSIS officers believed that this intelligence list was a partial one and that a more comprehensive list was held by Long. They commented that it would be interesting to see what action Droege or his associates took with respect to providing additional information on the targets.

The Source was asked about the list of 22 persons. He said that few in the movement could gain access to it. The Source stated that he did no work to update the information he received,

² The Heritage Front Report: 1994, pp. 5-6, prepared by the League of Human Rights of B'nai Brith, Canada.

³ Zundel stated *"that is absolutely nonsense"*.

there was nothing new on the list, but he gave it to his handler anyway.⁴

The Source was asked if he ever provided information to Terry Long. He said he absolutely did not give information to Terry Long; it was a largely a one-way street with the information going from Long to the Heritage Front and not the other way.⁵

As late as February 1992, names were being placed on a computerized list. For example, Terry Long's spouse asked two names to be added to the Aryan Nations computer intelligence list. The two individuals were "enemies" who had initiated a Human Rights complaint and a civil suit against her husband. The investigator comments, however, that "*Due to Terry Long's absence, the computer connection with the Heritage Front appears to have terminated.*" With the imprisonment of Terry Long, the computer link, which was described by the Source as defective in any case, appeared to have become inoperative. These names also were passed to the RCMP.

5.3 The Hate Line

The Heritage Front's telephone Hate Line was established in the Summer of 1991. It was to be the target of a number of legal actions by the Jewish and Native communities, and was to be stopped, and then restarted seven times over the next three years.⁶

Through the Summer and Fall of 1991, work continued on the hate line. We learned that Lincoln dictated the message, as approved by Droege, on the answering machine. Eventually, the hotline was mainly Gary Schipper's project, and certainly the voice was his.

5.4 The Rise of the Anti-Racist Groups

The first record we have of activities involving anti-racists concerns the attendance of Heritage Front members on September 24, 1991 at the Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations. At the meeting, Paul Fromm allegedly interrupted Rodney Bobiwash by shouting "*scalp them*", resulting in a confrontation. Subsequently, as a result of the confrontation, some Front members were ejected, but two of them, Lincoln and Bristow were able to stay as members of the general public.

⁴ SIRC interview of Source.

⁵ SIRC interview of Source.

⁶ The Heritage Front Report: 1994, pp. 5-6, prepared by the League of Human Rights of B'nai Brith, Canada.

In early 1992, according to a magazine article, a new kind of militant anti-racist group, Anti-Racist Action was born.⁷ In a "three hour festival of vocal havoc and counter-intimidation" in front of Toronto's Ristorante Roma, Anti-Racist Action demonstrators tried to confront the estimated 40 skinheads inside.

"Finally, at 11:00 p.m., a cordon of officers shielded the Neo-Nazi's from a barrage of eggs as they fled the scene".⁸

The Ristorante Roma incident was to "characterize what ARA was going to be like". According to Kevin Thomas:

"The group ... was mostly made up of people who hadn't done anything like this before, so we weren't going to abide by the rules laid out for people on how you're supposed to negotiate political action. It was like, 'no we'll do whatever works'. There's been sort of that theme all along".⁹

At the Ristorante Roma, Droege asked Grant Bristow to negotiate between the two groups. The police wanted people to leave the premises peacefully and, with Grant Bristow urging a peaceful withdrawal, this took place.¹⁰

The Anti-Racist Action, or ARA, according to "This Magazine" had the motto, "Do what works. It's what works that counts. Do it now, right this instant". ARA newsletters provided information on how to "hack into" the Heritage Front hate line and block messages. ARA members demonstrated in front of Heritage Front meetings, and would confront individual Heritage Front members. ARA members would not wait for the Heritage Front to act first. Eventually, a small group of ARA members would "trash" (vandalize) Gary Schipper's house.¹¹

⁷ This Magazine, February 23, 1992.

⁸ "I Hate You Back" by Clive Thompson, This Magazine, November 1994.

⁹ "I Hate You Back" by Clive Thompson, This Magazine, November 1994.

¹⁰ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

¹¹ "I Hate You Back" by Clive Thompson, This Magazine, pp. 16-21, November 1994.

According to the ARA, "hate was getting younger" and it was becoming attached to street violence. It was time for different solutions:

"a number of inner city youth who'd had run ins with the skin-heads decided that court battles against phone lines weren't enough. Federal laws might be able to stop racist propaganda after a few years of hearings, they figured, but they didn't help much when skin-heads were threatening you in your favourite drinking hole or in front of your locker".¹²

5.5 Recruiting at High Schools

Both the Heritage Front and the anti-racist leadership agreed on one thing: their market for recruits was the disaffected young. The first indication in CSIS files of actions involving high schools is a reference in June 1990 to Wolfgang Droege telling Grant Bristow about plans to distribute leaflets at a school. He also talked about "spray painting and vandalism operations" to respond to actions by anti-racists.

By late 1992, the Heritage Front began recruiting in earnest. According to one account:

"Heritage Front members leafleted and visited dozens of high schools in Southern Ontario, seeking to tap the frustrations of kids who faced dismal job prospects and were willing to blame it all on immigrants and non-whites".¹³

Recruiting at high schools led the Heritage Front into direct conflict with the ARA, and with High School staff. The ARA started holding meetings at high schools, and putting their positions forward.

Both sides then started targeting students who were members of their opponent's organization.

We learned that to discredit the anti-racists, Bristow advised Droege that he had contacted the principal of Riverdale Collegiate and asked why he had allowed a paedophile to enter the

¹² "I Hate You Back" by Clive Thompson, This Magazine, p. 18, November 1994.

¹³ "I Hate You Back" by Clive Thompson, This Magazine, pp. 16-21, November 1994.

school premises and speak to children. Bristow claimed the principal had been in tears.

In August 1994, after Bristow was alleged to be a CSIS source by the media, Droege provided his version of Bristow's contact with Riverdale Collegiate to another reporter. He alleged that Bristow stated 'we are going to make sure that they will never have another meeting at any of the schools in Toronto.' Droege explained that Bristow had identified someone as being a child molester and he informed the principal and the School Board Trustees that some convicted paedophiles were affiliated (with ARA). Bristow then threatened to make this information public if they (principal and school trustees) persisted in allowing ARA to hold meetings.

The Review Committee spoke to the Principal, at the time, of Riverdale Collegiate. He said that he had not received any calls from any Heritage Front member, and that no school staff member had told him of receiving any such calls.¹⁴

According to the Source, quite a few people were calling schools. Droege was reported as having called the Ministry of Education as well as schools. The Source said that he told Droege that he had talked to such Board officials, but actually, he had not. The handler said that he believed that the Source was not involved in this type of activity.¹⁵

5.6 Machine Busters

In the Summer or early Fall of 1992, Rodney Bobiwash set up the group called "*Klanbusters*". They had discovered a method of finding the remote code (usually two digits) of answering machines. They used this knowledge to access Droege's answering machine. They could change the message he left on his machine, and they could note his callers and then telephone them.

Droege would later tell the Review Committee that among those who made threatening telephone calls to the Heritage Front hotline were the ARA and "*various leftist groups, such as the International Socialists, also Trotskyites; the Jewish Students Network.*"¹⁶

¹⁴ SIRC interview of former Principal of Riverdale Collegiate.

¹⁵ SIRC interview of Handler.

¹⁶ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

In return, Droege learned how to obtain the code which allowed external access to the Klanbuster hotline message centre. He was thus able to obtain the names (not identified) of "two left-wing types who were attempting to infiltrate the Heritage Front". CSIS learned that Droege confided to the source that he would like to actively conduct a counter-intelligence program to identify these individuals and prevent further penetration. He also wanted to run informers into the left wing milieu.

The Source told SIRC that Marc Lemire probably taught Droege how to obtain information from various answering machines and the Hotline.¹⁷

CSIS' Toronto Region thought that the Front was "taking internal security matters very seriously. They are also branching out under Droege's direction to include offensive counter-measures." This development would likely increase the potential for violent confrontations between the racists and the anti-racists.

Droege regularly called Bobiwash's machine. People who had left messages for Bobiwash would get a call back from the Heritage Front. One of Lemire's tricks was to put parts of Zundel's speeches on a tape loop which repeated itself constantly, and feed it to the machines of Heritage Front opponents.¹⁸

Wolfgang Droege showed Bristow how to break into answering machines. He alleged that much of Bristow's time was spent breaking into people's machines, usually when they were not at home.¹⁹ Droege added that the Heritage Front people could break into two-digit machines at will, in less than half an hour.

Toronto Region learned that Church of the Creator leader George Burdi's right hand man, Eric Fischer, and his brother, Carl (Elkar) Fischer, were helping Grant Bristow perform security duties. On December 15, 1992, the Fischer brothers and Bristow went to the Toronto Public Library to learn how use a Toronto Mights Directory to trace telephone numbers, numbers obtained from Droege's answering machine or from left-wing and anarchist

¹⁷ SIRC interview of Source.

¹⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

¹⁹ SIRC interview of Droege.

telephone hotlines and message centres. The Source reported that the brothers could not work out how to use the MIGHTS Directory.²⁰

5.7 The "IT" Campaign

The "IT" campaign apparently started at the end of 1992 and continued until about November, 1993. The "IT" campaign drew on the information that the Heritage Front obtained by breaking into answering machines. Most of the information came from Rodney Bobiwash's "Klanbuster" machine.²¹

Elisse Hategan, who defected from the Heritage Front after she was charged for a hate crime, stated in an affidavit that:

*"when someone was made IT that person's life would be made miserable. More precisely, the person would be reminded of the fact 24-hours a day; one would not be able to eat or sleep in peace. Calls would be made at home, at work, constantly, the goal being to make IT's life miserable, get IT fired from IT's job and made to fear one's own shadow, until IT felt IT was never alone for even a second, that IT was always watched. There could only be one IT. The only way one could get out of being IT was to give the name and phone number of another person in the ARA, so that that person would take the place of IT."*²²

According to Hategan, she called several "victims" at Bristow's urging, and she knew that he made some calls.²³ Police authorities advised the Service that Hategan's information was not very accurate.

According to the Source, some of the calls involved the statement "you have been selected to be 'IT'. I am to become your closest personal friend; if you don't want to be 'IT', give me the names and telephone numbers of someone else and they can be IT".²⁴

²⁰ Eric Fischer indicates that, in fact, the MIGHTS Directory was "pretty simple" to use.

²¹ SIRC interview of Source.

²² Affidavit of Charlene Elisse Hategan, September 23, 1993.

²³ Toronto Sun, "Spy Unmasked", August 14, 1994.

²⁴ SIRC interview of Source.

The Source invented the "IT" scenario in an attempt to avoid criminal threatening charges. Originally, Droege wanted all the participating HF members to phone ARA people and actually threaten them with bodily harm.²⁵

After the press allegations in August 1994, Barker told a journalist that he heard Bristow call up and incite people on the phone, two to three hours a day, in the morning, usually from 9:15 hours to 11:30 hours. Barker continued that he (Bristow) would get on the phone and Barker would sit there and 'roar' as he (Bristow) would call these people up and incite them, everything from A to Z. At the time these comments were made, Droege and his associates were fabricating information for the media.²⁶

The Source acknowledged that he provided coaching and instruction for the "IT" campaign.²⁷

In the case of Elisse Hategan, for example, the Source said he told her, *"don't break the law, do not threaten people; if they say 'you are harassing me', don't call them back."*

Droege wanted to involve other people and the Source was trying to control the process. He thought that by having everyone work through him on the "IT" campaign, he could retain the numbers that the Heritage Front members collected. He could also restrict, to some extent, the participation of others. To dissuade others from becoming involved, he would say that he had the whole thing under control.²⁸

According to the Source, as part of his instruction to others, he would let them hear his technique on three-way calls. In making these calls, he said that he did not harass nor issue threats. His only purpose was to collect information on these *"enemies of freedom."*²⁹

We learned that Gerry Lincoln told Droege that Bristow did not make a single one of those (Harassment) calls. Droege agreed with this. Droege said that Elisse Hategan was not bad, as

²⁵ Droege denies this allegation.

²⁶ Droege denies this allegation.

²⁷ SIRC interview of Source.

²⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

²⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

she made it appear, it put it all onto Bristow's shoulders, everything, which, in a way, was not bad at all.³⁰

The Source stated that one has to understand the environment at the time. Bobiwash's people were placing calls to the Heritage Front, making threats and hanging up. Bobiwash's people eventually went and vandalized Gary Schipper's home; activities Bobiwash described as "jocularly" in Federal Court. The Source said that every faction was in on the act: threatening and breaking into each other's machines. There was considerable anger amid a climate of charges, counter-charges, posters, and telephone calls.³¹

According to Bristow, other people made most of the calls. He did, however, call two people: a female anti-racist activist and Kevin Thomas.³²

We asked the Source about counter-intelligence activities against anti-racist groups, and its potential impact on confrontations between anti-racists and the Heritage Front.³³ He said that there was no serious counter-intelligence program, and no "human sources". If the left-wing had a march, Droege and/or Zundel would think it a good idea for them to be covered.³⁴ Sometimes Bristow would be on the street photographing and taking numbers, sometimes Fischer or Hategan did this.³⁵

The Source was asked about the use of "plants" (Heritage Front people who attended ARA meetings). He said that there were none. Some of Eric Fischer's people, however, were working against the anti-racists, and this was reported to Droege. Fischer would place his people in the anti-racist meetings and Bristow would debrief them along with Fischer when they reported back.

³⁰ Droege indicated to SIRC that Bristow had told him he had made harassment phone calls.

³¹ SIRC interview of Source.

³² SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

³³ During this period, there was an anti-racist rally which started at the corner of Church and Wellesley, and moved to Yonge street. There was also a January 1993 demonstration planned by "East Toronto Organizing Against Racism and Hate".

³⁴ Zundel indicated that he did ask people to monitor marches in order to protect his house against attacks.

³⁵ SIRC interview of Source.

In February 1993, Wolfgang Droege was told that the Klanbusters and the International Socialists were going to hold meetings and that someone from the Church of the Creator (COTC) would be covering the meetings. The COTC persons who were sent by Fischer to cover the meetings were Talic and Cake. Their job was to find out what was going on.³⁶ However, they soon became bored with this activity, and stopped attending the meetings.³⁷

5.8 Information Collection on the ARA

Al Overfield alleges that he received a list of known "lefties" from Bristow, and that the Source was also attempting to obtain Rodney Bobiwash's home address.

Bristow said that he had never provided a list of known "lefties" allegedly obtained from the Heritage Front counter-intelligence program to Overfield. The Source said that Bristow did provide some names, under instruction from Droege, which had appeared on Droege's answering machine. The Source consulted with the Toronto Region Investigator, who said that he could provide telephone numbers to others if the information received from the answering machine was specific and well known.

According to the Source, Droege was seeking Bobiwash's address. Droege wanted to attack Bobiwash. Had the Source wanted to do so, he could have obtained the address quite easily.³⁸

Droege wanted Bristow to obtain the addresses of Kevin Thomas and the other ARA leaders. The only addresses that Droege ever obtained, said the Source, were the ones he developed himself.³⁹

5.9 Harassment of ARA Members

The information on the harassment of the anti-racists is somewhat sparse due to the nature of the events themselves and because of the refusal of Members of the ARA to cooperate with the Review Committee. The events described below indicate what was alleged to have happened to three present or former members of the Anti-Racist Action group.

³⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

³⁷ SIRC interview of Source.

³⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

³⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

5.9.1 The Harassment of an Anti-Racist Activist

The anti-racist activist is a former ARA member who, in her own words, was one of the most active ARA members for a two or three month period. She told SIRC that she was subject to intense harassment from January to April 1993. During this period, she received 25 to 30 calls every day, at all hours of the day and night. This diminished to 25-30 calls a week between May and July 1993.

The Source said that the activist appeared to be both stable and aggressive. Bristow's calls involved "you're IT" at normal hours. Many other people probably also called her. The "IT" campaign was to collect information and was not designed to harass anyone day and night. The Investigator acknowledged the possibility however, that some of the younger Front members may have spent some nights making such calls.

Though most of the harassment took the form of telephone calls, the activist said there was also some "stalking". She would be told that "we know that you were here and here and here during the day" and "we're watching your every move". During the January-April period, she said the calls involved increasing threats of violence. In early March, she was told that her house would be fire-bombed. The activist said that she never reported the incident to the police. The telephone harassment calls at her home involved many "hang-ups" and disguised voices. She said that she did not report the harassment campaign to the police.

The Source told the Review Committee that no "stalking" took place because Heritage Front members never had the patience to engage in that type of activity. The Source said he has no knowledge of anyone ever being placed under surveillance. If it had happened, the Source said he would have known about it in due course.⁴⁰

The activist said that some of the calls did not appear, initially, to be harassment. For example, she would be told that the caller's child had been injured at an ARA rally and that the caller wanted to speak to someone about the issue. When she asked "how did you get my home number", the caller would hang up. The Toronto Region Investigator said this type of call may have been part of the harassment campaign. However, it was an unusual type of call for the Heritage Front, and he had not previously heard about it.

⁴⁰ SIRC interview of Source.

The activist spoke of a number of additional specific incidents. Her descriptions and the Source's responses are provided below.

In January 1993, while sick at home from her job, the activist's boss was called, and told that she was videotaped at an ARA demonstration. Bristow said that Droege wanted a few people to call her boss to say that she was out demonstrating and they hoped that she did not call in sick.⁴¹

The Toronto Region Investigator said that Droege authorized the telephone harassment campaign, and the Source controlled it. One call to the activist's employer was made by Bristow, as a conference call with Mitrevski also on the line. The Investigator told the Source to try to avoid getting into that sort of situation.⁴²

A mock Heritage Front flyer was distributed which listed the activist's home address, thus giving the impression that she was a Heritage Front member. The perpetrator was actually an anti-racist who was tricked into preparing the flyers.

The handler indicated that the Source did not distribute the hate flyer involving the activist. Nor did the Source threaten to fire-bomb her house. He was not surprised at the frequency of the harassment calls; he thought it was something the younger or violent members could do.⁴³

The Source created a series of imaginary events which he told Heritage Front members had happened; e.g., he had called the anti-racists to tell them that a Heritage Front event was going to be at a certain place and to knock hard; then he would call others to say they were from the Neo-Nazi Welcome Wagon and the Nazis could be found at a such an such address.⁴⁴

On one occasion, a Heritage Front member actually did this type of thing. A racist, posing as an anti-racist, called an ARA member and said that there was going to be a Heritage Front action at the activist's house; the ARA sent over a large

⁴¹ SIRC interview of Bristow.

⁴² SIRC interview of Handler.

⁴³ SIRC interview of Handler.

⁴⁴ SIRC interview of Source.

contingent to ward off a possible Front attack.⁴⁵ In this case, the Heritage Front used the name of an individual taken from Bobiwash's answering machine. Droege had said that they were to use that fellow's name to get the left working against the left. The Source said that Droege himself probably made the call.⁴⁶

The activist said that skinheads would often sit on a bench across the street from her office; they would just wait there and stare at her while she was at her desk.

The activist was informed by others in the movement that Grant Bristow was responsible for making the telephone calls. She was told by ARA members that their "ears had pricked up" when they had heard Bristow speak at a meeting - they had allegedly heard the voice in harassment calls.⁴⁷

We asked the Source about the harassment of the activist. He said that she was singled out after someone made a harassment call to Droege's machine. Her telephone number was compared to a master list of names and numbers on Bobiwash's list.

When the Review Committee checked a short Heritage Front list of callers which was provided to CSIS by the Source, we did not see the number that the activist told us she had at home during 1993. Other lists may exist however.

According to the Source, the harassment telephone calls to anti-racists were not organized; everyone did it once they knew how to access answering machines, and it developed on its own. Droege harnessed it into a program.⁴⁸ The activist was said to be one of the last persons harassed.

In one of the affidavits filed by Elisse Hategan on September 23, 1993, she recounted her perception of what had taken place:

"[Grant] said Sister [Activist] had been under a lot of stress lately, and she was on temporary leave from work. He said the fact that [the Activist] had been IT caused her a lot of stress, and he seemed to take credit for it. He said that

⁴⁵ SIRC interview of Anti-Racist Activist.

⁴⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

⁴⁷ SIRC interview of Anti-Racist Activist.

⁴⁸ SIRC interview with Source.

[the Activist] was not getting a moment in peace - people were calling her in the middle of the night, at all times of day and night, they'd also been doing it at work, and the pressure was too much for her to handle, that she had to take a leave of absence. He said he thought she'd had a breakdown - in fact, he was sure of it. By this time, Grant was laughing really hard and was almost in tears - he said she had tried very hard to hold onto sanity and not given any names as of yet, but he was confident she'd break soon. He said she even had people move in with her, because she was so scared."

After the Toronto Region Investigator expressed concern about the campaign against the activist, the Source tried to diminish the Front's interest by telling members that she had lost her job and that they should take the heat off her.⁴⁹

The Toronto handler discussed, in general, the telephone harassment campaign. He noted that the telephone harassment blitz started with quite a few people being harassed and then the procedure was narrowed down. At the start, everyone was phoning people on the lists they had collected. After about a month, the calls started to become very threatening and the possibility of violence occurring had become very real. According to the Source, by the Summer of 1993, as a result of the "IT" campaign, the calls had become more of an information collection exercise under the Source's direction.⁵⁰

The handler noted that the Source tampered with the numbers on the lists of names designated for phoning. When a list of people was given to the Heritage Front members, some of the names and the telephone numbers were changed by the Source. Not all of them were changed, particularly those of prominent individuals such as Kevin Thomas, because suspicions would have been raised.⁵¹

The harassment calls started abating in June 1993, and finally stopped in November 1993. According to the Source, the harassment program was viewed as a major victory by the Heritage Front. His understanding was that most of the harassment calls

⁴⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

⁵⁰ SIRC interview of Handler.

⁵¹ SIRC interview of Handler.

ended in the Summer, and that no physical harm resulted from the program.⁵²

5.9.2 The Thomas Incident

Press accounts stated that "Kevin Thomas was made 'IT' for awhile". One media report stated:

"At first, it was simply probes for information. He was called at work by a man he later realized was Bristow. "He said he was Ron Tafner, and was supposedly from the Ottawa Citizen". Unable to get information from him, Bristow apparently changed tactics, Thomas says. The calls - made to his business - would sometimes be profane and abusive. In June 1993 - after bloody clashes between racists and anti-racists - Bristow led a group of Front members to Thomas' Richmond Street offices and told his landlord Thomas was a violent terrorist and had a record of procuring children for sex."⁵³

In a The Fifth Estate interview, Thomas indicated that most of what was said was "just plain abuse - "he [Bristow] would call me a repulsive little shithead or call me a loser, or coward, or whatever he could think of". Thomas went on:

"When you are taking on Neo-Nazi's, you go in expecting that it's going to be dirty and its gonna be violent because that's the nature of a Neo-Nazi organization like the Heritage Front, but you don't expect that to come from the government. You don't expect it to be somebody who is actually paid to go and do that and to orchestrate it and to organize other people to do it. You don't expect them to have somebody paid to make phone calls, to make threats, to make your life miserable."

The commentator added, "Police sources say CSIS knew exactly what Bristow was up to."⁵⁴

We learned that Droege told a journalist in September 1994 that Bristow et al would go to Kevin Thomas' office building to let Thomas know they were there and when they could not do that,

⁵² SIRC interview of Source.

⁵³ Toronto Sun, August 14, 1994.

⁵⁴ The Fifth Estate, October 4, 1994.

they went to a few of the neighbours on the floor in the building and said 'this blackbird next door, you better watch them, they are anti-racists, they are terrorists, they procure children for sexual favours', all kinds of nasty stuff, right up to telling them that these individuals such as Kevin Thomas, were 'hooping little gerbils.'

We asked the Source to identify who had led the effort to obtain the names of the ARA leaders and their home addresses. He said that Droege wanted him to obtain the addresses of Kevin Thomas and the other ARA leaders. According to the Source, the only addresses which Droege ever possessed were the ones he developed himself.

According to the handler, Thomas was on a list of names subject to telephone harassment. Because he was so well known, the Source could not tamper with his telephone number.⁵⁵ The Source said that he did pass along information concerning the location of the ARA hotline and where Kevin Thomas worked. In general, the Source only provided information from newspaper articles which named leftists who appeared in Court.

Bristow did not remember calling Thomas at his place of work, describing himself as a reporter from the Ottawa Citizen; though he said this could have been the case.⁵⁶ According to Bristow, he once called Thomas a "*repulsive little shithead*", adding that it was said in Rodney Bobiwash's "*jocular fashion*"; Thomas and Bristow were always exchanging slurs.⁵⁷

The Source provided the context to the Front members' visit to Thomas' workplace. Droege was before the Courts, and Thomas had sent people down to the Court, and to a radio station show, to make derogatory statements about the racists. In the end, Droege was denied bail, and his people were angry and wanted action. The Source told them to calm down, and Bristow took them in a car to go on a mission to check out Kevin Thomas' workplace.⁵⁸ He said that they did not enter the workplace.

According to the Source, he was not involved in identifying residences to be "*trashed*". Dawson, Paul Graham and another couple had "*spun by*" Thomas' place in Bristow's car. The

⁵⁵ SIRC interview of Handler.

⁵⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

⁵⁷ SIRC interview of Bristow.

⁵⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

Source conveyed the message that things were under control, and that they should take the moral high ground and let the others get arrested (in relation to houses being trashed). The Source defused the situation.⁵⁹

Regarding the alleged call to Thomas by someone posing as an Ottawa Citizen reporter, the Toronto Investigator said that the Source does not believe that Bristow made the call; there was no evidence found to confirm that such a call was made. The Investigator had no knowledge of the Source going to Thomas' neighbours and complaining about him.

5.9.3 The Harassment of Merle Terlesky

An affidavit signed by Elisse Hategan on September 23, 1993 attested that activist Merle Terlesky was harassed day and night. The Review Committee asked the Source who organized and carried it out. He said that Terlesky was "talked to" by Droege and Bristow, but he was not aware of Terlesky ever being harassed.

Apparently, when Barker saw information in the newspapers about a charge against Terlesky, he ordered gerbils to be sent to Terlesky's house. According to the Source, Terlesky was probably the activist on the left who commanded the most respect from Droege.

5.9.4 Involvement with the Hategan Hate Posters

In March 1993, according to one media account, Bristow had a part in the production of the "Animal Series #2" flyer. Specifically, he had added the names and home addresses of anti-racists used on the poster, and had photocopied the document at Al Overfield's house.⁶⁰ The "Animal Series #2" flyer, was a poster combining the body of an ape with the head of a gorilla. The Heritage Front flyer is actually a doctored reproduction of a much earlier American racist poster.

In October 1993, Elisse Hategan was charged with publishing defamatory libel, and wilful promotion of hatred. In her sworn affidavit dated September 23, 1993, Hategan affirmed that she was informed that Al Overfield produced the flyers that she was arrested for distributing.

We have learned that Al Overfield mentioned to Droege that Bristow was supposed to come over (to Overfield's residence)

⁵⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

⁶⁰ Toronto Sun, October 4, 1994.

because they were going to do 'Animal Series Number 2' and something about the homo child molester.⁶¹

According to Al Overfield, Bristow actually produced the flyer on a copier at Overfield's house. Our investigation further revealed that Bristow and Droege discussed Hategan and her confusion. Bristow told him that Hategan wanted to figure out if it was alright to say that she thought Bristow was the one making up the stickers. Bristow said everybody in town was to be told to keep their mouth shut this time around.

Droege told the Review Committee that it was Bristow's idea to put the names of anti-racists on the "Animal Series" posters. One of the names, said Droege was provided by Bristow as he "had information as to where the main ARA organizers were."⁶²

On February 17, 1993, we learned that Droege told Bristow that Hategan had been arrested for those posters that Overfield had made up. Bristow said they should find out how many posters had been made up and Droege replied that only Overfield would know that. Droege then contacted Overfield and told him to dispose of the Animal Life Series posters. Overfield said he would do that right away.

We asked Bristow about the production and distribution of the posters. He indicated that he had passed some names from Droege to Overfield, names such as "Celeste", that were eventually used on the posters. These were names of anti-racists to whom the poster was attributed. Other than that, he had no role in the poster affair. In the case of the flyers, Overfield developed them, and had a formal unveiling. Overfield produced the flyers, and gave them to Droege. Droege then gave them to Elisse Hategan, who gave them to others.

The Toronto Region Investigator said that the Source does not think that Bristow had any role other than to provide the ARA names to Overfield.

The Investigator said that the Source discussed Bristow's relationship with Hategan. He noted that Bristow used to pick on Hategan and they disliked each other intensely. Bristow intended to

⁶¹ Overfield does not recall the posters having anything to do with the homo child molester. He recalls Bristow photostatting something at his place.

⁶² SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

get under Hategan's skin. He hoped that he could force Hategan into leaving the Heritage Front.⁶³

5.9.5 Bristow and the Hategan Affidavits

On September 23, 1993, Elisse Hategan signed a number of affidavits. Hategan told reporters that she had "given sworn statements that involved Grant Bristow in harassment campaigns, but nothing had been done".⁶⁴ According to Hategan, "Bristow orchestrated a vicious harassment campaign targeting individual anti-racists".⁶⁵

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation stated that not only did CSIS not act on these allegations, but the Toronto Region Investigator made statements that he would discredit her.⁶⁶

The Toronto Region Investigator denied that he made those statements, and was dismayed because he knows they originate with someone who was once a colleague. The Investigator instructed the Source to stay away from her, saying she was nothing but trouble. He added that he probably told other agencies that Hategan was not credible; at one point she had a very active role in the Extreme Right Movement, and she had had a sudden change of heart after being charged.⁶⁷

We looked at the affidavits, and, whereas they provided background for our study, in one expert opinion:

"The assessment of the information provided was that it was hearsay and in the absence of direct evidence, not sufficient to support a criminal investigation".⁶⁸

⁶³ SIRC interview of Handler.

⁶⁴ Toronto Star, September 30, 1994.

⁶⁵ Toronto Sun, August 14, 1994.

⁶⁶ The Fifth Estate stated that "When Elisse came out and said she was going to tell the truth, CSIS was saying they were going to get out and discredit her because at least Hategan was pointing the finger at Grant Bristow... we'll tear her to shreds".

⁶⁷ SIRC interview of Handler.

⁶⁸ October 28, 1994.

The Source was asked about the accuracy of the September 23, 1993 affidavits, but he said that he had not seen them.⁶⁹ Wolfgang Droege, for his part said that Elisse "didn't lie out-right" but had a tendency to misread situations, and "things got twisted".⁷⁰

The Source said that Droege used to delight in telling stories to Hategan. For example, when he showed her sand in a jar, he said "*that once she kills someone and they're cremated, she gets one too*". Max French actually brought the jar of regular sand back from Libya.⁷¹

5.9.6 Sneaky Dees and the Trashing

On June 11, 1993, an estimated two hundred and fifty ARA members headed from downtown into the East End of Toronto by streetcar. "*Rather than wait for a far right gathering, ARA organizers decided to take a proactive approach.*"⁷²

The demonstrators poured into a neighbourhood near Gary Schipper's house. Gary Schipper was believed to be the voice on the Heritage Front hate line. According to one ARA member, "*ARA intended to 'out' Schipper, to expose his previously secret address to his blue collar, ethnically diverse neighbours.*"⁷³

According to one article, the police were out in force, but they mistakenly believed that the ARA target was Ernst Zundel's house. A small number of ARA members "*launched into their most aggressive action yet*".

*"A dozen masked protesters hurled rocks at Schipper's house, smashing his windows and battering his door. One protester threw a neighbour's tricycle through Schipper's front window, and police even found human excrement among the debris splattering the building".*⁷⁴

⁶⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

⁷⁰ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

⁷¹ SIRC interview of Source.

⁷² "I Hate You Back" by Clive Thompson, This Magazine, p. 21, November 1994.

⁷³ "I Hate You Back", This Magazine, p. 21, November edition.

⁷⁴ "I Hate You Back", This Magazine, p. 21, November edition.

Droege told the Committee that after the attack on Schipper's house, Bristow was "over at Alan Gardens agitating our people to go over to Sneaky Dees", the "hangout for so-called anti-racists."⁷⁵ Droege said that he agreed, but suggested that the ARA be the aggressors and told Bristow to "keep them (the HF members) in line."⁷⁶

Bristow, Droege said, was across the street from Sneaky Dees with two girls and he started calling the anti-racists names which started the two groups fighting. Droege noted that police arrived immediately, almost as though they had been tipped off.⁷⁷ Droege was among those arrested and charged by the police for several offenses.

According to the Source, the Heritage Front thought Zundel's house was going to be hit. They were using police radio scanners, and when it was clear that Zundel's house was not going to be hit, they headed to the East End. Initially, Bristow told Droege that it might be Mitrevski's place; then he concluded that it would be Schipper's place and he notified the police.

After the house was vandalized, the Source said that he went to Schipper's home to get the telephone lists, the contact logs, etc. He persuaded Schipper to remove them from the house, and give them to him. The Source said that he later gave all of this information to the Toronto Region Investigator.

The Source said that after leaving Schipper's house, Droege and Bristow first met in an underground garage, and then moved downtown near Gerrard Square and discussed their options. Droege was upset and wanted the strongest worded protest to go out because the Metro Police had not intervened.

Later, said the Source, they all went to Zundel's house. Droege wanted a beer, but Zundel did not approve and said that everyone should go home. Droege was upset, but Zundel was not; it was not his house that had been trashed.⁷⁸ George Burdi (Church of the Creator) was present and said that they should take a group and lose the police.

⁷⁵ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

⁷⁶ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

⁷⁷ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

⁷⁸ Zundel said that such a statement about Shipper's house would be callous, and he did not make it.

According to the Source, Droege and the others went to Sneaky Dees to have a beer. After an hour, Droege told everyone to go home. When they left a fight erupted with the anti-racists. The Source passed information as to where the attackers went to the police.⁷⁹

The Source did not provide Droege with the names of the demonstrators, but people identified some of them using videos of news accounts. Lincoln took still photos from the videos and they were handed out to Heritage Front members. Ernst Zundel's expensive equipment was used for this purpose.⁸⁰

Prior to the confrontation, the Investigator said that he had learned that Bristow told the HF people to settle down. George Burdi, a charismatic speaker, was the person who addressed the crowd in the park before going to Sneaky Dees.⁸¹

In September 1994, Droege and Barker alleged to a journalist that Bristow told HF members to go down to Sneaky Dees to confront the anti-racists and he "pumped them up" in the park before the confrontation.

According to Bristow, he absolutely did not tell Heritage Front members to go down to Sneaky Dees to confront the anti-racists. George Burdi got out a megaphone in the park before the confrontation and rallied the Heritage Front people. He added that there was no confrontation until after the anti-racists started throwing bottles at them.⁸²

5.9.7 The Ottawa Demonstration

In May 1993, an estimated five hundred ARA supporters demonstrated outside a Heritage Front recruitment concert in Ottawa. The racist band, RaHoWa⁸³, was playing to a crowd of about 60 skinheads. What followed was a series of scuffles and fights involving the police, Heritage Front members, and Anti-Racist Action supporters.

⁷⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

⁸⁰ SIRC interview of Source. Zundel noted that they used videos and still photography for possible legal action against individuals harassing them.

⁸¹ SIRC interview of Handler.

⁸² SIRC interview of Bristow.

⁸³ Racial Holy War.

The Source was not present in Ottawa at the time. He had, however, been able to pass along "inside" information about the Anti-Racist Action group forming in Ottawa, and its support from Toronto. He told CSIS that the ARA would be sending two carloads of supporters from Toronto to participate in the Ottawa demonstrations.

After the 1993 Ottawa near-riot, the Heritage Front became more militant. We learned that Droege confided to the source that he had instructed Grant Bristow to again continue a counter-intelligence program against the ARA with the purpose of identifying the leaders and their home addresses. He also wanted to identify ARA meeting places for the purpose of attending at meetings in an effort to intimidate and/or provoke the ARA into further violent actions which he was confident the HF would win.

5.9.8 Training the Heritage Front

Bristow made himself out to be a security expert. Certainly, he was viewed by Heritage Front members as the security expert, and at one point even conducted a pretence "sweep" of Zundel's house for hidden microphones. Sometimes he would talk to Front members on security matters. At one meeting, for example, Droege asked him to talk about the capability of listening devices.

In 1993, Peter Mitrevski contacted Bristow to talk about tracing people through marriage certificate records. He agreed to help Mitrevski with the marriage certificate technique, but knew that it was far more complicated than the book which Mitrevski had bought, made it appear.⁸⁴ Mitrevski was apparently trying to locate Bill Dunphy as he had recently purchased an instruction manual on how to track people and obtain information from various government records.

Droege asked Bristow to demonstrate the criss-cross directories to the Fisher brothers, but his instructions resulted in their being unable to understand how to use them.

At one point Fischer wanted Bristow to give a lecture on basic security techniques. The information he conveyed came from open sources.

Bristow gave COTC members a lecture on basic security. He told them that they should not get an answering machine with a two-digit remote code. He suggested that they get unlisted telephone

⁸⁴ SIRC interview of Bristow.

numbers and voice-mail. He also suggested that they use post office boxes as the addresses for their Drivers Licences.⁸⁵

According to the Source, Bristow never gave Front or Church members significant or sophisticated security information. He told people in the Front to put up aluminum on their windows to deter parabolic microphones and some of them actually did so. And at one point, he had Dawson writing messages using a code book and one time pads. This kept Dawson occupied.⁸⁶

We asked Bristow if he had taught any actual intelligence tradecraft to the Heritage Front or Church of the Creator members. He said that he had not. To avoid surveillance, he had instructed the Heritage Front members to walk for some distance and then to turn around and walk back.⁸⁷

5.9.9 Miscellaneous Issues

A reporter knew of an incident in which a woman's tires were slashed but he was not certain who had done it. According to the Source, he learned that a woman's tires had been slashed from the hotline and from his handler. He had no personal knowledge of the act but he thought it might have been committed by Droege. Droege would go out three or four nights a week for the bailiff company and he needed an assistant after Bristow left, so he took on Mitrevski. In fact, both Dawson and Mitrevski were used as drivers for Droege's repossession business.⁸⁸

A reporter asked Droege if Bristow was involved in the firebombing of Mona Zetner's house and Droege said that he did not believe so. The Source also stated that he did not know who bombed Mona Zetner's house.⁸⁹

Wolfgang Droege alleged that Bristow planned to break into Hategan's house in June or July 1993. We have no evidence that this was the case.

⁸⁵ SIRC interview of Bristow.

⁸⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

⁸⁷ SIRC interview of Bristow.

⁸⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

⁸⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

5.10 Harassment and Contact with Jewish Groups

When the media stories about CSIS and the Heritage Front first aired in mid-August 1994, they significantly increased the already high level of fear in Jewish communities, particularly in Toronto which has Canada's biggest Jewish population.⁹⁰ Jewish communities around the world were still reeling from the bombing of a Jewish community centre in Buenos Aires. Of particular concern were the allegations that Grant Bristow might have passed on the names of Jewish community leaders to the white supremacist movement.

A representative of B'nai Brith said that he felt a sense of betrayal, that CSIS *"may have turned into an instrument which has helped to promote hatred and racism in this country"*.⁹¹ With these concerns in mind, the Review Committee investigated the allegations pertaining to the Jewish community.

5.10.1 Strategy Towards Jewish Groups

We asked the Source about the Heritage Front's strategy towards Jewish groups. He said that the Heritage Front had no general position regarding Jewish groups. Wolfgang Droege perceived the Jewish Lobby to be too big an opponent for him to confront. Droege, said the Source, knew that he did not have enough resources to fight the Jewish groups.⁹²

The Source believed that Droege's personal feelings were that the Jewish groups represented an enemy lobby, and that they were responsible for multi-racial schools and race mixing. He would monitor them through the Jewish community newspapers such as the *"Covenant"*, the *"Canadian Jewish News"*, and *"Forward"*.

Droege's aim was to get back at the Jews through political lobbying. Others in the movement, however, did not understand his strategy. The Aryan Nations believed, for example, that they were the last tribe of the real Jews and they pushed Droege to take physical action. Gerry Lincoln, closely associated with Ernst Zundel, would constantly defend the message of Holocaust

⁹⁰ SIRC interview of Bernie Farber, National Director of Community Relations, Canadian Jewish Congress.

⁹¹ Frank Dimant quoted in the Globe and Mail, Elizabeth Payne *"Spy Agency placed Jewish lives in Danger"*, September 10, 1994.

⁹² SIRC interview of Source.

denial.⁹³

We asked the Source about his dealings with Bernie Farber, the National Director of Community Relations with the Canadian Jewish Congress. The Source never talked much to Farber, but saw him in Court.

The Church of the Creator, Droege, and the skinheads all believed, said the Source, that Farber was the major enemy of the Heritage Front, and he was certainly the most reviled of all their "enemies". There was a major effort to find Farber's residence, but the Source did not help, and the HF never succeeded. The Source said that he could have found it easily if he had wanted to.⁹⁴

5.10.2 1993 Mayor's Committee Meeting

On April 4, 1993, B'nai Brith lawyer Marvin Kurz, a member of the Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations attended an orientation for new members of the group. There, he told the Review Committee, a person who he thought might have been Grant Bristow tried to intimidate him by looming over him, implying that he knew where he lived, and staring at the lawyer.⁹⁵

Prior to the meeting, Kurz had written a letter, with his address in the heading, to Droege threatening to sue for libel based on Front hateline statements about the B'nai Brith staff. The Front had offered a retraction.

At the Mayor's meeting, Kurz said, Droege pulled him over and another person, who Kurz thought might be Bristow, stood over Kurz saying, "*we thought you lived in Brampton*". Kurz wondered if they would follow him home. He said that Janice Dembo, Coordinator of the Mayor's Committee, saw him standing there with another person and Droege, and she took Kurz out the back way.⁹⁶

Janice Dembo recalls that Burdi, Lemire, Barker and Droege tried to disrupt the meeting, assuming it was the same one that Kurz referred to. Kurz came up to Dembo and said that the HF was "*hassling him and he kept going on about Droege and Barker*." He was in an agitated state, and she had others escort him out of

⁹³ Lincoln denies this statement.

⁹⁴ SIRC interview of Source.

⁹⁵ SIRC interview of Marvin Kurz.

⁹⁶ SIRC interview of Marvin Kurz.

the building. She does not specifically remember extricating him, although she says it is possible.⁹⁷

Kurz was not positive that Bristow was involved and, indeed, his memory was only jogged in the wake of the press allegations in 1994, when Wolfgang Droege called him. Droege offered to help Kurz lay a complaint against Bristow based on the incident.⁹⁸

Wolfgang Droege would later tell the Review Committee that, for him, it was important to keep in touch with his opponents, and to be able to discuss differences. He alleged that he was having a peaceful conversation when Bristow showed up on the scene, "*got into the man's (Kurz's) face*", and was generally menacing. Kurz was a small man, and he sought protection.⁹⁹

According to Bristow, he said to Droege, "*don't talk with that low life, let's get out of here.*" At that point, Metro Toronto Police officers were standing at Grant Bristow's shoulder and he was not about to make a commotion. Droege then said that "*Marvin Kurz is not a bad guy*", and went and had his picture taken with Michael Lublin (see Chapter V, section 5.6.1).

Bristow does not think there was another incident in which he might have intimidated Kurz. According to Bristow, he had every opportunity to harass Kurz if he had wanted to; he lived near to Kurz at the time and knew his address from his letterhead.¹⁰⁰

5.10.3 The Jewish Student Network Incident

On May 6, 1993, Grant Bristow approached the President of the Jewish Students' network (JSN) who was participating in a demonstration outside the Ontario Attorney General's office in Toronto. The protest by the Jewish Student Network concerned the provincial government not moving quickly enough on hate crimes prosecution/legislation. She said that she recognized Wolfgang Droege and Peter Mitrevski in the crowd.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ SIRC interview with Janice Dembo, Co-ordinator, Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations.

⁹⁸ SIRC interview of Marvin Kurz.

⁹⁹ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁰⁰ SIRC interview of Bristow.

¹⁰¹ SIRC interview of the President of the Jewish Students' Network.

The President was handing out her business card to the media and gave one to a "Trevor Graham", who, she said, represented himself as a reporter for the "Ottawa Citizen" and a writer for the "Canadian Press". Trevor Graham was Grant Bristow.¹⁰²

The next day, on May 7, 1993, "Graham" called her, identified himself and, in the course of the discussion, said that he had had a conversation with Wolfgang Droege. He described the conversation in such a friendly way "with the Nazi" that she became suspicious. She pretended, nevertheless, to be friendly despite her suspicions.¹⁰³

During her conversation with him, Graham (Bristow) did not ask about information the Network possessed on white supremacists. He did ask about how the group was organized and the names of the students who worked there. She felt these were not appropriate questions.¹⁰⁴

She was not sure how her conversation with "Graham" ended; she telephoned the "Ottawa Citizen" and the "Canadian Press" that day and they both indicated that they had never heard of "Graham". She then spoke to the B'nai Brith and the Canadian Jewish Congress. Several days later, she went to Bernie Farber's office at the Canadian Jewish Congress, where she looked through an album of photos of racists. She recognized Bristow from his photo in a *Toronto Sun* story.¹⁰⁵

Bernie Farber called author Warren Kinsella to find out if Trevor Graham was associated with him.¹⁰⁶ Warren Kinsella said he had no connection with Graham and complained to the Ottawa Police that Grant Bristow had been using his name to seek information from Jewish groups. The Ottawa Police informed Kinsella that the incident was in the Metro Toronto Police Force's jurisdiction. Approximately two weeks later, the Ottawa Police checked with their Toronto counterparts and learned that Kinsella had filed a complaint. The basis for the complaint was that:

"Bristow had claimed to be working for Kinsella in researching Kinsella's latest

¹⁰² SIRC interview with the President of the Jewish Students' Network.

¹⁰³ SIRC interview of the President of the Jewish Students' Network.

¹⁰⁴ SIRC interview of the President of the Jewish Students' Network.

¹⁰⁵ SIRC interview with the President of the Jewish Students' Network.

¹⁰⁶ SIRC interview of Bernie Farber.

book; enquiring about the organization's knowledge of skinheads and the White Supremacist movements. Bristow also requested access to their files."

The Metro Toronto Police Force received a FAX from Warren Kinsella about the incident and, on review, concluded that no criminal offense had been committed; the Crown could not establish a *prima facie* case. No report was filed as there was no offence in the Criminal Code to cover it: Trevor Graham did not exist.

When "*the Heritage Front Affair*" became public knowledge, the Metro Toronto Police Intelligence Unit resubmitted the information to the Crown. The feedback they received was that there was no "*personation*" because there was no such person as Graham. No formal complaint had been submitted by a Jewish group¹⁰⁷.

According to Bristow's account, he volunteered to collect information on the periphery of the demonstration. Members of the Church of the Creator and the Heritage Front had been starting to merge and Bristow did not want to be on the front lines as there was a good chance the media would be there. He asked Droege, "*why don't I wander around the crowd to find out who is here.*"¹⁰⁸

Droege's version is that Bristow "*felt it was important for us to find out as to what information they possessed. So he was going to try to infiltrate them or at least try to gather information from them.*"¹⁰⁹

Bristow said that he approached a woman who identified herself as the President of the Jewish Student's Network. Bristow does not remember the name he gave. During the brief discussion, Bristow received a business card with the Network's address and a telephone number. He said that he had no reason to ask for it, but she did not object to providing it.¹¹⁰

Bristow said to the Review Committee that he had no desire to pursue the matter further, but Droege said that he should find out more about the group, for example how many members they had. He told Bristow to call her to learn more of this kind of

107 SIRC interview of Metropolitan Toronto Police Force.

108 SIRC interview of Bristow.

109 SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

110 SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

information. Droege also wanted to know what others knew about him and the right wing, as he was facing numerous tribunals.¹¹¹

From the business card, they realized that the Student Network office was located in close proximity to other Jewish organizations, and Droege thought that maybe Bernie Farber was secretly controlling the group. Droege thought that Farber was capable of using "cutouts". Droege believed that the President of the Jewish Students' Network was, in fact, an agent of Bernie Farber, because he had seen them together on other occasions.¹¹²

Bristow said that he called the President of the Jewish Students' Network but not for the purpose of obtaining information to target people. He purposely gave her good reason to be suspicious by saying that "*Droege was not such a bad guy*". She gave him no information. He then went back to Droege and said, "*I think they are suspicious, Wolfgang.*"¹¹³

The Source said that he was sure that he had told the Investigator of Bristow's meeting and telephone call to the President of the Jewish Students' Network.

According to the Toronto Region Investigator, he was informed about the Jewish Student Network event immediately after it occurred. CSIS had issued a threat assessment concerning the Heritage Front visit to Marianne Boyd's office. The Source called the Investigator and said that Bristow had talked to the President of the Jewish Students' Network using the name Trevor Graham. Bristow did not directly say he was working for Kinsella.

5.10.4 Two Incidents

Two incidents were described to the Committee which involved community events in Toronto, and about which we received contradictory information regarding the presence of Grant Bristow and the Jewish Students' Network.

On June 8, 1993, the Simon Wiesenthal Centre organized a presentation at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.¹¹⁴ The event featured a lecture by Yarom Svoray on his infiltration of neo-Nazi groups in Germany. The President of the Jewish Students'

¹¹¹ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

¹¹² SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

¹¹³ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

¹¹⁴ SIRC interview of Sol Littman, Simon Wiesenthal Centre.

Network said that she was certain that she saw George Burdi and Joe Talic of the Church of the Creator there and that the security personnel were informed.¹¹⁵

She thought that Bristow was also present, but she could not be absolutely certain that it was him as she had seen him only once before. Talic was asked to present his identification, and the group was asked to leave.¹¹⁶ Bristow told the Review Committee that he does not believe that he was there.¹¹⁷

The second incident took place in May 1993, and involved the harassment of B'nai Brith officials. During that month, a public "anti-hate" symposium took place at Harbourfront in Toronto.

B'nai Brith officials stated that the ARA and the Heritage Front were both present, and confronted one another. Droege and Burdi asked some abusive questions implying that Jews were racist. Wolfgang Droege asked most of the questions.¹¹⁸

An anti-fascist demonstration started, and the B'nai Brith participants found themselves in between the two sides. Police had to separate the potential combatants. According to the B'nai Brith, Bristow was present at the encounter and was using the name Trevor Graham, but they did not remember if he stayed for the remainder of the meeting after the HF people left.¹¹⁹

According to Bristow, he had met the Heritage Front group at Union Station prior to entering the Harbourfront Symposium. When he entered, he said, he saw that the President of the Jewish Students' Network was there. He left after about three or four minutes, as he did not want her to see him with the Heritage Front group.¹²⁰ Bristow thinks that he left by himself. The President of the Jewish Students' Network has informed the Review Committee that she did not attend the Harbourfront symposium.

¹¹⁵ SIRC interview of the President of the Jewish Students' Network.

¹¹⁶ SIRC interview of the President of the Jewish Students' Network.

¹¹⁷ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

¹¹⁸ SIRC interview of Frank Dimant and Dr. Karen Mock, B'nai Brith.

¹¹⁹ SIRC interview of Frank Dimant and Dr. Karen Mock, B'nai Brith.

¹²⁰ SIRC interview of Bristow.

5.10.5 Other 1993 Incidents

B'nai Brith. The Source said that he had no knowledge of the telephone harassment campaign against Karen Mock which took place after the May 1993 Harbourfront Symposium.¹²¹ He said that Schipper was the one who initiated, wrote, and dictated most of the messages on the hotline. The actual message concerning Mock and the B'nai Brith used on the hate line was written by Schipper, but the Source did not know who instructed him to do so. Droege, and to a lesser extent, Lincoln¹²², were the main influences on Gary Schipper. The Source stayed away from dealing with the hotline.¹²³

Vancouver Leader. The allegation was made in 1992 that Front members circulated the unlisted telephone number and address of a prominent Vancouver Canadian Jewish Congress leader, Dr. Michael Elterman.

Bernie Farber of the Canadian Jewish Congress referred to the media stories about Elterman's name being circulated among the extreme right. Whereas the name was not listed in the public telephone directory, it was published in the Vancouver Jewish community telephone book, which was not difficult to obtain. Farber said that Elterman was concerned about a large bloodstain that appeared on his porch around the time that Bristow was supposed to have met McAleer in Vancouver.¹²⁴

Bristow said that he knew absolutely nothing about Elterman. His statement is supported by Droege's testimony before the Review Committee.

We learned that on August 25, 1994, Tony McAleer told Droege that he had the address of Elterman, and could say that Bristow gave it to him, but McAleer speculated that they could get into trouble if Bristow ever surfaced and spoke up. Droege told McAleer that no-one would believe Bristow.¹²⁵

¹²¹ SIRC interview of Frank Dimant and Dr. Karen Mock, B'nai Brith.

¹²² Lincoln said he never told Schipper anything about Mock.

¹²³ SIRC interview of Source.

¹²⁴ SIRC interview of Bernie Farber. McAleer said he had absolutely no knowledge of the incident.

¹²⁵ Droege denies having said that. McAleer said he did not commit any illegalities and he said he did not counsel others to do so.

Voice Hate Mail. Bernie Farber said that he was called at the Canadian Jewish Congress on June 22, 1993. A caller with a heavily muffled, deep voice said, "*you fucking Jew*", "*I'm gonna fucking kill you*", "*fucking goof*". We asked the Source about the call. He said that it probably came from a younger member.¹²⁶ We were unable to determine, definitively, who in the Front was most likely to have used the expression "*fucking goof*". One member certainly used the expression often, but others sometimes did as well.

Parking Lot Camping. We were informed that the media were going to allege that Bristow had camped out in the Canadian Jewish Congress parking lot, and that he copied licence plate numbers which he then processed.

We have learned that Droege provided false information about Bristow to the reporter involved.

Grant Bristow stated that he never recorded licence numbers, and there was only one incident in which he stopped near the Canadian Jewish Congress parking lot. Furthermore, if anyone else had collected that information, they would have given the plate numbers to Bristow to process, but Bristow said that he never received any.¹²⁷

The Source said that on one occasion, James Scott Dawson parked his car, went into the CJC building, and bluffed his way into Farber's office.¹²⁸

The Threat. In one instance, the CSIS Source learned of a possible threat of serious physical violence to leaders of the Jewish community in October 26, 1993. Droege confided to the Source that Barker had told him that a Heritage Front member had been planning to walk into the CJC offices at 4600 Bathurst Street, Toronto and 'take out some people'.

It was the Source's opinion that the primary target was to be Bernie Farber. He also stated that Droege was concerned about this type of plan but he was laughing about it. The Source said that he was shocked by this revelation, but he did not pursue the subject with Droege. Droege also mentioned to the Source that he would like to see a couple of high profile Jews assassinated as

¹²⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

¹²⁷ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

¹²⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

that would act as a deterrent to others who are constantly harassing the Heritage Front (HF).¹²⁹

The member was associating with the "French Cruller" gang; Ken Barker, Phil Grech, and, peripherally, Marc Lemire (The Donut Shop Gang). An associate of the Heritage Front, the member had secretly aligned himself with the Church of Aryan Nations Jesus Christ. He had also set up a telephone line with hate messages. The Source created hurdles in the planning for violence by saying that more people were needed to carry it out, that it wasn't a good idea, that it would take a long time, and other reasons designed to dissuade the Heritage Front member.¹³⁰

CSIS passed the information about the Heritage Front member's plan to the Metro Toronto Police on October 29, 1993.

According to the Source, the member appeared to be unstable. Instead of attacking the CJC, he and his associates subsequently held up a donut shop and stole a small amount of money.¹³¹

5.10.6 Information on Jewish Groups

Droege, in his testimony to the Review Committee, said:

*"My problem with the Jewish community is sometimes its leadership. They constantly go on about persecution. I don't feel that anyone owes anyone anything."*¹³²

Wolfgang Droege told the Committee that Bristow was the person who collected information on Jewish groups:

*"more or less names, addresses, who is who within an organization, where some of the funding may come from, that type of information."*¹³³

¹²⁹ Droege denies having said that.

¹³⁰ SIRC interview of Source.

¹³¹ SIRC interview of Source.

¹³² SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege. Droege also went on to say that he questioned "certain aspects of the Holocaust...But I certainly believe there should be a debate."

¹³³ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

Droege said that most of the information that he received about the B'nai Brith, for example, was from public records, and he was not sure if Bristow ever obtained any big secrets. The information was mainly someone's home address, position, travel plans and source of funds (e.g. government funds). Droege said that Bristow knew how to dig up information.¹³⁴

We found very little information about specific individuals. In one case, we learned that Grant Bristow told Droege that an anti-racist was possibly harassing Ken Barker's line. Barker had given Bristow a telephone number that had appeared on his Maestro, and Bristow traced it back to the activist.

The Review Committee learned that the Source, using the pseudonym Jeff Taylor, a journalist, talked with Michael Lublin. The Source learned that the Kahane Chai organization, which is headed by Benny Kahane, is growing around the world. Lublin said the group seems to be responsible for a lot of activity which was formally carried out by the JDL. According to Lublin, Benny Kahane's organization was thinking of opening a chapter in Toronto and Kahane would be in Toronto the following week.

We asked the Source about the kinds of information collected on Jewish groups and their leaders. The Source stated that Zundel tasked Bristow to obtain specific information about the names, work places, home addresses, telephone numbers, and profiles of prominent Jewish individuals and groups.¹³⁵

Zundel said that he needed the addresses of members of the Jewish community so that he could serve subpoenas, but the Source said that Bristow did not believe this. Bristow told Zundel that he might be able to get the information but that it would cost a lot of money. As a result, Zundel said he would accept simply the work addresses.

Zundel also asked for information on specific individuals. He told Bristow that he wanted information from 1989 through 1990 about what Meir Halevi's (Jewish Defense League) addresses were, his kids, family, cars driven, his real name, and business.¹³⁶

The Source was asked to help Zundel to obtain the names and addresses of every Jewish leader from Quebec to Winnipeg. When

¹³⁴ SIRC interview of Droege.

¹³⁵ Zundel denies this allegation.

¹³⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

told about this request from Zundel, the Toronto Region Investigator had said, "don't do it, stall." The handler then told the Source to find out what he could from open sources. He was to give Zundel only work addresses and telephone numbers that came from the telephone book or from dialling 411.

According to the Source, the day-to-day information on the Jewish lobby and other groups came from television shows, and subscriptions to Jewish publications which were collected daily. This type of information processing began long before the Source was on the scene. It was done by everybody and it was a standard operating procedure for Zundel, Lincoln, Droege, and Max French.

The Source said that Zundel gave Bristow a thick file on the Jewish Defence League in compensation for electronically sweeping Zundel's house.¹³⁷ The Source, in turn, gave the file to CSIS. It was all public information (mostly news clippings) but he did not pass it along to others in the organization.¹³⁸

We asked the Source what actions he personally participated in regarding Jewish groups, and what knowledge he had of what others did. The Source said that he only provided open material, and that Zundel sometimes gave Bristow information.¹³⁹

Zundel told the Review Committee that the information that he received was "publicly available" and it was only a matter of convenience that he obtained it from Bristow. He went on to say "it was nothing he couldn't have found himself".¹⁴⁰

The Source was asked if he ever provided information on members of the Jewish community to White Supremacists in the United States. He said that he absolutely did not pass information on members of the Jewish community to white supremacists in the United States; and, specifically, that he absolutely did not provide information on any Heritage Front target groups or individuals to Tom Metzger. He added that Gerry Lincoln sometimes gave information to Tom Metzger about Canadian Jews but as far as he knew, they

¹³⁷ Zundel noted that the file was about 20 pages of open source information. It had previously been provided by him to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force.

¹³⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

¹³⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

¹⁴⁰ SIRC interview of Ernst Zundel.

usually received such information from Zundel.¹⁴¹ He added that Grant Bristow never provided information to White Supremacists in the United States. Lincoln denied ever giving information about Canadian Jews to the Metzgers.

In regard to the Metzgers (see chapter IX, section 9.2.2), the Review Committee learned that Droege plotted with colleagues and associates to tell the media that Bristow also gave Metzger documents on Jewish groups in Canada and on Jews and on other leftist organizations. The statements reveal that this was part of a plot to manipulate the media. Droege would later tell the Committee, *"At least Tom Metzger told me that Grant Bristow provided him information, but I don't have any first hand knowledge of it."*¹⁴²

The Source was asked if he had ever given anyone information on the Jewish community which they then passed to other White Supremacists. He said that he definitely did not do so. He noted that Droege tried on many occasions to find out where Bernie Farber lived but he never succeeded and the Source did not help.¹⁴³

We asked the Investigator about the overall information strategy. He said that the idea was for the Source to control (and obstruct) the collection of information and, if things went beyond his control, to be the funnel for that information, and, therefore, be in a position to advise the Service and ask for instructions.¹⁴⁴

5.10.7 The Security Training School

When the Review Committee met with B'nai Brith officials, they said that they were concerned that Bristow had set up a training facility in a predominantly Jewish section of Toronto.

The concern was threefold:

¹⁴¹ SIRC interview of Source. Zundel noted that such individuals were on his mailing list, and received his newsletter, videos, etc. He specifically denied passing information to them concerning the Jewish Community in Canada.

¹⁴² SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁴³ SIRC interview of Source.

¹⁴⁴ SIRC interview of Handler.

- o that the school was being used to teach security skills to racists;
- o that the school might be used to recruit new Heritage Front members; and
- o that the school would generate money for the Heritage Front.¹⁴⁵

In November 1992, Grant Bristow was identified in the media as a Heritage Front leader. As a result of this publicity, he lost his regular employment. Shortly afterwards, he set up a course in security training.

Bristow said that he conducted only one security course. There were six students in the class: a Black, an East Indian, a Jew and three others. Among the six were a retired IBM programmer and troubleshooter, an individual who used to be in the securities area, two individuals in the transport business, and an employee of a large optical (binoculars) business. In the end, two of the six students completed the course and landed jobs.

At his school, which was advertised in a newspaper, Bristow taught his students a wide array of skills. For surveillance techniques, they practised near Dixie Road and the 401; a commercial district including truck yards. When people in the Heritage Front learned that he was running a course, they wanted to join, but he stalled them. In one instance, however, he used a few Front members as a decoy in a vehicle surveillance exercise.¹⁴⁶ This was the sole case, Bristow said, of Heritage Front participation in the course.

5.11 The Morgentaler Bombing

On May 18, 1992, the Morgentaler abortion clinic in Toronto was firebombed. Graffiti identifying the Heritage Front was found on a nearby wall. Heritage Front members were interviewed by the police.

The Committee learned that Droege stated that Bristow had told him that no one in the HF was under suspicion but Andrews had told the police to look into the HF. Mitrevski said he did not

¹⁴⁵ SIRC interviews of officials in the B'nai Brith and Canadian Jewish Congress.

¹⁴⁶ James Dawson, Paul Graham, and Tyrone Alexander Mason.

believe that and he thought that Bristow was causing the same kind of dissent in the right wing as he caused within the left wing.

The Source thinks that the bombing was by a left wing activist to make the government take action against the anti-abortionists. Both Bristow and Droege were interviewed by the Morgentaler Task Force.¹⁴⁷ There is nothing in CSIS files to suggest who the culprit was.

5.12 Contacts with the Police

Media reports suggest that Bristow, as a Heritage Front member, made use of police information. Bristow, within the Heritage Front, was very secretive about how he obtained his information, and often said to his racist colleagues that he had personal police sources.

5.12.1 CPIC Information

We questioned Bristow on this matter. He denied ever having approached members of the Metro Toronto Police Force to obtain Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) information. He says he did not need information from CPIC, and, in any case, he rarely operated within the jurisdiction of that police force. Much of the time, he would pass information to the police through his full-time employment duties.

Bristow stressed that he never used CPIC for the Heritage Front. Droege was told, falsely, that Bristow used CPIC information to find cars. As regards CPIC printouts, he said that no policeman would be so mentally deficient as to give a print-out of a CPIC report, because it identifies the individual who accesses the report. He said that police sometimes showed him information, in the course of his investigations for his employer, but this was never CPIC information.¹⁴⁸

Alan Overfield, Droege's employer told SIRC that he knew that Bristow received CPIC information. He said that every investigator has contacts: police, the telephone company, and others. These contacts help them to obtain information for their tracing activities. CPIC material, he said would be used for tough cases and could provide, for example, court dates when their quarry would show up.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ SIRC interview of Bristow.

¹⁴⁸ SIRC interview of Bristow.

¹⁴⁹ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

Overfield said that he was amazed that Bristow had complete CPIC print-outs: some 300 over the years 1990 - 1993 he estimated. When we asked Overfield for examples, he responded that Bristow never let him keep them. He said that he could not remember a single name of any of the subjects of the investigations.¹⁵⁰

Wolfgang Droege told the Committee that he did not know if any CPIC information was acquired by Bristow.¹⁵¹

A Detective of the Ottawa Police Service told SIRC that using CPIC to collect information is not particularly useful: addresses are rarely listed; Court dates are no longer given; convictions and sentences are provided; but the information is almost always out of date.¹⁵²

CPIC members are subject to random audits; the RCMP even audits its own detachments. All CPIC queries or printouts can be traced to a particular machine, and logs are kept.

We found no information from the Source in CSIS files that Bristow had ever obtained CPIC information.

5.12.2 Police Communications

The Source was asked about the monitoring of police communications. He noted that Bristow would constantly tell the Heritage Front that he would monitor police communications, but Paul Graham did most of this. Eric Fischer provided scanning devices and metal detectors, using money from his military severance pay and his savings.¹⁵³

When the American white supremacists were in town, the Source would pick them up and put the Mitre 5 scanner on to see if the police were following them. In fact, the information he was picking up was quite irrelevant. The Americans thought it was important though, and they had a sense of security.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵⁰ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

¹⁵¹ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁵² SIRC interview of Ottawa Police Service.

¹⁵³ Eric Fischer said the money was from his employment, and donations from other members of the security group.

¹⁵⁴ SIRC interview of Bristow.

Bristow, and Front "security" were often seen with hand-held walkie-talkies. According to Bristow, Eric Fischer, an ex-member of the Canadian Airborne Regiment, ran physical security for Heritage Front meetings. Fischer used two-way communications systems; Bristow had contributed three hand held radios which did not work well.¹⁵⁵

One of the stories Bristow told Front members was that he had special sources of information, and that he was always running licence plate numbers. Bristow said that he had not run any licence plates through the Motor Vehicle Bureau for the Heritage Front. Droege, on the other hand, had access to Overfield's account while Bristow did not, and it was a regular practice for Droege to run the plate numbers when Zundel wanted information.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁵ SIRC interview of Bristow.

¹⁵⁶ Droege stated that he never provided such information to Zundel. Zundel denied that he had ever asked for any licence numbers to be run.

VI. THE FUNDING OF THE SOURCE IN THE HERITAGE FRONT

In this section, we examine CSIS funding of its Source in the Heritage Front. We do so using Human Source Branch files, both from Headquarters and Toronto Region, interviews with Human source officials and the source handler, and an interview with the Source.

6.1 CSIS Payments to the Source

According to Service policy, Human sources "... shall not normally be offered any form of inducement or compensation, other than the assurance of confidentiality and payment in money or payment in kind, in exchange for providing operational assistance to the Service."

6.1.1 Payments for Operational Assistance

CSIS pays sources for "operational assistance" usually information. It provides these payments according to an annual budget.

6.2 Expenses

The Service reimburses sources for monies spent while assisting the Service. The Service accounts for some of the expenses as part of the monthly payments to the source. Trips by the sources, however, are accounted for separately. This is done, in part, because the Service provides travel advances.

The Service noted that, on average, expenses were \$260 per month over the seven years, an amount which was, in their view, reasonable.

The Service compensated the Source from time-to-time for special trips. Usually, the Investigator would estimate the likely cost of the trip before the fact, and provide the Source with a cash advance. The Source, on completing the trip, would provide the handler with receipts, and the handler would then calculate the balance from the advance. All expenditures relating to trips, throughout the period, are rigorously accounted for by receipts.

The handler also compensated the Source for daily expenses. He usually claimed for regular expenses once a month². These expenditures were, primarily, for meals, telephone use, and transportation.

Until January 1990, the "Source Financial Statements" would list items and the corresponding receipts obtained from the Source. Beginning in February 1990, the handler estimated expenses, and would periodically ask the Source for receipts.

According to the CSIS Operational Manual, to obtain authorization, the handler has to fill in the "Source Financial Statement", and the Human Source office has to review the statement and ensure that "receipts are attached or an explanation is given when receipts are not obtained".

According to the records we examined, the Source frequently divided up expenses with other Heritage Front members, and he was reimbursed accordingly by CSIS. For example, CSIS paid the source only \$67 dollars on two Radisson Hotel invoices totalling \$202 dollars.³ The invoices had a hand notation that the bill had been split three ways. Such invoices, and hand notations, were common.

From time to time the Source would agree to pay dues and make contributions to the Heritage Front. For example, one telex shows that the Source listed people making donations, and put himself down for \$40. Another telex shows that the Source obtained a "Nationalist Party citizenship card". Recipients "were to pay \$50 on receipt of their card". All group members were asked to "donate some personal money" to defray the printing costs of the Heritage Front publication "Up Front". There is no evidence that the Source ever contributed to Droege's legal fees.

According to the Source, as a Member of the executive, he was generally exempt from paying dues and paying for the magazine subscription. Many of the contributions took the form of paying for group meals, transportation or accommodation. He noted that he had made an initial contribution of \$70 to \$100 dollars to the Heritage Front. On one occasion, he had had to come up with several hundred dollars for hall rental, of which all but \$50 was reimbursed. He also said that he had pledged \$75 to \$100 to help defray the cost of the Metzger's trip, though this may have been written off against a lunch for Droege's lawyers. He paid 25% (probably \$200 - \$300) of the publication costs for the first issue of the Heritage

² In a few cases, the Source would make no claims for a month.

³ "Source Financial Statement", April, 1989.

Front magazine, "Up Front". He provided \$90 - \$100 towards the Front hotline, but was reimbursed by Droege and, on a special occasion, he donated some money because Droege wanted the hotline to continue. Generally, according to the Source, he made no direct contributions, although he would buy T-shirts and the like from time to time.⁴

The Source said that he always claimed for what he spent, and he does not think that CSIS provided funds for the creation or maintenance of the Heritage Front through any other means.⁵ He said that he was "cheap", and Front members knew "he would not part with a penny".⁶

The Source said that he sometimes paid lunch expenses during Court hearings. Droege would ask him to pay the bill and would then reimburse him. In 1993, there were five or six times when the bill might have been \$50 for sandwiches. The Source added that Droege reimbursed him dollar-for-dollar about 50% of the time.

The handler said that Droege and the Heritage Front collected money in a haphazard manner. He thought dues were between \$25 and \$50. The Source, like other leaders, would frequently duck paying dues. According to the handler, the Source contributed no more than \$1,000 over five years in donations to the operations of the Heritage Front. This takes into account postage, letterhead paper, general office supplies, donations to the Heritage Front legal fund, and \$25 here and there. The Source said that he may also have made a \$25 contribution to the costs of Ken Barker's hotline.⁷

The handler discussed the treatment of dues and contributions as expenses. He noted that he was not required to itemize and account for specific expenses but that he himself vetted expenses from time to time

He also noted that the Source was supposed to tell him about any contributions he made to the HF, and that any large amounts were to be approved first by Headquarters.⁸

⁴ SIRC interview of Source

⁵ SIRC interview of Source

⁶ SIRC interview of Source

⁷ SIRC interview of Source

⁸ SIRC interview of Handler

In our review of the expenses files, we found no reference to any contributions or donations. In our review of the source administrative files, we found no applications to Headquarters for donations or contributions.

6.3 Loss-of-Employment Compensation

CSIS officers stressed to the Source that the payments were temporary, and actively encouraged him to look for other work. At one point, he was asked for "a monthly report detailing [his] efforts to find a job".

6.4 The Source's Financial Situation

Evidence from many sources indicates that the Source did not spend lavishly.

A review of his 1989 and 1990 "meals" expense receipts indicates that he only infrequently (i.e. perhaps four or five times a year) "treated" anyone. Many of the available bills indicate that he paid (and was reimbursed for) only 1/4 or 1/3 of the bill. Most of the meal bills were for \$50 or less. CSIS did not keep itemized receipts after 1990.

Nor was he generous with CSIS money. He apparently gave few gifts that CSIS was specifically billed for; total miscellaneous expenditures for seven years are less than \$260.

According to the handler, the Source did not have much to spend. He earned between \$35,000 and \$40,000 per year from his employment, including car allowances and benefits. He supplemented this with odd investigation jobs. Considering the time spent in his employment and his work for CSIS, however, the handler indicated that he did not have much time for odd jobs. He did some skip tracing, but not very much or for very long: no more than \$5,000 in total.¹²

The handler said that the Source was thrifty, as were other Heritage Front members. Also, he was in some financial difficulty. He was always in debt because he used his credit card for expenses and maintained high debit balances. Also, his car (a 1987 or earlier year Ford) was always breaking down. He owed money from a failed business as well. His common law wife was not

¹² SIRC interview of Handler

working, and he had to support the family. According to the handler, the Source spent his money on himself not on the movement.¹³

The Source said that he had very little money. He was known within the Front as not wanting to part with a penny, and he certainly did not have enough money to finance or underwrite Front activities.¹⁴

In the CSIS Human Source files, we did not find any discussion of lavish spending by the source. The Service, of course, did not know precisely what the Source was spending his income on.

6.5 CSIS Assistance To The Heritage Front

In our review of financial and source administrative files, we found no indication of any intention to financially support the creation, development, or continuation of the Heritage Front, or any other groups. In no files predating August 1994 did we come across any discussion of the potential of Service payments to assist the Heritage Front. To the best of our knowledge, it was never a subject of Service discussion.

According to the financial files, the Source did pay for vehicle rentals, shared accommodation and the like. These costs were then shared with other Heritage Front members. In the case of

¹³ SIRC interview of Investigator

¹⁴ SIRC interview of Source

meals, the Source infrequently picked up the bill.¹⁸ More frequently, receipts indicate that the source paid for a portion of the bill, and that the Service reimbursed the Source for this portion only. According to CSIS files, "many of the expenses were paid on a cost-sharing basis (one would pay one time and someone else the next)".

CSIS noted that the majority of the transportation and meals costs were paid to the Source as business expenses incurred on their behalf and in no way supported the Heritage Front.²⁴

We asked Al Overfield and Wolfgang Droege if anyone made significant direct contributions. They indicated that everyone would share in costs, and that this meant at times giving as much

¹⁸ We have detailed expenditures and receipts for 1989 and 1990.

²⁴ Correspondence from CSIS, November 18, 1994.

as a few hundred dollars at a time, but that, in the words of Wolfgang Droege, there were "no large lump sum payments". Al Overfield said that the Heritage Front was perpetually broke.

6.5.1 Other CSIS Funding of the Heritage Fund

We found no other indication of any funds being provided to the Heritage Front by CSIS.

6.5.2 Funding of American White Supremacists

When the Metzgers were deported, they were unable to take their flight from Toronto, and had to have a ticket reissued. This resulted in an additional expense. The Source paid his share of the additional expense, and the handler is not certain whether he was reimbursed by Droege.²⁵ We found no other indications of funds provided to white supremacists.

According to the files, Sean Maguire, another American white supremacist, came to Canada with \$25,000 to deposit in banks. He deposited most of the money in various banks, and left the remainder at Grant Bristow's home. The Source told us that Bristow later returned an unspecified amount to Maguire.²⁶

We asked Wolfgang Droege about possible funding. He indicated that he had no direct knowledge of any such funding. He noted that Maguire had called him up to complain that Bristow had not returned \$40,000 he had left with Bristow as an investment. He said that Bristow subsequently returned the money.

We asked Metropolitan Toronto Police Officers about the funding of foreign white supremacists. They stated that they saw no money or information going to or coming from south of the border; people in the movement were supported by UIC, welfare, donations, subscriptions, and some jobs.²⁷

6.6 Value of Information and Assistance

Over a seven year period, the Source was paid less than \$80,000 for actually assisting the Service.

²⁵ SIRC interview of Handler .

²⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

²⁷ SIRC interview of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force.

The evaluation of the worth of a Source is always subjective. However, the Source provided a great deal of information.

According to a CSIS assessment:

"Between the Years 1989 and 1994, Human source coverage has provided the Service with a high volume of quality information concerning white supremacist activities in Canada, the United States and, to some extent, Europe. This coverage enabled the Service to monitor developing trends within the violent racist movement as well as to warn of potential public confrontations involving violence..."

CSIS information primarily from [the Source] led to the arrest and deportation of a number of leading international white supremacists:

*Steve HAMMOND (01/91)
Sean MAGUIRE (09/91)
Tom METZGER (06/92)
John METZGER (06/92)
David IRVING (11/92)
Dennis MAHON (93/01)*

CSIS also provided information to the police which led to the arrest of Ken Barker, a Heritage Front member, who was charged with armed robbery.

Since 1989, CSIS has produced over 80 threat assessments on the activities of white supremacists.²⁸ We have provided advance information to police and government officials on the potential for violence at demonstrations and other events.

In addition, the Service has produced 10 detailed CSIS Reports on the status of the white supremacist and organized racist community in Canada.²⁹

The Source also provided police with information that may have saved individuals from harm. For example, the handler told police about a Skinhead plot to disrupt an anti-racist march by hurling bottles and rocks from downtown Toronto rooftops. Police subsequently manned the rooftops. He frequently reported on activities involving guns and other weapons, providing information which was passed to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force.

The handler was asked about the value of the operation. He indicated that he saw it as having severely damaged the right wing in Canada and the USA and "they know it". He stated that the organization is turning in on itself. He added that if an organization like The Order in the United States had started up in Canada, CSIS would have been in a position to know about it.³⁰

We do not know for sure that the Source was the direct cause of the arrest of any HF members. According to the Metropolitan Toronto Police, however, in 1993 they and the Ottawa Police arrested about 15 members of the HF and the Church of the Creator (COTC) for various offenses.³¹

²⁸ According to the Service, "while it is not possible to quickly attribute the contents of specific assessments to [the Source], the intelligence from this individual is seen as a significant contributor". Staff estimates that about half derive from, or are likely to derive from, the Source.

²⁹ "Value added", undated.

³⁰ SIRC interview of Handler

³¹ SIRC interview of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force.

6.7 Conclusions

There is no indication that CSIS consciously provided funding for the creation, development or nurturing of the Heritage Front. Indeed, CSIS Human Source files suggest that CSIS officers never discussed the impact of funding on the growth of the Heritage Front.

There is no way of determining objectively if the Source was overpaid. However, only about \$79,000 was paid for information, the rest being for expenses, and loss-of-employment compensation.

The Source was paid at the rate of \$30,000 annually for fifteen months, in compensation for losing his job. This payment was based on an estimated employment income of \$41,000.

Service accounts suggest that expense monies from the Service were by and large not spent on other Heritage Front members; though some money was most certainly spent for shared vehicle expenses and the like. The CSIS financial records indicate that CSIS never paid for airline tickets for other Heritage Front members.

We do not know, with certainty, what the Source decided to do with the money he obtained from CSIS. He and his handler indicate that he was a penny pincher, and had substantial bills to pay.

The Source said that he made minor contributions and donations to the Heritage Front. Service financial records, however, contain no entries for donations and contributions.

VII. REFORM PARTY

This section reviews the wide-ranging allegations that a CSIS informant took actions that were designed to discredit the Reform Party of Canada. The Reform Party asked us to investigate these allegations and to answer a large number of associated questions. To respond adequately to the Reform Party's request, we have had to conduct an unusually broad investigation and have explored all leads which came to our attention. We have attempted to provide as complete and as accurate an account of what took place as the available information allows.

On April 6, 1991, the Reform Party of Canada, at its Fourth Annual Convention in Saskatoon decided to expand into Ontario and the Maritimes. The decision would be ratified by a referendum of the members the following month. Reform Party (RP) officials had already been at work in Ontario to raise public interest in the Party and they were setting up interim riding associations.¹

Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada explained that when the Party began to move into Ontario, a constituency association could be formed in that province with only 40 members.² The Party feared take-over attempts in its early years, Fryers said, and they had been concerned about "pockets" of Western extremists, such as Terry Long in Caroline, Alberta.³

Fryers emphasized to the Review Committee that the tenets of the Reform Party are that all people are created equal and that the values of the white supremacists are not acceptable to the Party.⁴

7.1 The First Meeting

The fears of the Reform Party's Executive about infiltration came to pass in Ontario during 1991. One of the Toronto area constituency associations, Beaches-Woodbine, became the focus of the Heritage Front's activities. Hugh Pendergast was the President of the association and he went on to be a candidate in that riding. Pendergast initially organized the association and

¹ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

² SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

³ SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

⁴ SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

he was later assisted by several people associated with the extreme right.⁵ Prominent among them were: Alan Overfield,⁶ who owned and operated a bailiff company; Nicola Polinuk, Don Andrews' common-law wife; and James Dawson, a Heritage Front member. The majority of the riding association members were not extremists.

Pendergast would later tell the Reform Party's Special Committee which investigated the infiltration attempt that he initially saw nothing odd in the behaviour of some of the new members in his riding association. But he said that later on, some of these people started getting "*pushy*" and tried to take over the association.⁷

After the April convention in Saskatoon, the Reform Party planned to have Preston Manning tour Ontario in June 1991. Reg Gosse, Chairman of the Ontario Expansion, asked Andrew Flint to set up the large Reform Party meetings in Ontario (the province was divided into four sectors for organizational purposes).⁸ Flint was asked to organize major rallies in the Toronto area and he chose the International Centre in Mississauga, near Toronto's Pearson International Airport for the first one.⁹

In 1991, Preston Manning had no RCMP protection and no personal bodyguards to accompany him. The Reform Party leader depended on local organizers for such arrangements when suddenly Toronto area interest in the Party exploded and thousands attended the meetings. The decisions about security were therefore local,

⁵ Hugh Pendergast stated he is not a racist and he rejects any association with racist ideologues.

⁶ Al Overfield was described as a former member of the extremist organization, the Western Guard and subsequently was associated with the Ontario section of the Social Credit Party which national leader Ernest Manning refused to recognize. Murray Dobbin, Preston Manning and the Reform Party, 1992.

⁷ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan. Pendergast later said he did not think Overfield tried to take over the riding association.

⁸ SIRC interview of Reginald Gosse, Former Chairman of Ontario Expansion for the Reform Party.

⁹ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

and no one at the national office was monitoring this aspect of Ontario operations.¹⁰

In early 1991, the Reform Party in Ontario was concerned about groups which might disrupt or even possibly try to take over or at least discredit their fledgling riding associations. One umbrella group which had already tried to do so was CARP - the Coalition Against the Reform Party. The group was described in various news accounts as being a rather mixed bag of representatives from both the far left and single-issue groups.¹¹ CARP disrupted a meeting in the Trinity Spadina riding.

On May 27, 1991, Andrew Flint was at a Beaches-Woodbine information meeting for the Reform Party in a Church on Woodbine Avenue. There he met Al Overfield. To highlight the good things that he could do for Reform, according to Bristow, Alan Overfield thought that he should display his security people. Overfield asked his employees to attend and asked Wolfgang Walter Droege to have several members of the Heritage Front appear at the small Beaches-Woodbine riding association meeting.¹² Overfield was inside the meeting where he met Flint, while his team, which included Droege, Mitrevski, Bristow, Dawson and a couple of others, waited outside, ostensibly doing security for the meeting. At least one of the Heritage Front people standing outside had no idea why they were there.¹³

Hugh Pendergast remarked to Andrew Flint that he was somewhat intimidated by the size of Overfield's security staff who were lingering outside this meeting.¹⁴

Alan Overfield has described himself as associated with the Nationalist Party of Canada (NPC) in the past. Through his early association with Don Andrews and the NPC, Overfield came to know and eventually employ Wolfgang Droege as a part-time bailiff. As a result of this relationship and his position within the Reform Party, Overfield obtained Droege's assistance and through him, the Heritage Front members, for Reform Party security duties.

¹⁰ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

¹¹ Globe & Mail, June 14, 1991; Globe & Mail, June 13, 1991.

¹² SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹³ SIRC interview of Bristow.

¹⁴ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint.

Flint was organizing meetings in the Toronto area and Overfield offered to do security for Reform, free of charge.¹⁵ Overfield would later tell the Committee that the security group was the idea of the Reform Party's Executive Council.¹⁶ Flint had confidence in Overfield's company because as bailiffs, they had to be licensed by the government. Reg Gosse, Chairman of the Ontario Expansion of the Reform Party at the time, stated that he asked Overfield if all of his personnel on the security team were bailiffs. He said that Overfield replied, "yes".¹⁷ Overfield, furthermore, was acting as a Director for the Beaches-Woodbine riding association and neither Flint nor Gosse had any reason to doubt him.

The Reform Party's Ontario organization was described as having no money at this time and offers of free services from small businesses were welcome. When Flint said that bailiffs could provide security, Ron Wood, Manning's Press Secretary said "OK if this does not cost any money."¹⁸ Andrew Flint accepted Overfield's offer to provide security at the upcoming meetings.¹⁹

John Thompson, a Reform member and advisor, said that the Party should expect a lot of the CARP people, possibly hundreds, to show up at the planned major rally in Mississauga.²⁰ Consequently, the organizers wanted adequate crowd control, and the Reform leader Preston Manning had to be protected.

Wolfgang Droege said that he learned about the security group from Al Overfield. He said that it was Overfield who suggested that they could influence the Reform Party. Overfield would later say that it was Grant Bristow's idea (section 7.3 in this chapter reviews the plots). Droege thinks that he got Grant

¹⁵ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

¹⁶ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

¹⁷ SIRC interview of Reg Gosse. The Heritage Front members were not licensed bailiffs.

¹⁸ SIRC interview of Ron Wood, Preston Manning's Press Secretary.

¹⁹ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

²⁰ At least fifty people did arrive to protest the rally.

Bristow involved. He thought it was also possible, however, that Overfield approached Bristow.²¹

On June 10, 1991, Toronto Region informed CSIS HQ that Droege, Bristow, Lincoln and Dawson "were employed as security people for a recent Reform Party constituency meeting held in Toronto." The report noted that the placement was organized by Al Overfield who was a Reform Party member and local organizer. CSIS learned that the same individuals were again contracted by Overfield to provide personal security for Reform Party leader Preston Manning at a major rally to be held in Toronto on June 12, 1991.

Al Overfield said that his group performed security duties twice at a high school in Scarborough, after the Church on Woodbine meeting. Droege was present but Bristow was not.²² Overfield later said that Bristow had done security for "two or three" or "a couple of riding associations" at a Don Mills school and at Scarborough Collegiate Institute in April 1991.²³

Grant Bristow was at only one Reform meeting prior to the big Mississauga rally.²⁴ Overfield claimed that Bristow attended the Scarborough meetings at least twice, and one in Markham (May 1991), probably with Peter Mitrevski and Droege.²⁵

Based on the information we collected, we believe that Grant Bristow attended only one meeting prior to June 12, 1991 - the Beaches-Woodbine information meeting.

7.2 The International Centre Rally

When the Reform Party decided to hold its major rally at the International Centre in Mississauga, Andrew Flint asked Al Overfield to provide security and, as mentioned earlier, this was agreed to by the coordinator of the Party's expansion into Ontario, Reg Gosse.²⁶

²¹ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

²² SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

²³ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

²⁴ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

²⁵ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

²⁶ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

7.2.1 The Organizing Meeting

Overfield and Flint agreed to meet during the first week of June 1991 to go over security arrangements at the International Centre. Flint met with Overfield, Bristow and the International Centre's head of security to make arrangements for the rally. This was Flint's first exposure to Grant Bristow; Overfield had mentioned that Bristow would attend the meeting.²⁷

The Source said that a few days before the Mississauga rally, Droege had said to Grant Bristow: "*I need your help to do security for the Reform Party*". The Source said he informed his handler that Overfield and Bristow would attend the meeting.²⁸

On the way in to the International Centre, Bristow saw a former employer who is Jewish and who introduced him to his companion, saying "*I made him (Bristow) what he is today*".²⁹

At the planning meeting, Bristow really stood out, said Flint. He was an immaculate dresser, his shoes sparkled, he wore a neatly trimmed beard, and overall he appeared clean-cut. Bristow made an impression on him as being articulate and intelligent. His knowledge of security issues was deemed excellent by Flint and the Centre's Head of Security. For Flint, the Mississauga rally was to be the first major event and it was a learning experience. Flint said Bristow did most of the talking at the meeting and generally dominated the conversation.³⁰

In that meeting, Bristow described his role as the "*drop man*" - the person who would shadow Preston Manning from the time he arrived at the rally to the time he left. Bristow would be the person who would deflect any attack from an assailant. To do so, he would have to closely follow Manning all the time he was in the hall.³¹ Overfield denied that the meeting ever took place.³²

²⁷ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

²⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

²⁹ SIRC interview of Bristow.

³⁰ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

³¹ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

³² SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

The Source reported that Overfield decided that some people should be posted to various spots in the International Centre. Bristow suggested that the potentially dangerous types, the Skinheads, be posted well away from Manning.³³ Wolfgang Droege would tell SIRC in 1994 that Bristow wanted to have the role of Manning's personal bodyguard, and Grant "*elected himself*" to handle security.³⁴

Grant Bristow was also going to be the liaison person with the Peel Regional Police who had a sub-station in the International Centre. Overfield said that Bristow happened to know the Inspector at the local division.

7.2.2 The Mississauga Rally

Al Overfield stated that he was the person who assigned the security roles for the team at all Reform Party meetings.³⁵ Overfield said that he decided ahead of time who was required. On the night of the Mississauga rally, June 12, 1991, there were perhaps a dozen of Overfield's security people present. Then Overfield, Bristow, Whit Gibson and Jerry Young met in a cafeteria to assign everyone their specific positions.³⁶

The primary task for the security group was to keep CARP people away and to guard Preston Manning. The security group was divided into two, with one section outside to watch CARP and the other on the inside for crowd control and to protect Manning.³⁷ Inside the International Centre, a crowd estimated at 6,000 gathered to hear Preston Manning's speech.

Overfield was supposed to be protecting Preston Manning but he had too much to do and so he delegated the job to Bristow. He spent most of his time "*fighting fires*", and admitted that he was not actually around Bristow and Manning that much.³⁸ Overfield said that although skinheads were not invited to the meeting, there

³³ SIRC interview of Bristow.

³⁴ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

³⁵ SIRC interviews of Alan Overfield.

³⁶ SIRC interviews of Alan Overfield.

³⁷ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

³⁸ SIRC interviews of Alan Overfield.

might have been former skinheads in the crowd, but they were appropriately dressed and had cleaned up their act.³⁹

Bristow was supposed to have supplied the security equipment for the security team, Overfield said, but all he ever brought were walkie talkies, which "were virtually useless".⁴⁰

Manning was picked up at the airport and driven to the back door of the Centre where Bristow and Peter Mitrevski were waiting. Steve Erickson might also have helped. The group walked through the back corridors to the "green room" where Manning was met by Deborah Grey, Gordon Shaw, Reg Gosse, Andrew Flint and the security people.⁴¹

Andrew Flint said that he "highly doubts" that serious discussions took place in this environment, with all of these people present.⁴² Reg Gosse had the same response.⁴³ Ron Wood, Preston Manning's Press Secretary, remained close to Manning throughout the rally and stated unequivocally that no sensitive Party discussions took place.⁴⁴

SIRC received information that Droege told a reporter that Bristow had been shadowing Manning. The reporter asked if Bristow had taken notes. Droege said he did not know but Bristow potentially could have because Bristow was privy to Manning's private conversations.

Alan Overfield said that Bristow had "a considerable conversation with Mr. Manning." Overfield also told us that "I introduced myself to Mr. Manning and I had a short discussion with him regarding my political background again."⁴⁵ Mr. Manning denies that this conversation ever took place.

³⁹ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁴⁰ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁴¹ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

⁴² SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

⁴³ SIRC interview of Reginald Gosse.

⁴⁴ SIRC interview of Ron Wood, Press Secretary to Preston Manning.

⁴⁵ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

Bristow, as agreed during the planning meeting, stayed relatively close behind Manning wherever he walked. Bristow remained at the bottom of the stage when Manning was on the platform. When Manning walked off the stage, Bristow followed him to the "green room" where Manning thanked the six or seven security people for their "excellent job".⁴⁶ Manning has said that he does not remember Bristow from the event. The Source informed the Review Committee that Bristow never overheard any conversations between Preston Manning and his staff.

Based on the information we received, the Review Committee is of the opinion that Grant Bristow was not privy to sensitive information.

The event over, the security detail walked Manning to the back door where Bristow and three others got into the "chase car" to follow Manning's car to the airport. Bristow and the others were back at the Centre in 10 or 15 minutes to help collect the money buckets at the end of the evening to give to the organizers. The evening over, the Overfield security team left.⁴⁷

7.2.3 CARP Summer

Membership in the Reform Party after the big Mississauga rally in June 1991 skyrocketed in Ontario and many ridings had public/town hall meetings. At the Trinity Spadina meeting, more people from CARP than Reform people showed up and the former seized the microphone and tried to take over the meeting. The meeting was cancelled - other ridings in the Toronto area feared a re-occurrence.⁴⁸

Due to the effective performance of the Overfield security team in Mississauga, several ridings contacted Al Overfield directly or through the Beaches-Woodbine association asking him to attend and keep an eye on things.⁴⁹ The security group was present at a Broadview Greenwood riding meeting, for

⁴⁶ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

⁴⁷ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

⁴⁸ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

⁴⁹ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

example, just after the major rally.⁵⁰ At the meetings, Overfield said, they would attempt to be unobtrusive, and gently escort out troublemakers.⁵¹

On June 19, 1991, an article about Wolfgang Droege and his racist beliefs appeared in the "Toronto Star":

*"But Droege does take some comfort in the current political mood of the nation, most notably the public's positive response to the Reform Party. While Preston Manning would likely shudder receiving the Heritage Front's seal of approval, the fact is, he's got it. 'They have given us some hope.'"*⁵²

7.2.4 The Legion Hall

During July 9, 1991, the security group was at a Legion Hall on Dawes Road for the founding of the Beaches-Woodbine constituency association. The interim board for the riding closed on this date. The election of executive officers closed on July 30, 1991. Grant Bristow, dressed in blue jeans and a light blue shirt, was outside the hall with Wolfgang Droege doing perimeter security on the property line which separated the Legion Hall from the street. Al Overfield has stated that 10 people from CARP appeared at the hall to protest.⁵³ The protesters were walking around the street and Bristow and Droege were doing the same thing. Al Overfield was elected to the riding executive as one of 12 board members.⁵⁴

Overfield's security group provided services through the summer - Flint estimates three to five times through the summer of 1991; he did not know if Bristow was present.⁵⁵ Overfield then told the Committee that Bristow was present at two meetings: one at

⁵⁰ SIRC interview of Hugh Pendergast.

⁵¹ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁵² Rosie DiManno, "Ex-mercenary aims for country 'uniquely' white", Toronto Star, June 19, 1991.

⁵³ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁵⁴ SIRC interview of Hugh Pendergast

⁵⁵ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

a Scarborough school and the other at the Legion Hall described below.⁵⁶

People's memories about the meetings which Grant Bristow attended during the summer and fall of 1991 are poor. Al Overfield thinks that perhaps Bristow appeared two or three times (he thinks Bristow may have sat outside in his car at a Scarborough meeting).⁵⁷ Wolfgang Droege estimated that Bristow may have attended five Reform meetings in all.⁵⁸

Al Overfield wanted Bristow to go to Reform Party meetings and fundraisers, beyond those reported here, but Bristow said that he never did so. Overfield said that Bristow usually appeared when an important Reform Party figure was present.

The Source stated that Bristow was present only at the Legion Hall on Dawes Road.⁵⁹ By the fall of 1991, CARP had disbanded and was a non-issue.

7.3 The Plots Against Reform

In the course of the Review Committee's investigation, we learned of several plans by members of the extreme right and those who allied themselves with the racists, to discredit the Reform Party. Two such plans are described below. A third plot is described later in the report.

Overfield met Don Andrews in 1967 and became an active member of the organization that Andrews and Paul Fromm founded, the Edmund Burke Society.⁶⁰

On February 23, 1972, the right wing Edmund Burke Society became the white supremacist Western Guard. The leader of the former and member of the latter, Paul Fromm, succeeded in taking over the Ontario wing of the national Social Credit Party.⁶¹ The national president of the Social Credit Party then placed the

⁵⁶ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁵⁷ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁵⁸ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

⁵⁹ SIRC interview of Source

⁶⁰ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

⁶¹ Stanley R. Barrett, *"Is God a Racist?"*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

entire Ontario Branch under his personal trusteeship to counter Fromm's activities. According to one author, among the four members of the Western Guard who ran for Social Credit was one Alan Overfield.⁶² He ran in the Beaches Woodbine riding and was expelled from the national Party, but not the provincial group.⁶³

Though Ernest Manning was the leader of the Party, the members of the Ontario wing blamed Preston Manning, his son, for the organization being placed in trusteeship. Fromm told SIRC that "I don't trust Preston Manning."⁶⁴

One year after the formation of the Western Guard, the name changed to the Western Guard Party. The leader was Don Andrews who established a special cadre to distribute leaflets, paint racist messages on buildings and harass Jews and Blacks.⁶⁵ Among its members was Wolfgang Droege. One of its para-military group "soldiers" was Alan Overfield.⁶⁶ In 1973, Overfield says that he founded the Canadian Liberty League "as an alternative to the Western Guard."⁶⁷

Andrews subsequently formed the Nationalist Party of Canada (NPC) in which Al Overfield was a member. Overfield says it is possible he was a member of the NPC but he did not remember.⁶⁸ Overfield produced a list of the weapons that would be required for the ill-fated coup attempt against Dominica; the attempt resulted in a three year prison sentence for Droege.⁶⁹

⁶² Murray Dobbin, "Preston Manning and the Reform Party", Halifax: Formac Publishing, 1992, pp. 277-278.

⁶³ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

⁶⁴ SIRC Hearing, Paul Fromm.

⁶⁵ Stanley R. Barrett, "Is God a Racist?", Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989, p. 79.

⁶⁶ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield. Mr. Overfield denies being a "soldier" of the Western Guard Party and says he does not agree with the harassment of Jews and Blacks.

⁶⁷ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

⁶⁸ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁶⁹ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

Bristow was informed that Overfield and Fromm felt that Preston Manning could have protected them and the others in the far right years ago in Social Credit Party days and did not do so.⁷⁰

Through his association with Andrews and the NPC, Overfield *"came to know and eventually employed Wolfgang Droege as a part-time bailiff."* Overfield considered himself a friend to Wolfgang Droege and would not *"turn his back on him. Droege confided in Overfield."*⁷¹ As a result of this relationship and his position within the Reform Party, Overfield obtained Droege's assistance for Reform Party security duties.

Overfield told the Review Committee that he had been inactive in politics for 15 years, *"but it was in his blood"* and when Reform came along, he decided that it was close to his beliefs and he was one of the first to join in Ontario.⁷² He said that before he joined, *"he let the Reform Party executive know about his political past, and they had no problems with it."* He said that he informed them that he had been a member of the Edmund Burke Society. He apparently did not mention his long involvement with the Nationalist Party of Canada.

Al Overfield stated that he was signed up in the Reform Party by Harry Robertson.⁷³ Robertson has no memory of that taking place.⁷⁴ Overfield has also stated that Stephen Harper, MP knew his background.⁷⁵ Harper had no recollection of meeting or even speaking with Overfield. Harper explained that in 1989-90, he was giving the Party's platform a strategic focus and was working out of MP Deborah Grey's office. He was building issues into the Reform Party's platform to actively discourage extremists and *"nut cases"*.⁷⁶

All of Harper's files during that period were given to Reg Gosse. Harper asked Gosse to find his material when Dunphy's

⁷⁰ SIRC interview of Bristow.
⁷¹ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.
⁷² SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.
⁷³ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.
⁷⁴ SIRC interview of Harry Robertson.
⁷⁵ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.
⁷⁶ SIRC interview of Stephen Harper.

exposé article came out in late February 1992. Gosse said he was not able to locate the files in question.⁷⁷

Overfield described himself as an "activist" who filled a void in the Party: he organized, recruited and provided personnel. By doing so, he said he worked his way onto the executive by helping Hugh Pendergast. At the time, said Overfield, he protected Hugh Pendergast from internal and external attacks. Overfield stated that Pendergast eventually learned to recognize attacks on his own.⁷⁸ Overfield later told the Committee that Pendergast was not weak but lacked interpersonal skills.⁷⁹

Overfield said he joined the Reform Party in January or February 1991.⁸⁰

7.3.1 Overfield's Plan

On July 5, 1991, Toronto Region forwarded CSIS HQ a letter which was sent to all Reform Party Ridings. The letter stated:

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This letter will confirm that Alan J. Overfield and Grant Bristow are jointly responsible for the security of all present and future Reform Party Events that are planned for this region. They have been given our full co-operation and permission to ensure the safety of our guests and members.

If you have any further questions in this regard, I would be pleased to discuss their responsibilities in further detail with you.

Sincerely,

*Andrew A. Flint
Regional Co-ordinator"*

Grant Bristow stated that Overfield asked for the letter in order to receive recognition and to show that he was appointed.

⁷⁷ SIRC interview of Stephen Harper.

⁷⁸ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁷⁹ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

⁸⁰ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

Grant Bristow's name was included in the letter because he said: *"Unless we have a letter of understanding, there could be legal liabilities if there was a confrontation with protestors at a Reform Party event".*⁸¹

CSIS received no reporting on Reform Party activities or events. Bristow's involvement was described as security for Party events. The Source would be in a position to monitor this (white supremacist) situation. CSIS HQ was asked to comment on the matter and did so in August 1991 (see section 5.4, Headquarter's Instructions and Debates).

Just prior to the Mississauga rally, on June 10, 1991, it was learned that Overfield was one of the Directors of the Beaches-Woodbine Reform Party riding association. Overfield had stated that he had a couple of men who were going to handle (i.e., protect) Manning because the police were refusing to give any assistance. Overfield informed a colleague that CARP announced that they would send eight busloads of people to protest the appearance of Preston Manning at the rally near Toronto.

Overfield's plan, he confided to extreme right wing colleague Paul Fromm, was to unify all the right wing people into one cohesive organization. He was pushing to infiltrate, literally take control of, ten or twelve Riding Associations in Metro (Toronto). Even if they did not win the Riding Associations in an election, at least they would have control. The attraction of Reform for Overfield and like-minded persons, he said was that it was strictly white bread, 100 percent white Canadians, really anti-immigration; there was really no difference between those people and them (Overfield's group).

Wolfgang Droege would say that it was Grant Bristow who thought that some ridings could be controlled by the Heritage Front.⁸² He would later tell the Review Committee that Overfield said that *"he could arrange for us to have a security team and with doing security we could also then have a certain influence within the Party."*⁸³

We learned that Overfield said that he dove in (to the Reform Party) a couple of months ago and so far had worked within the Party, just playing the party worker, mainly because he did not want them pulling a Social Credit (manoeuvre), outlawing them

⁸¹ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

⁸² SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

⁸³ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

overnight and they did not want to shoot themselves in the foot when they got even close to power or got a chance at it.

Overfield said he had sent a message to rival Don Andrews that if he tried to join the RP he would fight him tooth and nail. He thought instead Andrews would plod along with his stupid Nationalist Party (of Canada). He would fight Andrews entering the RP even though Reform said they would accept anyone whose heart was in the right place.

Droege too was to later say to the Review Committee that *"their (Heritage Front) involvement, however, was not questioned by the Reform Party; the HF was 'not an issue', even though we were one of the main organizers"*.⁸⁴

Through the Source, CSIS corroborated the existence of Overfield's plan that the White Supremacist movement should take control of at least twelve local riding associations. The purpose of this action was to form a voting block of *"agents of influence"* within the Reform Party's political apparatus. Once successful, the block would push senior Party executives to adopt policies favourable to the White Supremacist movement. An example of such a policy would be a call for reductions in non-white immigrants into Canada and tough restrictions on refugees.

In October 1991, Overfield was looking for a few people for the Reform Party because there was some trouble in the area between Markham and Victoria Park and Eglinton and Elsemere and there was a good chance they could take over the riding association.

7.3.2 Droege's Plan

Al Overfield was not the only one with a hidden agenda. The Service learned from a Source that Droege too had clandestine plans. As far as Droege was concerned, the Reform Party was threatening the momentum of the White Supremacist Movement. The Reform Party had to be disrupted so that the Movement could carry out its own political agenda.

Droege held a view common to those in the extreme right that the same situation occurred in the United Kingdom when the Conservative Party undermined the National Socialist Party's momentum, and in the end the Neo-Nazi organization fell apart. Droege wanted to prevent the same situation from happening in Canada.

⁸⁴ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

The Source reported Droege as having said that the White Supremacist Movement wanted to discredit Preston Manning and the Reform Party before the general election in 1993. This idea would be accomplished by the Movement publicly identifying itself and its security relationship with the Reform Party's senior executive level. Among those who allegedly knew of the Droege plan were Gerry Lincoln, James Dawson, Ernst Zundel, Terry Long, Jurgen Neumann, Peter Mitrevski, and Grant Bristow. Zundel and Lincoln denied knowledge of any plot.

The Source stated that Droege believed that by getting involved with the Reform Party, eventually the media would take notice and Droege hoped they would wait until the 1993 election before burning the Reform Party.⁸⁵

The Source reported on July 31, 1991 that a discussion with Droege at times became heated as the Source tried to point out the negative aspects for the movement, including possible Federal Government security interest in Droege's involvement with the Reform Party. Droege responded that he did not want to think about the retribution. He said don't tell Overfield because Preston is a big boy.⁸⁶

The Source informed his handler about the hidden agendas of Overfield and Droege and was instructed to do what he was told and that the handler would get direction on this.⁸⁷

In the end, Droege stated that he and other Heritage Front people would continue to perform security duties with or without the assistance of the Source. Toronto Region understood that Droege and his associates received no compensation for their security work, but undertook this activity as a favour for Overfield.

The Region took care to point out that there was no investigation of Reform Party activities, but rather, the actions of Wolfgang Droege were of CSIS' interest. Toronto Region believed that Droege's activities with the Reform Party were going to continue. Because of this, the Source should continue to participate in the security duties to allow CSIS to monitor the White Supremacist infiltration and disruption activity within the Reform Party. Due to the political sensitivities associated with

⁸⁵ SIRC interview of Source.

⁸⁶ SIRC interview of Source.

⁸⁷ SIRC interview of Source.

the Source operation, the Region's Investigator and his Chief requested Headquarters comment and approval.

On August 1, 1991, the Director General of Toronto Region discussed this matter with the Assistant Director Requirements at Headquarters. The Deputy Director General Operations in Toronto Region asked that the issue be brought to the attention of the Assistant Director.

7.3.3 Early Warnings

A CSIS employee was a volunteer Director of Memberships for a Toronto area Reform Party riding association. Returning from his holidays on July 16, 1991, a co-worker told the CSIS employee that Droege had been on TV at a Reform Party meeting. On July 18, 1991, the Service employee met with Paul Kelly, President of the Scarborough West riding association and the two watched a videotape of the event. The Service staff member asked Kelly if he knew who Droege was. Kelly stated he believed Droege was with security. The CSIS employee stated "*that guy is no good for this party.*" When Kelly asked why, the reply was "*look, I know*".

The Service member said he was not divulging classified information "*since an article had appeared in the Toronto Star on the 19th of June identifying Droege as a white supremacist*".⁸⁸ The employee advised Paul Kelly to bring this to the attention of Andrew Flint, and asked to be kept out of it.

On July 30, 1991, the CSIS employee visited Kelly's house to pick up some membership cards. He alleged that Flint was also there and asked Flint what he thought of the article. Flint was said to have stated he would not knowingly use him again for a party function. Word got back to Droege that a member of CSIS informed the Reform Party that Droege was a white supremacist.

Paul Kelly told the Review Committee that he had been informed that some Reform people were also in the Heritage Front; they may have included Overfield. Kelly was uncertain about the timing of these comments. Kelly said he would have spoken to Andrew Flint about the matter.⁸⁹

The Service's assessment of the consequences likely to flow from the actions of its employee at the time was that the

⁸⁸ Rosie DiManno, "*Ex-mercenary aims for country 'uniquely' white*", Toronto Star, June 19, 1991.

⁸⁹ SIRC interview of Paul Kelly, Former President, Scarborough West Riding Association, Reform Party.

reaction of the Reform Party was difficult to predict. There might have been some attempt to imply that the Service was investigating the Reform Party although they thought that unlikely since the Party would not want its association with Droege publicized. The Internal Security Unit in Toronto Region reviewed the incident.

On August 4, 1991, it was learned that it was actually Al Overfield himself who identified Droege as a racist to Reform Party people. According to one report, Flint learned from Reform Party member Paul Kelly that Droege was a serious problem. Kelly would not explain what the problem was and that may have prompted Flint to question Overfield.

Andrew Flint has stated that he does not have any memory of being informed in 1991 that Droege was a serious problem, nor that he reported the incident described above to other officials in the Reform Party. He said that Paul Kelly recently told him about the incident, but Flint still does not remember it.⁹⁰ When SIRC interviewed the CSIS employee in 1994, he said the events described above were possible, but he too did not remember meeting Flint.⁹¹

Overfield told the Review Committee that a CSIS member approached him about the security team and Overfield threatened to expose him. Overfield then said he was advised by the Reform Party "to dispose of Mr. []" and he asked him to resign, which he did. Overfield also stated that Reform Party member John Thompson claimed to be a member of CSIS.⁹² John Thompson flatly denied Overfield's assertion. We believe Thompson's version on this issue.

On July 22, 1991, Al Muxworthy from the Don Valley North riding made a courtesy call on Bernie Farber, the Director of Community Relations for the Canadian Jewish Congress. Farber expressed concern to him about Droege's public endorsement of the Reform Party in the June 19, 1991 article in the "Toronto Star". The article did not say Droege was a member.⁹³

⁹⁰ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint.

⁹¹ SIRC interview of CSIS employee.

⁹² SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

⁹³ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan, Secretary to the Special Committee of the Executive Council, Reform Party of Canada.

Two days later, Muxworthy wrote to the Executive Secretary to Preston Manning to express his concern; he attached a copy of the article. The letter disappeared and was never found.⁹⁴

7.3.4 Signing Up for the Reform Party

Prior to the Mississauga rally, it was learned that Overfield was dealing with Andrew Flint who was the East End Toronto organizer and part of the Ontario Executive. Overfield said he was unofficially made a Director for the Beaches Woodbine area and he was signing up everybody in sight for the Reform Party. The Party, he alleged, would accept anybody, they knew who they (Overfield et al.) were, but unofficially the Party was saying keep your mouth shut.

Overfield told the Review Committee that, at the time, Heritage Front membership was not a bone of contention. He believed that the Reform Party "*played stupid*" about such connections, but knew well the background of many of its new members. He said that the Reform Party had Klan members out West: "*'racists' are not in the Reform Party closet*".⁹⁵ The Reform Party Chairman has completely denied this assertion.⁹⁶

Overfield says that he saw Grant Bristow pay for all Heritage Front memberships. He also said that Bristow was constantly recruiting for the Reform Party among the young fellows (Skinheads), which led him into arguments with Overfield following the meetings. Overfield said that Bristow would later tell him that "*we can get control over this Party*" but Overfield said that he did not want Bristow to recruit.⁹⁷ We learned that Overfield admitted that he personally signed up the skinheads. We saw no reliable evidence that Bristow was involved in this activity.

Overfield said that he did not know who was with the Heritage Front when he signed up new memberships. He said that he was never asked, and never offered information about the Heritage Front membership of the security personnel.⁹⁸ On another occasion,

⁹⁴ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan, Secretary to the Special Committee of the Executive Council, Reform Party of Canada.

⁹⁵ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁹⁶ SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

⁹⁷ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

⁹⁸ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

Overfield told the Review Committee that he signed up "ten to twelve people from the Heritage Front and Bristow encouraged five other people to join".⁹⁹ Finally, under oath, Overfield said he recruited 22 members for the Reform Party, five of whom were in the Heritage Front: Peter Mitrevski, Nicola Polinuk, Droege, Zvominir Lelas and Tony Cinncinato. He said he was unaware at the time that the latter two were associated with the HF.¹⁰⁰

The Source has stated that Grant Bristow was nearby when Overfield was signing people up at his house in the basement or the backyard. Overfield tried to get Droege to join the Reform Party but the latter refused to pay the \$10 fee to join the Party, as he did not think much of Preston Manning. Overfield provided the money for Droege's membership and threatened to take it off his cheques from the bailiff company.¹⁰¹ Droege told the Review Committee that he paid for his membership.

Droege has said that he was not present at the time; his interests were not with the Reform Party, but with the Heritage Front, though he thought they might potentially be able to influence it.¹⁰² On another occasion, Droege told the Committee that he did suggest to people that they sign up, but Al Overfield "was actively trying to sign up members".¹⁰³ Droege said that he never witnessed Grant Bristow trying to sign people up for the Reform Party, though he heard about it.

Droege stated that he and Bristow talked about "sending people into Reform, trying to get them on riding associations so we could have input and maybe influence policy down the road".¹⁰⁴

The Source was asked to join the Reform Party by Overfield. The Source responded that Overfield was late and gave the impression that he had already done so. The Source had been told not to join by the handler. The Source could not remember

⁹⁹ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

¹⁰⁰ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

¹⁰¹ SIRC interview of Source.

¹⁰² SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁰³ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁰⁴ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

making a speech encouraging people to join the Reform Party, but might have done so after Droege asked him to do it.¹⁰⁵

When the membership book came out at various meetings, the Source said that he made himself "scarce". In regard to who paid the Reform Party fees for Heritage Front members, the Source only observed that Overfield paid for Droege's membership. Whereas the Source did not provide money to other people, he said that he may have assisted Overfield to get information on the sign-up forms; this would have been done at the request of Droege or Overfield and certainly the Source had no authority to sign up anyone.¹⁰⁶ Droege's colleague Paul Fromm told SIRC, in relation to Droege, "I certainly have heard him say back at the time that people should join the Reform Party".¹⁰⁷

The Source stated that he may have been involved when one person joined - a college instructor completely unaffiliated with the extreme right wing.¹⁰⁸

Wolfgang Droege has said that he did not attend the June 1991 C-FAR meeting.¹⁰⁹ Bristow has indicated that he was only at Reform or C-FAR meetings where Droege was present.¹¹⁰

Paul Fromm testified before the Review Committee that Overfield set up a table at the C-FAR meeting "to take Reform Party memberships and Grant Bristow was actively involved in trying to, you know, shepherd people over to the table and get them to sign up". Fromm explained that the reason he allowed Overfield to set up the table was: "We generally take the view: Look, if you've got some information you want to pass on, we're a forum, pass it on. So we said: Fine, set up your table".¹¹¹

Overfield said that he attended only one C-FAR meeting. Prior to that meeting, Overfield said that Hugh Pendergast thought it would be a good idea to set up a table there. Overfield said

105 SIRC interview of Source.

106 SIRC interview of Source.

107 SIRC Hearing of Paul Fromm.

108 Instructor at Humber College.

109 SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

110 SIRC interview of Bristow.

111 SIRC Hearing, Paul Fromm.

that Pendergast came in with the table, and Tony Cincinnato¹¹² and Fromm had an argument because Fromm had not been consulted beforehand. Fromm, said Overfield, apparently does not like the Reform Party and had had a falling out with Preston Manning.¹¹³

Hugh Pendergast told the Committee that he "heard" that Bristow actively encouraged people to sign the Reform Party memberships at the 1991 C-FAR meeting. He stated that Bristow was buzzing around the meeting while Overfield was quietly sitting at the sign-up table at the back of the hall. The people in the hall were encouraged to pay a \$10 Reform Party membership fee and make a \$10 donation.¹¹⁴

Overfield said that he, Tony Cinncinato and Hugh Pendergast were encouraging sign-ups.¹¹⁵ Overfield said that Bristow got Heritage Front people to sign up using Overfield's book. This was normally done after the meetings were over and people were milling around.¹¹⁶ When asked why he did not report this activity to the Reform Party, he said he "*kept his mouth shut and let a person here and there know*"; when asked who he told, he replied, "*Andrew Flint*". When asked again why he co-signed for the new Heritage Front members, he said "*it was not my job to say 'you can't join'*" the Party.¹¹⁷

In March 1993, it was learned that Al Overfield promised to dig up a Reform Party membership card so that Droege could copy it. Droege said that he was thinking about issuing membership cards to HF members.

In regard to the June meeting of Paul Fromm's C-FAR, the Source said that he had no knowledge of whether Overfield sold Reform Party memberships there. The Source stated that any sign-ups

¹¹² Tony Cincinnato is a follower of the Aryan movement and was active in the Toronto white supremacist milieu during the early 1990's. In November 1990 he established a Toronto Ku Klux Klan cell (now defunct) and is an associate of Wolfgang Droege.

¹¹³ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

¹¹⁴ SIRC interview of Hugh Pendergast, Former Reform Party Candidate and President, Beaches Woodbine Riding Association.

¹¹⁵ Hugh Pendergast completely denies he encouraged anyone to sign-up at the C-FAR meeting.

¹¹⁶ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

¹¹⁷ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

would have been as a result of revenge: Fromm, Andrews and Overfield were all members of the old Social Credit Party in Ontario. They thought that Preston Manning could have stopped their expulsions. Around this time, Fromm was involved with the Confederation of Regions Party and the Source could not see Fromm doing this as a favour to Reform.¹¹⁸

In November 1991, it was learned that Overfield and Peter Mitrevski were to do security at Broadview and Greenwood "for a riding association going together." Overfield said that all the young skinheads he had signed up out there would go.

As noted earlier, Al Overfield, in the whole time he was a member of the Reform Party signed-up only twenty-two members. He told the Review Committee that, of this twenty-two, "only five were HF members; the other sixteen were not at all associated with the extremist group."

In the autumn of 1991, James Dawson and Nicola Polinuk were described as district directors in the Beaches Woodbine riding. Hugh Pendergast noted they were seeking election to the executive.¹¹⁹

7.4 Headquarters Instructions and Debates

7.4.1 CSIS HQ Instructions

In August 1991, the Human Sources Branch in CSIS HQ responded to a Toronto Region suggestion (July 30, 1991) that the Source remain in place with the security group for the Reform Party meetings. The response, which was actually provided by the Chief of the Desk dealt with two issues.

The first issue for the Desk was:

- o the extent to which Droege's activities with respect to the Reform Party were germane to CSIS' investigation of the political leadership of the extreme Right Wing.

The Chief concluded that Droege's involvement in the Reform Party was not central to the focus of the Service's investigation: "the capability of Droege and others in the Right Wing political leadership to plan, direct and initiate acts of

¹¹⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

¹¹⁹ SIRC interview of Hugh Pendergast.

violence to advance their racist agenda". Consequently, the involvement in the Reform Party was "not of concern in itself".

The second issue was:

- o whether the source's credibility and access would be affected by the Source's response to Droege's plans.

As the Source appeared to be a trusted confidante of Droege, the Chief thought the relationship could withstand a difference of opinion. Consequently, "I am more inclined to direct Source to disengage from any activity whereby Source could become associated with the Reform Party".

On August 8, 1991, the Human Sources Branch at CSIS HQ instructed the Region: "Please direct the Source to avoid Reform Party activities".

The next day (August 9, 1991), the Assistant Director Requirements at CSIS HQ added his voice to the matter. He stated that he agreed with the CSIS HQ response, but he wanted the point made more firmly:

"There is no apparent reason to be involved, therefore, Source should not be. If TR has arguments to the contrary, we will listen but in the interim no activities in/with the Party. Please ensure that Source does not/not involve himself with any Reform Party activities in any form."

On August 23, 1991, Toronto Region Investigator informed CSIS HQ that "the Source has been directed to refrain from further Reform Party activities and has agreed to these instructions." In the same message, Toronto Region expressed the concern that:

"Wolfgang Droege and his colleagues in the NPC who are involved in the periphery of Reform Party activities may suggest that the CSIS is investigating the Reform Party even though this is not true.

HQ may wish to consider the feasibility of debriefing the leader of the Reform Party of the Service's interest in individual(s) who support the White Supremacist movement that may have connections to the Reform Party but at the same time assure the leader that we are not/not investigating the Party."

On August 28, 1991, three managers in the Human Sources Branch and the Counter-Terrorism Branch at Headquarters stated their view that:

"A certain threshold of danger would have to present itself before it would be feasible to consider debriefing the leader of the Reform Party, regarding certain white supremacists connections within. The present circumstances would not seem to warrant this action."

The Service view was that the decision not to inform the Reform Party did not violate the CSIS mandate, but to have done so might have been construed as a violation and also jeopardized the Source's security.

7.4.2 Whether to Tell the Reform Party

SIRC interviews with CSIS managers from HQ and Toronto Region and the Deputy Director of Operations and Analysis revealed that all are of a mind that the Source was indeed directed to leave the security group. The instructions from CSIS HQ for the Source to refrain from Reform Party activities appeared to be clear and although that should have been the end of the issue, this may not have happened. The instructions did not actually specify that the Source leave the security group. The Source attended the Pickering rally.

To place the issue in context, the Overfield security group's activities took place during a period of transition at the executive level in CSIS. The Deputy Director Operations and Analysis (DDO) was the Acting Director, for a considerable time in the Summer and Fall of 1991.

The Deputy Director Operations and Analysis informed the Review Committee that he and the Assistant Director Requirements (ADR) made the decision not to inform the Reform Party as the situation was not sufficiently egregious that it warranted that kind of action.¹²⁰

The DDO said that the Service had no mandate, in fact, no lawful authority to tell Mr. Manning anything. Another option that he noted was to go to the Minister or the Privy Council Office and let the latter talk to Mr. Manning. The DDO said that if the investigation had been within the CSIS mandate, it could have been construed as an attempt to subvert a democratic institution. That

¹²⁰ SIRC Hearing, CSIS Deputy Director Operations and Analysis (DDO).

would fall under 2(d) of the CSIS Act, and the Minister's approval would have been needed.

The DDO said that he and the Assistant Director Requirements decided that the Reform Party was perfectly capable of policing itself, cleansing its own ranks, and taking care of itself; our job was not to keep undesirables out of the Party.¹²¹ He believes that he "*probably did tell the Director*" and that government agencies were informed about the attempts through the CSIS Reports.¹²²

We saw no written evidence that the issue was brought to the attention of the Director during the Summer or the Fall of 1991.

7.4.3 Briefing Note to the Director

The new Director, Raymond Protti, arrived on October 1, 1991 and the briefings began on the key issues and operations in the Service.

On January 9, 1992 a Briefing Note was sent to the Director who had asked for details on any targets or sources of the Service who may have been involved with the Reform Party. The request arose during a general briefing about Human Sources.

The Director was informed that:

"The Reform Party has never been investigated by the Service."

The Note did say, however, that there were a few instances where Service investigations on mandated targets had surfaced peripheral information regarding the Reform Party.

Among the issues described were:

- o In 1989 the Service was told that an unidentified individual had donated significant funds to Preston Manning's 1988 political campaign on behalf of a foreign government. The three month investigation failed to substantiate the allegation. (We review this investigation in section VIII.)

¹²¹ SIRC Hearing, CSIS DDO.

¹²² SIRC Hearing, CSIS DDO.

- o A proposal to investigate suspicions about a foreign intelligence service's contacts with the Reform Party by developing a source in the Party was not approved.
- o Through his employer, Wolfgang Droege provided security for the Reform Party at meetings in Toronto. The source was directed to report only that information related to the CSIS mandate.

The Counter-Terrorism Branch pointed out that three other Droege associates were also providing security, but CSIS was interested in them only because of their white supremacist activities.

The Briefing Note concluded by reiterating that CSIS was *"sensitive to investigations that touch on the Party and have issued appropriate direction to ensure that only targets' activities related only to our mandate are reported."*

7.4.4 CSIS Reports on the Infiltration Attempts

CSIS reported on the infiltration of the Reform Party by the Heritage Front in two of their CSIS Reports and one Threat Assessment. These reports were routinely given wide distribution within the Federal Government's intelligence community.

In the report dated August 23, 1991 entitled the *Extreme Right and Racist Skinheads*, CSIS stated that *"Droege encouraged members of the Heritage Front to become involved with the Reform Party which seems to be viewed as a formidable rival by extreme right-wing figures"*. Droege hoped to discredit the Reform Party which he thought would eventually benefit the extreme right-wing. The Service believed that Preston Manning was unaware of Droege's involvement in the security group which protected him.

Although this report would have been sent to the Ministry of the Solicitor General as a matter of course, we have not seen evidence to suggest it was brought to the attention of the Solicitor General.¹²³ We noted too that the issue does not appear in any other material which we have seen and which went to the Minister's office.

On May 26, 1992 the Counter Terrorism Branch issued a Threat Assessment on Preston Manning. The assessment mentioned the

¹²³ The former Solicitor General did not recall this report. SIRC interview of Doug Lewis.

media reports of the infiltration of the Reform Party but concluded that the Service was unaware of any Heritage Front plans to use violence or otherwise physically disrupt/attack Reform meetings or Manning to revenge the expulsions from the Party earlier that year.

In the "Endnotes" of a July 1992 CSIS Report, the Service stated that the Heritage Front militants became members of the Reform Party in 1991, "in an attempt to use the latter as a springboard to obtain greater visibility".

7.4.5 Reporting Continues

On January 8, 1992, the Assistant Director Requirements told the Region that he wanted them to:

"review the direction given to the source and handler re: reporting on the targets' activities. As I recall, those instructions were very explicit; however the reiteration of them here seems somewhat confusing. (referring to a Briefing Note) For example, I cannot imagine how we could avoid reporting on Droege's activities in the Reform Party as suggested in the Briefing Note.

In effect, we should already have: he provides security. Since he appears to be intending to undermine or discredit a legitimate political institution, we must assess what he is doing to achieve that objective.

What we should not be reporting - which is what I understand the direction to be - is reporting on the RP, its members, activities, etc. Close monitoring of the source operation is necessary to ensure that we remain within our mandate."

In a January 9, 1992, message to the DDG Ops in CT Branch, the frustration was beginning to show in regard to the Droege investigation: "I'm not sure we aren't sucking and blowing at the same time here. Droege is a 2(c) CT target - the undermining of a political party, if it is real, is 2(d) and reporting beyond Level 1 is requiring Ministerial approval - I think we should sit down and discuss this whole issue so the game plan is clear to all of us."

On January 15, 1992, a note passed between CSIS HQ personnel in the Human Sources Branch stated that, "I don't believe we need to instruct Toronto Region any further. If RCT (CT Branch) wish to alter the instructions to Toronto Region they can discuss

it with OHS (Human Sources Branch) and the ADR (Assistant Director Requirements)." He would discuss it further with RCT for a coordinated response to the ADR.

On January 27, 1992, the CT Branch outlined its position in regard to the Source's activities:

"Droege's comments are probably well known by R.P. members, particularly the moderate middle roaders, who are aware of the possibility of the right wing extremist fringe; and the optical damage they can do to the Party.

Our focus is not on the Party, and I believe it is too early, without additional substantiating information, to look any further into the 2(d) aspects. You're right, however, to have us tune our antennae."

7.4.6 Handler's Instructions Given to the Source

The Review Committee asked the Source what instructions he had received from the Handler over the course of his association with the Overfield security group for the Reform Party. The Source stated that the Handler said that the rules were that:

- o he was told not to become a member of the Reform Party;
- o he was not to participate in any disruptive events against the Party; if anything did happen, he was to get the police involved;
- o he was to collect information on what the Heritage Front was doing with the Reform Party; and
- o he was not to report on the Reform Party itself.¹²⁴

The Source would give everything he collected to the Handler who would decide what was to be retained or not used. For example, when Overfield was planning something with Andrew Flint, the Source would report it, but he did not take notes on the platform of the Party or other information relating to it.¹²⁵

¹²⁴ SIRC interview of Source.

¹²⁵ SIRC interview of Source.

The Source said that when he was told to avoid Reform Party activities, he did so.

7.5 Final Act

7.5.1 Pickering Rally

In November 1991, Flint spoke to Overfield again and asked him to provide security for the next big rally in Pickering. Overfield said that he would not at all mind doing it.¹²⁶

For the Pickering rally on January 22, 1992, there are conflicting stories as to what the Overfield security group actually did. According to Andrew Flint who organized the rally, the Metro East Trade Centre provided their own security people for Preston Manning. Overfield's group were only to collect tickets at the front door and provide crowd control.¹²⁷

Al Overfield, on the other hand, stated that the Saturday before the rally, he and Grant Bristow surveyed the site and discussed various security options. Overfield said he was the Head of Security and he appointed Bristow as his assistant and the "takedown" man to protect Preston Manning. Overfield said that Bristow wanted the job, "looked like he had good background training, he was dynamic and liked to stay in the forefront. Bristow "was right on top of Manning" while Overfield ran back and forth "fighting fires."¹²⁸ Bristow has no memory of a pre-rally survey.¹²⁹ Overfield may have confused the two large rallies.

Flint has no recollection that Bristow was there and would not have recognized him if, for example, he had shaved off his beard.¹³⁰ The security people were present when Manning came into the building and the security group "may have floated around" in the back to prevent the public from going into unauthorized areas. Manning arrived just before the rally was to begin and waited from approximately 7:00 p.m. to 7:15 p.m.; the security

¹²⁶ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

¹²⁷ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

¹²⁸ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

¹²⁹ SIRC interview of Bristow.

¹³⁰ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

group was likely hanging around at this time.¹³¹ Once again, Ron Wood, Press Secretary to Preston Manning, stated that no conversations that were remotely sensitive took place.

Ron Wood said that, for him, only one person stood out in the security group, a guy with a long black leather or polyester coat who "looked like a Nazi".¹³²

At the Pickering Rally, said Andrew Flint, a man spotted Peter Mitrevski as one of the security people and this was reported to the National Council and to the Canadian Jewish Congress.¹³³

After the event, there was a media scrum following which Flint drove a car in which Manning was being interviewed by the Wall Street Journal.¹³⁴ Overfield's team escorted Manning out of the building and provided shadow cars for Flint's car until it reached highway 401 and was out in the open.¹³⁵

Droege told a colleague that he did not get to talk to Manning because one of the Ontario organizers did not want him to get too close to the cameras. He said they (Reform Party) had already been called by CSIS to try and have him (Droege) kicked out.

At CSIS, an Administrative Interview took place in early February 1992 and the Human Source officers apparently assured themselves that the Source understood the directions he had been given. The Human Sources interviewer discussed with the Source the August 1991 Headquarters message that the Source was to withdraw from this responsibility of security and not be involved with the Reform Party.

The Human Sources manager reiterated that the Source was not a member of the Reform Party and was not involved in any Reform

¹³¹ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

¹³² SIRC interview of Ron Wood, Preston Manning's Press Secretary.

¹³³ Peter Mitrevski is a white supremacist and a former member of the Nationalist Party of Canada. He is a trusted associate of Wolfgang Droege in the Heritage Front and one of the few who was described as knowing about Droege's agenda to discredit Preston Manning.

¹³⁴ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

¹³⁵ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

Party activity in 1991. The Source stated that this withdrawal from security responsibilities caused some friction with Droege and a loss of credibility. However, he has managed to survive using various alibis and excuses and everything is OK now.

The Source continued to find his role challenging and exciting but at times it became difficult to operate in this milieu with such requests as withdrawing from security for the Reform Party, but he manages to survive. The Human Source officer explained the reasons for such directions. CSIS instructed and queried the Source about criminal activities and he responded that he had not been involved in criminal activities.

7.5.2 The Story Breaks

The Reform Party did not use the security group after the Pickering event. On February 28, 1992, the story appeared in the "Toronto Sun" that the Heritage Front had infiltrated the Reform Party.

In the Heritage Front's work with the Reform Party, they had behaved "impeccably", according to Flint. Unlike other groups who took advantage of the fledgling Party in Ontario, the Front did not make statements to the press or use the occasions to distribute their material. Flint said they gave no indication of their racist philosophy.¹³⁶

But once the story broke in February 1992, the Front made up for lost time. The revelations put a shadow on the Pickering rally, the third largest in the Reform Party's history. Droege was on television every day. After this, every time Preston Manning showed up in Toronto, Droege would try to be outside the meeting.

In the fall of 1992 for example, at the opening of the Oshawa office, Manning was present and Droege showed up. The HF also made it a point to be present at nomination meetings, such as the one in Don Valley West where John Gamble was running - they seemed to be everywhere.¹³⁷

As the infiltration of the Reform Party became public knowledge at the end of February 1992, Droege commented that there were hundreds of Heritage Front people in the Party. The Source has stated that this type of statement "was a standard line for

¹³⁶ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

¹³⁷ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

Droege." The Source was only aware of Overfield, Dawson, Mitrevski, Nicola (Polinuk) Andrews, and possibly Max French.¹³⁸ Droege told the Review Committee, "I don't think I stated hundreds. At that time, in February 1992, that is when we started really to grow." He estimated that later on, "maybe 150 to 200 people...would have been possible members of the Reform Party."¹³⁹ He offered no evidence for the estimate.

Paul Fromm, an associate of Droege, has characterized the "hundreds" figure from the latter as "a little white lie."¹⁴⁰ Al Overfield thought the estimates were "very valid", and that the two groups had become quite intertwined.¹⁴¹

Droege stated to the Committee that in February 1992, the Heritage Front had about 40-50 members in the Reform Party, spread across a number of ridings in the East End (mostly). Some members were on the executives of Reform constituency associations. Ultimately, however, he believed that some 150 to 200 Heritage Front people could possibly be Reform Party members.¹⁴²

The Source said that his last contact with anyone associated with the Reform Party took place after the meeting in Pickering Ontario; he saw Hugh Pendergast by chance at Overfield's place.¹⁴³

7.5.3 The Reform Party Informed

Thomas Flanagan, the Reform Party's Chief of Strategy in 1992, first learned of the infiltration problem when Bill Dunphy from the "Toronto Sun" telephoned him on February 27, 1992. Dunphy wanted a comment for the story he was to run the next morning about the Heritage Front infiltration of the Reform Party.¹⁴⁴ The Party's

¹³⁸ SIRC interview of Source.

¹³⁹ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁴⁰ SIRC Hearing, Paul Fromm.

¹⁴¹ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

¹⁴² SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁴³ SIRC interview of Source.

¹⁴⁴ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan, Secretary to the Special Committee of the Executive Council, Reform Party of Canada.

Chairman described the call as "an incredible story."¹⁴⁵

Once told, the Reform Party launched an investigation. A Special Committee of the Executive Council was struck to look into the allegations.¹⁴⁶ The Special Committee was chaired by Myles Novak who was the President of the Reform Fund Canada and who was on the Management Planning Committee. The Secretary of the Special Committee was Thomas Flanagan, a Professor at the University of Calgary.

The Committee could make recommendations and terminate memberships.¹⁴⁷ The Party had deliberately put a strong termination clause (2(d)(iii)) in the Reform Party of Canada Constitution because, as Ernest Manning used to say, "*a bright light attracts a lot of bugs*". After a member is expelled, the Chairman mentioned, there is an arbitration clause which can be used by the former member.¹⁴⁸

Flanagan then learned that someone in the Party had some knowledge of similar events and an internal investigation was already underway.¹⁴⁹

Michael Lublin, a Reform Party member, had brought to the attention of Reform Executive Council member Dick Harris a press article which raised the question of racists and the Reform Party.¹⁵⁰ Lublin and Harris met with Bernie Farber of the Canadian Jewish Congress. The latter expressed concern about possible other racists in the Party, not just the HF, and gave Harris a list of nine names to check against the Reform Party membership lists.¹⁵¹ Lublin says these events took place in 1991 and Reform members

¹⁴⁵ SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

¹⁴⁶ SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

¹⁴⁷ SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

¹⁴⁸ SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

¹⁴⁹ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan, Secretary to the Special Committee of the Executive Council, Reform Party of Canada.

¹⁵⁰ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁵¹ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

state the actions occurred in January-February 1992.

After his travels, Harris said he returned to Calgary and asked the Membership Chairman to check the nine names; only one was a member - Wolfgang Droege.¹⁵² Harris then asked that the names be checked against Info Globe. At that point, journalist Bill Dunphy called Flanagan about the story which subsequently appeared on February 28, 1992.

7.5.4 Reform Party Findings

The Reform Party investigation revealed that Al Overfield was a bailiff who employed Droege and others in his business. The Special Committee learned that Overfield had sold/sponsored 22 memberships (at \$10.00 a membership) to which he signed his name after giving out the forms. Al Overfield was considered not to be a member of the Heritage Front but he consorted with them while he was a member of the Reform Party.¹⁵³

The Special Committee concluded that of the 22 names, four were Heritage Front members: Wolfgang Droege, Jim Dawson, Nicola Polinuk and Peter Mitrevski. They were expelled from the Party. Others may have also been members, but the Special Committee had difficulty confirming that they belonged to the Heritage Front. Flanagan asked his Toronto officials to telephone each of the names to find out whether they were affiliated with the Heritage Front - most denied it.¹⁵⁴

Andrew Flint remembered the wording of Overfield's expulsion letter that "*he showed poor judgement in the hiring of known neo-Nazis.*"¹⁵⁵

When Droege received the Reform Party letter which terminated his membership in March 1992:

¹⁵² SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

¹⁵³ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

¹⁵⁴ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

¹⁵⁵ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint, Former Ontario Regional Coordinator, Reform Party.

"So I thought well, if they want to play these games, fine. What we will do is we will endorse the Reform Party openly."¹⁵⁶

Despite his expulsion by the leadership of the Reform Party, Droege stated that he "felt much of the membership in the Reform Party seemed to have very similar opinions as I did on most issues."¹⁵⁷

Two or three other members were expelled from the Party, among them Anne Hartmann of the Northern Foundation. Flanagan became suspicious of her after learning that a racist article was written by one of her children. When Hartmann was evasive with Flanagan, a written warning was sent to Party members. When she attacked the Party publicly, she was expelled in September 1992.¹⁵⁸

Neither Tom Flanagan nor other members of the national Executive Council we spoke to ever heard Grant Bristow's name during or after the Reform Party investigation, until August 1994.

According to Al Overfield, there was no conspiracy, and they did not resist when they were kicked out. He said that everything was done to avoid any embarrassment. Overfield said the conspiracy story came from an article in the "Toronto Sun" and Tom Flanagan.

7.6 Conspiracies and Plots

The Chairman of the Reform Party said he never believed or thought that there were higher levels to the infiltration story, i.e., the possibility of direction by others.¹⁵⁹ But many of the Reform Party members and officers we spoke to were absolutely convinced that the infiltration was directed by persons associated with the Progressive Conservative Party in order to discredit the Reform Party.

"The Heritage Front Affair" is the first time that some officials in the Reform Party think that they may have evidence of such a conspiracy.

¹⁵⁶ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁵⁷ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁵⁸ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

¹⁵⁹ SIRC interview of Clifford Fryers, Chairman and Chief Operating Officer of the Reform Party of Canada.

7.6.1 The Enigma

On June 12, 1992, Michael Lublin, a member of the Kitchener-Waterloo Jewish community and the self-professed "*highest ranking Jewish member of the Reform Party*, went on national television to denounce the party as racially intolerant and anti-Semitic, and to declare that a Reform Government would be a disaster for Canada."¹⁶⁰

Thus began another chapter in the complex lead-up to the 1993 federal election.

Michael Lublin told the Review Committee that he joined the Reform Party in April 1991 because he liked their economic policies.¹⁶¹ Lublin told his then friend, John Toogood, that he was interested in Reform because they were standing up for civil liberties and he thought that Reform was misunderstood.¹⁶²

In June 1992, Lublin had a rift with the Reform Party; he became angry, he said, after "*pin stripe racists at the Waterloo riding level made things tough*" for him. He said he left the Party when he was prevented from going to a meeting.¹⁶³ Paul Kelly stated that Michael Lublin applied for the job of Regional Coordinator for Southwestern Ontario. He did not get the job but Reg Gosse did.¹⁶⁴ Lublin later said that the differences of opinion with Reg Gosse were racially motivated.¹⁶⁵ Gosse completely denied the allegation and said he was upset that Lublin would say so, having spent many "*long hours*" listening to Lublin's problems.

The Party had turned Lublin down for a position on June 9, 1992 and he went public with his criticism of Reform on June 12, 1992.

¹⁶⁰ Murray Dobbin, "*Preston Manning and the Reform Party, Halifax: Formac Publishing Company, 1992*", p. 271.

¹⁶¹ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁶² SIRC interview of John Toogood.

¹⁶³ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁶⁴ SIRC interview of Paul Kelly.

¹⁶⁵ SIRC interview of Richard Van Seters, Former Campaign Worker for John Gamble.

7.6.2 The Conservatives

Lublin said his friend John Toogood, a university student, acted as an political advisor to him and Lublin took him to Reform Party meetings.¹⁶⁶ Toogood agreed that they attended some meetings together, but he denied being an "advisor" and also stated that he was always candid about his Conservative Party links.

Toogood says that Lublin called him to say there were to be other Reform Party meetings and they went to two or three such meetings together; he said he went to learn what Reform's appeal was and he never attended any small riding meetings: the ones he went to were publicly advertised, large, and attended by the media.¹⁶⁷ Toogood says there was never any doubt that both Gosse and Lublin knew he was a member of the PC Party.¹⁶⁸ Reg Gosse confirmed Toogood's statement.¹⁶⁹

In the Summer of 1992, Toogood told SIRC, he worked in Solicitor General Doug Lewis' office and had little or no contact with Lublin at that time, to speak of. As a summer student, he answered the telephones, and liaised with the Ministry of Justice in regard to the gun control issue. His only contact with CSIS was to book appointments. In regard to the Reform Party, Toogood said he wrote synopses of their Justice policy: all based on newspaper articles and Reform Party literature. He stated that at no time while working for Doug Lewis or otherwise, did he ever make use of any external groups or agencies.¹⁷⁰

Lublin said that Joe Lafleur, a Conservative official, tried to recruit him. Lafleur told the Review Committee that he did not try to get involved in the Reform Party. Lublin, who was seeking a job, gave Lafleur a Campaign Contributions list which Lafleur said he never used: he just threw it in a file cabinet and left it there.¹⁷¹ Lublin said the list was a publicly available

¹⁶⁶ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁶⁷ SIRC interview of John Toogood.

¹⁶⁸ SIRC interview of John Toogood.

¹⁶⁹ SIRC interview of Reg Gosse.

¹⁷⁰ SIRC interview of John Toogood.

¹⁷¹ SIRC interview of Joe Lafleur, Former President, PC Party, Kitchener-Waterloo.

corporate contributions list.¹⁷² Lafleur said he was happy to hear Lublin's complaints about what was going on in the Reform Party, as they were the opponents, but no dirty tricks took place.

7.6.3 The Plots

Lublin first told us that John Toogood and Bernie Farber, the Canadian Jewish Congress Director of Community Relations were working together to discredit the Reform Party.¹⁷³ He later said they did not work together toward the goal.¹⁷⁴ Lublin also says that he had a conversation with Hugh Segal, Advisor to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.¹⁷⁵

Both Toogood and the CJC Director have stated that they have never met or spoken to each other, much less conspired together.¹⁷⁶ Both completely denied they ever tried to discredit the Reform Party. Hugh Segal received a message from Lublin but does not believe he ever spoke to him. Segal says he had his secretary give the name of a party official to Lublin to contact, wary of the negative comments Lublin made about his former mentors in the Reform Party.¹⁷⁷

7.6.4 Money to Droege

Lublin described Droege as a complex, complicated and interesting individual, notwithstanding the fact that Lublin's Serbian friends fought Droege's people in the Kitchener-Waterloo area.¹⁷⁸

It was learned that in November 1992, Lublin called Droege for information about a lecture by British Nazi sympathizer, writer David Irving. Droege said it was a closed meeting, but

¹⁷² SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁷³ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁷⁴ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁷⁵ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁷⁶ SIRC interviews of John Toogood and Bernie Farber.

¹⁷⁷ SIRC interview of Hugh Segal.

¹⁷⁸ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

authorized Lublin to inform the media. Lublin stressed they keep their association with one another secret and Droege agreed.¹⁷⁹

In the Spring of 1993, Preston Manning came to Oshawa. Lublin said that lawyer Louis Allore called him in Florida to say he wanted to discredit Manning. He would pay Droege \$500 to have the Heritage Front "*hound Manning*" in May or June 1993. Allore told Lublin that Droege does not get paid until the "*stunt*" appears in the newspaper.¹⁸⁰

7.6.5 View from the Outside

Bristow was aware that Michael Lublin was an anti-racist who wanted to be a spokesperson for the Jewish community. The hearsay within the Heritage Front was that Lublin had his eye on the Director of Community Relations' job at the Canadian Jewish Congress.¹⁸¹ Bristow overheard some of the conversations between Wolfgang Droege and Michael Lublin: Lublin did not like Reform and wanted to be seen as a peacemaker between the Nazis and the Jews. As a negotiator, he could make a name for himself.¹⁸² Bristow took a photograph of Lublin and Droege arm-in-arm together.

Alan Overfield said that Michael Lublin was a case of "*sour grapes*". Although Lublin accused the Reform Party of being racist, he still attended their meetings. Lublin knew Droege by his first name and he was involved in a lot of manipulation in the Jewish Community.¹⁸³

Bristow believed that Wolfgang Droege received cash from a Bay Street fellow to attend Reform Party meetings to discredit and embarrass the Party. Bristow was of the opinion that Lublin coordinated the contacts but that the money came from the other person.¹⁸⁴

We received reports that someone called CITY TV in Toronto to tell them that Droege would attend Reform Party

¹⁷⁹ Lublin denied that this conversation ever took place.

¹⁸⁰ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

¹⁸¹ SIRC interview of Bristow. Lublin denied this was his objective and he said that he did not have the qualifications for the job.

¹⁸² SIRC interview of Bristow.

¹⁸³ SIRC interview of Alan Overfield.

¹⁸⁴ SIRC interview of Bristow.

meetings. The staff we spoke to at CITY TV denied they were informed in advance of Heritage Front activities.¹⁸⁵ The Source, however stated that it was "*standard methodology*" for someone to call CITY TV in Toronto to tell them that Droege would attend Reform Party meetings. A Reform Party member and advisor has stated that reporter Colin Vaughn was present at some of the Reform Party demonstrations.¹⁸⁶ Droege said he had no knowledge about the CITY TV matter.¹⁸⁷

Droege told Bristow that Lublin thought it was a good idea if Droege went to Reform Party meetings: Lublin would call the Press to make sure Reform was discredited. The Review Committee has confirmed that Michael Lublin made at least some of the calls.¹⁸⁸

It was learned that Lublin told Droege during April 1993 that he had contacted the media to tell them, that Heritage Front members voted at the John Gamble nomination meeting. He later said that he told reporter Colin Vaughn that this made him fearful as a Jew. He suggested that two well-known officials in the Reform Party be made the fall guys. Droege agreed.

In April 1993, Droege told Bristow that the Heritage Front might wish to engage Michael Lublin for publicity purposes and also the two groups could work together to discredit Preston Manning and the Reform Party. The Source subsequently learned that Lublin had some personal grudge against the Reform Party and is seeking to form a clandestine alliance with the Heritage Front.

It was further learned that Lublin told Droege that the Heritage Front should publicly claim that Lublin was their (HF) primary opponent. Lublin would like the notoriety to establish himself as the guardian of the Jewish community and to weaken groups like the Canadian Jewish Congress and the B'nai Brith. Lublin even suggested that the HF should blow up his personal vehicle so that he could show the public that he was an important neo-nazi enemy.

Lublin was reported as saying to Droege that the two could feed off one another to gain maximum media exposure. Droege

¹⁸⁵ SIRC interviews with: Colin Vaughn, Reporter; Ben Chin, Reporter; and John Thornton, Senior Assignments Editor.

¹⁸⁶ SIRC interview of John Thompson.

¹⁸⁷ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

¹⁸⁸ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

confided to the Source that he would be open to a mutual campaign of publicity and controversy with Lublin.

7.6.6 The Whitby Lawyer

Lawyer Louis S. Allore was on the Board of Directors of the Ontario riding association (Pickering, Ajax, Whitby) for the Reform Party. During the fall of 1991 or the spring of 1992 serious conflicts arose in the riding.¹⁸⁹

Riding President David Barber held a secret meeting with some Board members to try to oust Allore. When the full board found out, they reacted and Barber was ousted as President. Jack Hurst and Reg Gosse came in to mediate and Allore subsequently conducted a vendetta against them. Allore also complained when the Party expelled John Gamble and David Andrus.¹⁹⁰

David Andrus stated that Allore devoted a lot of time and campaigned seriously for the nominated candidate in his riding. He was expelled from the Party for his support of Gamble (see 5.6.8). Once expelled, he carried on a one man campaign through the media to tell the press what he thought of the Reform Party and Preston Manning.¹⁹¹ He launched two legal actions against Manning and Andrus said that he was making some progress when he died in August 1994. Andrus saw it as a questionable death and said that Allore was a man of integrity.¹⁹²

Richard Van Seters, John Gamble's campaign manager viewed Allore as bitter about his expulsion and as a person who went to extremes to create embarrassment. Van Seters said that Allore talked to the Heritage Front and "*they were employed to disrupt*" the Gamble meeting.¹⁹³ After his expulsion, Van Seters said that Allore corresponded with Conservatives Jean Charest and Mike

¹⁸⁹ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint.

¹⁹⁰ SIRC interview of Andrew Flint.

¹⁹¹ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

¹⁹² SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

¹⁹³ SIRC interview of Richard Van Seters.

Harris.¹⁹⁴ John Gamble, however, did not think that Allore would have anything to do with the Heritage Front.¹⁹⁵

The Review Committee was informed that the only point of contact between Allore and Harris were the two letters which Allore sent to the Ontario leader. The two never met.¹⁹⁶ Similarly, Jean Charest said he does not remember ever having met Louis Allore. The five letters which Allore sent to Charest were never answered.¹⁹⁷

On April 29, 1993 a story appeared in a satirical magazine. The article stated that Droege, "has been happily describing how he is exacting his revenge while having someone else pay for it...the mysterious paymaster is a Toronto area Tory campaign chairthingy."¹⁹⁸ Some present and former Reform Party officials believed the story contained some truth.¹⁹⁹

The source of the report was John Thompson,²⁰⁰ a Reform Party member, who said that he had had a source infiltrate the Heritage Front one Summer.²⁰¹

On August 21, 1994, it was learned that Droege advised Gerry Lincoln that lawyer Louis Allore, was a person he had met, who was trying to infiltrate the Reform Party. Droege confided to Lincoln that Allore gave him some money personally. This was probably in relation to the Oshawa Conspiracy (see 7.6.7). Lincoln said he never heard about the matter.

Wolfgang Droege, under oath, informed the Review Committee that he received \$500.00 from lawyer Louis Allore to publicly support the Reform Party. He was given the money to attend a meeting where he could embarrass Preston Manning. When asked if others were involved, Droege said he did not know,

¹⁹⁴ SIRC interview of Richard Van Seters.

¹⁹⁵ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

¹⁹⁶ SIRC interview of Bill King, Aide to Mike Harris.

¹⁹⁷ SIRC interview of Eric Wildhaber, Assistant to Jean Charest.

¹⁹⁸ Frank Magazine, "A Wolf in Tory Togs", April 29, 1993, p. 15.

¹⁹⁹ SIRC interviews of Ron Wood and Richard Van Seters.

²⁰⁰ SIRC interview of John Thompson.

²⁰¹ SIRC interview of John Thompson, Reform Party Advisor.

although Allore was in touch with other dissidents from the Reform Party such as John Gamble and David Andrus. Droege stated, "it was mainly an attempt by myself and Louis Allore to discredit Preston Manning."²⁰²

7.6.7 The Oshawa Conspiracy

On May 27, 1993 Wolfgang Droege left his home and picked up Tracy Jones, Peter Mitrevski and Drew Maynard in the Hillington/Danforth area; he then he drove to Whitby, Ontario just before noon. He picked up an envelope at the Ontario Court Division (Rossland Road East) and then drove to Oshawa where he tried to attend a Reform Party Meeting at 50 Bond Street.

Wolfgang Droege and Peter Mitrevski appeared at the Reform Party meeting in Oshawa at which Preston Manning was to appear before the Canadian Auto Workers. The two racists had received \$10.00 tickets to attend the meeting but the Reform Party officials refused to allow them to enter and refunded their money.²⁰³ They were escorted out of the building by police officers.

The next day, it was learned that Droege told Marque Poole Jewer that the incident in Oshawa went pretty well because there was some publicity in Oshawa about his being kicked out by the police. Droege revealed that some Reform Party dissidents were going to start a new party as soon as the election was over, and he was expecting to receive some favours in return since he already did them a few (see section 7.6.13 below). The Heritage Front leader also said he was going to meet with an attorney (thought to be Louis S. Allore) the following week to receive taskings.

Droege told the Source several days later that he was given \$500.00 and two tickets to the event by Michael Lublin. Lublin denies he provided the \$500 or the tickets and said he was in Florida at the time. Droege took Peter Mitrevski with him and was to pay him \$100.00 for his participation. Drew Maynard and Tracy Jones were taken to hand out flyers. Droege said that the Reform Party claim that the Conservative Party had hired him to discredit Preston Manning was humorous. One and a half years later, on the day that the lawyer died in a car accident, Droege again said that Allore gave him some money 'personally'. A CSIS Investigator stated that he believed that the deal was brokered by Michael Lublin.

Whereas the evidence is circumstantial, it appears that

²⁰² SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

²⁰³ Bill Dunphy, "Manning hounded by racist", Toronto Sun, May 28, 1994.

Droege collected an envelope containing \$500.00 and two tickets from Louis Allore and then, to embarrass the Reform Party, went to the meeting where Preston Manning was to speak.

Droege first told the Review Committee that he did not receive money to attend Reform Party meetings: "*afterwards, though, they would go out for a few beers. No money changed hands.*" He denied receiving money from Michael Lublin, who he said, was "*an opponent*" and, because of him, Droege "*got kicked out of the Reform Party.*"²⁰⁴ At a subsequent hearing on oath, Droege stated that Louis Allore paid him to attend the Reform Party meeting.²⁰⁵

7.6.8 The John Gamble Affair

One of the main planks in conspiracy theories is the John Gamble Affair. Gamble, a former Progressive Conservative Member of Parliament and contender in that Party's leadership race in the early 1980s, won the nomination on March 31, 1993 as the Reform Party candidate for the riding of Don Valley West.

Prior to the Meeting. Six days before the nomination meeting, the Secretary to the Reform Party, Mike Frieese wrote to the President of the riding association, David Andrus to say that Gamble's nomination would be bad for the Party because of his association with Paul Fromm and Ron Gostick who were publicly perceived to be associated with extremist views. Another letter from the Party also said, apparently, that Fromm was working with Gamble in the World Anti-Communist League during the mid-1980s.²⁰⁶

Gamble was the North American Chairman of the World Anti-Communist League and was the subject of an article in "*This*" Magazine. He said that Don Blenkarn and others in the Conservative Party were also mentioned as supporters of the League.²⁰⁷ One of the accusations against the League was that it was anti-semitic, but Gamble saw that as "*ancient history*" and the people involved were no longer associated with the League; Gamble had never known them.

The Nomination Meeting. At Gamble's nomination meeting on March 31, 1993, Wolfgang Droege (expelled from the Reform Party the year before), Peter Mitrevski and a few others showed up outside the

²⁰⁴ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

²⁰⁵ SIRC Hearing, Wolfgang Droege.

²⁰⁶ SIRC interview of Troy Tait, Policy Coordinator, Reform Party.

²⁰⁷ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

hall and made a public show of support for Gamble. The candidate, in turn, made a statement saying he would not refuse such assistance.

It was learned that Michael Lublin left a message for Droege on March 31st that they should get together and organize something for a candidates meeting scheduled for that night for the Don Valley. Lublin added that all the media would be there and it could be important.²⁰⁸

The Source remembered that Droege and Peter Mitrevski supported John Gamble's nomination. Droege told the Source that Gamble is not a bad guy and that he held him in high esteem. Droege also told the Source that he was given the financial incentive to embarrass the Reform Party by a supporter of Gamble. The Source did not know who the supporter was.²⁰⁹

John Gamble told us that he met Droege only once - and that was at the nomination meeting. Droege was pointed out to him by a member of a television news team. The reporter asked Gamble if he wanted the support of the people outside his meeting. Gamble said he would accept help "from anyone here if I can get it." The candidate said that he was told who Droege was after he made the comment. Gamble emphasized that he had no contact with the HF at any other time: Droege was not a member of Gamble's riding association and he did not recognize him, nor those with him. There were six or seven other Heritage Front people at the nomination meeting, but Gamble would not recognize any of them if he saw them now. Gamble never heard of Bristow, until he read about him in the press.²¹⁰

Droege has confirmed that Grant Bristow did not attend the nomination meeting. Droege and the others were there, he said, to lend support to Gamble and they urged people they knew to work for him. Droege said they only involved people who he knew could vote.²¹¹

The Appeal. At a meeting on April 2, 1993 the Executive Council of the Reform Party nullified the nomination of Gamble. On May 8, 1993 a hearing took place in Calgary to hear Gamble's appeal.

²⁰⁸ Lublin denied he was involved with the meeting.

²⁰⁹ SIRC interview of Source.

²¹⁰ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²¹¹ SIRC interview of Wolfgang Droege.

Ron Wood told SIRC that there was never any evidence of a conspiracy, but Gamble, as an ex-Tory, raised questions in the Reform Party as to what was happening and whether the purpose of his candidacy was to embarrass the Party.²¹²

Gamble and senior members of the riding association went to Calgary to appeal and said they brought with them the ballots which members in the riding were asked to fill out. In Calgary, according to Gamble, little notice was taken of the ballots and this convinced him that the Executive Council's decision was made before he arrived.²¹³

Another document that Gamble brought was a letter from Paul Fromm. John Gamble met Paul Fromm when the former was a Conservative Member of Parliament. He had received some Citizens for Foreign Aid Reform (C-FAR) literature and, since Gamble was concerned about taxes and where foreign aid money was going, he arranged a get-together between several Mps and Fromm. The two would later meet on several occasions.²¹⁴

Fromm attended a World Anti-Communist League conference in San Diego, which Gamble did not attend; nor Gamble says, did he send Fromm.²¹⁵ During the March 1993 nomination issue, a member of Gamble's staff heard that Fromm was described as the Secretary for the World Anti-Communist League and the staff member asked Fromm for a letter. The letter from Fromm, dated May 6, 1993 states that he never held the position of "*second in command to former MP John Gamble in the Canadian Branch of the World Anti-Communist League.*" Gamble says he last spoke to Fromm nine or ten years ago.

At lunch, Gamble held a press conference to announce what had happened. He stated that the Executive Council members did not appreciate the move.²¹⁶ About ten days later, the memberships of those who launched the appeal were revoked.²¹⁷

Kim Campbell. One of the statements made in support of the

²¹² SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

²¹³ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²¹⁴ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²¹⁵ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²¹⁶ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²¹⁷ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

Conservative conspiracy theory was that Gamble, a former Tory, met with Conservative leadership candidate Kim Campbell and MP Bobbie Sparrow in Calgary the same day as he appeared at his Reform Party appeal hearing.²¹⁸ People in the Reform Party thought it odd that a Progressive Conservative leadership candidate would take time out from her busy schedule to meet with a former Tory.²¹⁹

The evening of the appeal hearing in Calgary, the four members of the Reform Riding Association dined at the Calgary Inn and had nothing to do after dinner. Campbell and Bobbie Sparrow had a meeting in the hotel to encourage others to come to Ottawa to support Campbell. Gamble and Andrus met a lot of people they knew while walking in the halls and they decided to drop into the reception room.

Inside, they chatted with Sparrow and Kim Campbell, but, said Gamble and David Andrus, it was no more than a social meeting and nothing about Reform was discussed. Andrus and Gamble then went to another reception room and popped their heads into a Carol Channing performance which was underway at the time.²²⁰

After the Gamble expulsion, Van Seters said he was contacted by Bobbie Sparrows' campaign manager by telephone. This person was trying to obtain more "Gamble Affair" information.²²¹

7.6.9 Plots and Parties

In April or May of 1993, Allore, Gamble, David Andrus and Lublin met to talk about forming a new political party and setting up a constitution.²²² They concluded that it was too much work and too close to the election. Andrus was not well and could not devote the energy required to do the work properly. They had a couple of meetings to discuss the concept, but nothing resulted.²²³

Richard Van Seters, a Gamble supporter, said that Lublin

²¹⁸ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²¹⁹ SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

²²⁰ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²²¹ SIRC interview of Richard Van Seters.

²²² SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²²³ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

was sympathetic toward John Gamble and the controversy offered Lublin an opportunity to get some more attention.²²⁴

Conservatives and Lublin. Gamble said he had run against the Conservatives in 1988 as an independent and had no knowledge of any Conservative plot against the Reform Party, having left the Pcs in 1985. He joined the Progressive Conservative provincial party in Ontario earlier this year (1994).

Gamble thinks he met Michael Lublin before the nomination meeting. Lublin went to Gamble's home and told him about his experience with the Kitchener Waterloo Reform association.²²⁵ During the accusations against Gamble, Lublin came forward to say that Gamble was not anti-semitic.²²⁶

Michael Lublin has informed the Review Committee that he suggested to Droege that he attend the Reform Party meeting as a way to discredit the Party.²²⁷ He later denied he was involved.²²⁸

Other Theories. Richard Van Seters, Former Chair of the Reform Don Valley West Nomination Committee said he was not certain whether the Heritage Front was sent by Reform to discredit John Gamble to have him tossed out. One possible reason, said Van Seters, was the fear that Gamble might be a threat, that is, might vie for the Reform Party leadership as he did in the Conservative Party.²²⁹ Van Seters thought that comments by Ron Wood, Preston Manning's press secretary, after the Reform Party hearing in Calgary were consistent with this theory. Joe Clark, Van Seters pointed out, had a business relationship with Reform Party Chairman, Clifford Fryers.²³⁰

Van Seters said that during the 1993 federal election campaign, a former Minister in the Conservative Party, Dorothy Dobbie, was an observer at a Winnipeg Reform Assembly and was

²²⁴ SIRC interview of Richard Van Seters, Former Campaign Worker for John Gamble.

²²⁵ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²²⁶ SIRC interview of John Gamble.

²²⁷ SIRC interview of Michael Lublin.

²²⁸ SIRC interview with Michael Lublin.

²²⁹ SIRC interview of Richard Van Seters.

²³⁰ SIRC interview of Richard Van Seters.

actively trying to contact Reform dissidents. Van Seters said that among those she contacted were Louis Allore and Michael Lublin.²³¹ Lublin confirmed the contact. Dobbie told SIRC that she did have some contact with Allore and Lublin during September/October 1993. She said that she never provided any instructions to them to discredit the Reform Party and she said she never had any contact with the Heritage Front or Grant Bristow.²³²

David Andrus would add another theory: the HF presence created the perception that Gamble was associated with that group and "one wonders if Reform at the senior level used the HF". "They (the Overfield group) were used as bodyguards and everyone was told to use them; there was something more going on than meets the eye."²³³

It was learned in early April 1993, that Michael Lublin told Droege that he had advised the media that the Heritage Front was asked by someone in the senior level of the Reform Party to come out and draw the connection between John Gamble and the HF to discredit Gamble.

7.6.10 David Andrus

David Andrus was the former President of Don Valley West Riding Association of the Reform Party. Reform Party officials point to Andrus as one of those who may have been involved in a campaign to discredit the Reform Party, possibly by using the Heritage Front.

Andrus was at one time the business partner of Michael Wilson, former Conservative Finance Minister, and had helped to run Wilson's election campaign.²³⁴ He had also once been a fund-raiser for the Liberal Party. He joined the Reform Party after speaking with Preston Manning and attending the Saskatoon Assembly.²³⁵

Don Valley West Riding. Andrus lived in the Don Valley West riding and, as he had been involved in running political campaigns before,

²³¹ SIRC interview of Richard Van Seters.

²³² SIRC interview of Dorothy Dobbie.

²³³ SIRC interview of David Andrus.

²³⁴ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President, Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

²³⁵ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President, Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

he became President of the riding association for the Reform Party, probably in March 1992. Andrus said that it was an experienced seasoned riding executive in contrast to many other Reform associations at the time.²³⁶

Andrus said he set up a Nominating Committee which he did not sit on to select a candidate as he thought it was not appropriate. The Nominating Committee selected 3 candidates, among them, John Gamble, the only one with political experience.²³⁷

All candidates were to be heard by the membership at large at a meeting on May 27, 1993. Some days beforehand, Andrus received a call and was told to say that Gamble should not be nominated.²³⁸

At the nomination meeting, Droege and his group attended en masse; several other riding presidents attended the meeting and asked Andrus, "*did you know that Droege was over there*".

Andrus said he told Droege, "*I don't know why you're here, but I want you to understand this is a private meeting*". Andrus said he would have had them thrown out by the police if they spoke out. Droege and his associates stood at the back of the auditorium and cheered enthusiastically for Gamble, in a very noticeable manner.²³⁹

After the meeting, the media interviewed Gamble, Droege, and Andrus. Droege said he was there to see that the right candidate was chosen. In hindsight, said Andrus, he should have had them thrown out.²⁴⁰

²³⁶ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

²³⁷ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

²³⁸ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

²³⁹ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

²⁴⁰ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

Andrus said he knew nothing about the Heritage Front and he said he was never associated with them. Andrus said that to be "branded" as a racist was a mean blow and there was no basis in fact for that. He stated that he spent 10 to 11 years as Executive Officer for World Vision in Canada and was the International Treasurer for the aid agency, a role inconsistent with being a racist.²⁴¹

7.6.11 The John Beck Affair

One of the theories about a Progressive Conservative Conspiracy in the Reform Party concerns John Beck. He was expelled as a candidate for the York Centre riding in October 1993 and the theory is that he was linked to Grant Bristow, and perhaps also to the Heritage Front in order to embarrass the Reform Party.²⁴² Hugh Pendergast of the Beaches Woodbine riding association said that John Beck attempted to "suborn" the nomination in Pendergast's riding and the latter saw this as part of the Conservative plan.²⁴³ An unknown caller to MP Deborah Gray's office said that John Beck was a "set-up": he was funded by the Tories and was associated with the Heritage Front.²⁴⁴

John Beck responded to a newspaper advertisement which sought a candidate to run for the Reform Party in the riding of York Centre. He said he was interviewed by John Lawrence, the "manager" for the association. Beck went to the meetings, studied the Reform party's platform and won the nomination in May 1993. he said he did everything "according to Hoyle" to obtain the nomination.²⁴⁵

In a pre-election interview in October 1993, Beck was quoted by the York University student newspaper *Excalibur* as saying that some immigrants brought "death and destruction to the people." He also made unflattering remarks about Native Canadians.

In the wake of the statements, the Reform Party forced him to give up his campaign and expelled him. Ron Wood, Preston Manning's press secretary, was later quoted by *Varsity*, the

²⁴¹ SIRC interview of David Andrus, Former President of Don Valley West Riding Association, Reform Party.

²⁴² SIRC interview of Thomas Flanagan.

²⁴³ SIRC interview of Hugh Pendergast.

²⁴⁴ SIRC interview of Betty MacDonald.

²⁴⁵ SIRC interview of John Beck.

University of Toronto student newspaper, as blaming Beck for the loss of as many as four federal seats in Ontario and alleged he was part of a dirty tricks campaign by the Progressive Conservatives.²⁴⁶

We reviewed allegations that Beck was associated with "*The Heritage Front Affair*". Beck denied knowing or having contact with Wolfgang Droege, Grant Bristow or anyone else in the Heritage Front. He also said he never had any contact with Paul Fromm, Don Andrews or anyone from the Progressive Conservative Party.²⁴⁷

The former features editor for *Excalibur*, the student newspaper which revealed the Beck comments which led to his expulsion from the Reform Party was quoted as saying:

*"she doubts Beck was a plant. She said that if Beck had deliberately set out to sabotage his own campaign, he could have used a medium with much more influence than Excalibur (the student newspaper). "Frankly, I think it was a fluke," she said. "He just blurted out how he felt."*²⁴⁸

The Review Committee saw absolutely no information in support of the allegation that John Beck was associated with Grant Bristow, CSIS, or the Heritage Front.

7.7 Other Issues

Over the course of the Review Committee's investigation of "*The Heritage Front Affair*", a considerable number of allegations and statements have been made by and about the white supremacists and their activities in relation to the Reform Party. This section reviews several of the allegations and the answers which the Committee has obtained through its investigation.

7.7.1 Max French and "Race Traitors"

The Reform Party raised the question as to why, when David Maxwell French was revealed as a Heritage Front member, he

²⁴⁶ Bruce Rolston, "*Reform blames Tories for racist candidate.*" *Varsity*, October 4, 1994. Ron Wood was not available to comment on the quote when we sought to speak to him in November, 1994.

²⁴⁷ SIRC interview of John Beck.

²⁴⁸ Bruce Rolston, "*Reform blames Tories for racist candidate.*" *Varsity*, October 4, 1994.

allegedly called the Reform Party "race traitors".²⁴⁹ There is also the issue of who encouraged French to remain in the Party.

According to the Source, French was expressing a strongly and widely held belief in the extreme right: that in the United Kingdom, the Conservative Party under former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher won her elections by adopting the platform of the racist National Front Party. In so doing, she "pacified the masses."²⁵⁰

Preston Manning was seen by the white supremacists as an agent of ZOG (the Zionist Occupation Government) - an appeaser of the masses like Margaret Thatcher. His success in Canada would appeal to those targeted by the extreme right and would allow the population in this country to vent their frustration. It was believed that the right wing would need another 15 to 20 years to organize and attract wide support, especially after the Heritage Front expulsions from the Reform Party.²⁵¹

According to the Source, Max French drifted out of the Nationalist Party of Canada and towards Droege and the Heritage Front after a "falling out" with Don Andrews.²⁵²

There is no evidence that David Maxwell French was under pressure from anyone to remain in the Reform Party.²⁵³ He had been named, and his photograph published, in an article by Bill Dunphy in the Toronto Sun, in February 1992. It was simply going to be a matter of time before someone in the Reform Party noticed that he had not been expelled along with all the other known racists. No intelligent conspirator would have used such a well-known racist to infiltrate the Reform Party.

7.7.2 Grant Bristow and the Progressive Conservatives

The Review Committee asked Bristow whether he had had any contacts with members or officials of the Progressive Conservative Party.

²⁴⁹ French vehemently denies ever making any such statement.

²⁵⁰ SIRC interview of Source.

²⁵¹ SIRC interview of Source.

²⁵² SIRC interview of Don Andrews.

²⁵³ Droege, however, encouraged French to reveal his membership during the 1994 municipal elections to increase his publicity.

Bristow had two links to Progressive Conservatives. In 1984 he worked in the election campaign for David Crombie. Bristow thought that Crombie had been an excellent mayor of Toronto and he therefore wanted to support the candidate's federal election campaign.²⁵⁴

In the second case, Grant Bristow worked in the 1988 election campaign for Otto Jelinek, solely at the request of Bob Tye. Tye was Bristow's Supervisor at the firm of Kuehne & Nagel, and served on the executive of Otto Jelinek's campaign as a fundraiser. During the 1988 election campaign, Tye and Bristow had a friendly relationship.²⁵⁵

Bristow and Jelinek met a couple of times at Jelinek's home. During the election, Bristow performed two activities: he canvassed door to door the Sunday before the election, talking and handing out pamphlets. On election day, Bristow went to the polling station at night to count ballots; otherwise, Bristow said, he would not have been able to get into the victory party which was to follow.²⁵⁶

Allegations have surfaced about prominent Conservative Party official John Tory and his contacts with Grant Bristow. Overfield told the Review Committee under oath that his "well-founded suspicion" was that Wolfgang Droege "received funds through Grant Bristow, directly from John Tory; also Otto Jelinek and John Gamble."²⁵⁷ Al Overfield adduced no facts whatsoever to support this assertion.

John Tory's law firm was chosen by the former government to prosecute Droege for the Heritage Front hate line. It was learned that Droege told a reporter that it was not true that Droege was being paid by John Tory. But later, Overfield told Droege that they may as well do John (Tory) a favour and both Overfield and Droege laughed. Droege felt that to drop John Tory's name would get them [the Reform Party] really going. Overfield and Droege agreed that this was the right approach.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁴ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

²⁵⁵ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

²⁵⁶ SIRC interview of Grant Bristow.

²⁵⁷ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

²⁵⁸ Droege does not recall such a conversation. Overfield replied that he may or may not have said that.

The Review Committee learned that Overfield said that he did Jack Hurst a favour, he was the one who 'fucked' Overfield with the Reform Party. Hurst had been given ten names to check for Heritage Front affiliations by the Reform Party's Special Committee in 1992.

The Review Committee has confirmed that the above conversations took place.

Tory denied completely even knowing about Bristow until recently, much less having met him. He was not involved in any of the Canadian Human Rights Commission/Tribunal proceedings, though someone else in his firm may have been, he said.²⁵⁹

Overfield then told the Review Committee that he ultimately concluded that Toronto Sun reporter Bill Dunphy paid Bristow *"to infiltrate and create the Heritage Front."*²⁶⁰ The Review Committee has not contacted Bill Dunphy regarding this allegation.

Former Solicitor General Doug Lewis was asked by the Review Committee whether he issued any instructions, oral or written, to the Director of CSIS or his staff at the Service to investigate the Reform Party. Doug Lewis responded, *"Absolutely not!"* When asked if any of his staff issued such a direction, the response was *"One can never have complete knowledge, but I would be amazed if these instructions were ever issued. Blair Dickerson handled these things and we never had any discussions about this and she wouldn't have done so. I can be as assured about her as anybody."* He also stated, *"I know I never gave any direct or indirect instructions and I would be amazed if my staff did. I would be more than amazed if (my) staff took any action."*²⁶¹ The Committee also spoke to Blair Dickerson and she denied issuing any instructions to CSIS in regard to the Reform Party.²⁶²

The Security Intelligence Review Committee has seen no evidence whatsoever to substantiate the allegation that Grant Bristow sought to discredit or infiltrate the Reform Party on behalf of Doug Lewis or the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada.

²⁵⁹ SIRC interview of John Tory.

²⁶⁰ SIRC Hearing, Alan Overfield.

²⁶¹ SIRC interview of Former Solicitor General Doug Lewis.

²⁶² SIRC interview of Blair Dickerson.

7.7.3 Paul Fromm and the Reform Party

The Review Committee examined the links between Paul Fromm, the Heritage Front and the Reform Party. The material we examined suggests that Fromm attempted in 1987 and 1988 to ally himself with the Reform Party and use it to reach his political objectives. Having failed to achieve that, Fromm was, in subsequent years, in contact with those Heritage Front members who attempted to discredit the Reform Party.

1987 Western Assembly. In 1987, Paul Fromm arranged for author Peter Brimelow to speak at the Reform Association's Western Assembly which was held in Vancouver at the end of May. The Reform Association granted Fromm observer status for his efforts. The decisions taken at the Western Assembly led to the creation of the Reform Party of Canada.

In 1994, Fromm told the Review Committee that he was involved with the Assembly as *"a number of our subscribers in B.C. and Alberta were involved."* He said that he was *"looking for people who were interested in subscribing to his publications."*²⁶³

We learned that Fromm concluded that Doug Christie's Western Canada Concept would never obtain the base of support necessary to be elected, and so Fromm had turned his attention to the Reform Association's Western Assembly. Fromm said he attended the Western Assembly because it gave him the opportunity for a book table, the sales from which, proved quite lucrative.²⁶⁴

1988 Activities. Fromm showed renewed support for the Reform Party in 1988 when he went to their policy conference in Calgary. He said he urged the Party to come East. Fromm had made liaison with the Reform Party his priority and he made overtures to Preston Manning to establish an Ontario wing of the party.

As Droege would later say about his own views, Fromm's perception was that the general membership of the Party was more right wing than its executive.

With the assistance of an associate who had links to the Aryan Nations, Fromm made inroads with a Fraser Valley constituency association. We learned that in February 1988, Fromm was in contact with a Reform Party candidate in the 1988 federal election for that riding and a member of the executive.

²⁶³ SIRC Hearing, Paul Fromm.

²⁶⁴ SIRC Hearing, Paul Fromm.

In an early endorsement of Reform Party, the Spring 1988 issue of the *Canadian Population & Immigration Quarterly Report*, published by Fromm's C-FAR organization, contained a copy of a Reform Party pamphlet on immigration. The C-FAR publication said that it endorsed no political party but directed those interested to write directly to the address provided on the Reform Party of Canada flyer.

On August 12, 1988 Paul Fromm attended a three day Reform Party Policy Convention in Calgary.

"Disassociated" from the Reform Party. In August 1988, Paul Fromm spoke at a meeting on Vancouver Island where many in attendance were Reform Party of Canada members. Some of these individuals objected to the racist tenor of Fromm's speech, and complained to Preston Manning about Fromm's ties to the party.

In October 1988 Preston Manning sent Fromm a letter asking the latter to "disassociate" himself from the Reform Party. This letter may have contributed to Fromm's decision that the RPC was not the appropriate vehicle to further his political objectives. Fromm then ran as a candidate for the Confederation of Regions (COR) Party in the riding of Mississauga East.

Fromm informed the Review Committee that when he realized the Reform Party was not going to come East to Ontario, "I looked elsewhere."²⁶⁵

Subsequent Links to Reform. In February 1989, while in Vancouver, Fromm asked a Reform Party member to organize a centennial party in celebration of Adolf Hitler's birthday. The member planned to arrange things so as to involve as many local skinheads as cared to attend, but changed his mind after learning that almost all of the Vancouver skinhead community would be travelling to the Aryan Nations compound in Hayden Lake, Idaho for the occasion.

On December 5, 1990 Fromm said that he was asked to speak at the Martyrs Day Rally where, he said, he spoke about those in Canada who have "suffered" for freedom of speech. He stated that some of the other speakers, "I admit, were pretty radical, pretty off-the-wall."²⁶⁶

On June 13, 1991 Overfield set up a table at a C-FAR meeting to take Reform Party memberships. Our analysis of that

²⁶⁵ SIRC Hearing, Paul Fromm.

²⁶⁶ SIRC Hearing, Paul Fromm.

event is provided in section 7.3.5. Fromm was a featured speaker at a Heritage Front meeting on September 5, 1991.

In regard to the "*John Gamble Affair*" described earlier in this paper, the direct contacts between Paul Fromm and John Gamble took place in the early 1980s. When the allegation about Fromm was laid during the 1993 nomination issue, the Review Committee was told, a Gamble campaign worker contacted and secured a letter from Fromm who denied the charge.²⁶⁷

There is no evidence in the material we examined that Fromm actively supported John Gamble's nomination for the Reform Party in the Don Valley West riding for the 1993 federal election.

Overview. The SIRC investigation revealed that there were several persons in Paul Fromm's circle who were involved with the Reform Party from 1987 to 1991. In addition to Fromm, they were: Peter Lindquist, Al Overfield, Raymond Renwick and Robert Jarvis. The reports we saw did not focus on the Reform Party's activities.

²⁶⁷

SIRC interview of John Gamble.

VIII. THE REFORM PARTY AND A FOREIGN COUNTRY

In the course of our file review we learned that in 1989-90, CSIS conducted an investigation of "Unknown Contributor(s) to Preston Manning's Electoral Campaign".

8.1 The Tip

On November 2, 1988, an individual gave a CSIS Investigator some information about his relationship with a foreign mission in Canada.

He reported a conversation he had had with a member of the Board of Directors of an association which promoted links between the foreign government and Canada. He conveyed to the Board Member his concern over what he felt was unjust criticism by the foreign government of Canada's foreign policy towards the foreign country.

According to the individual, the Board Member apparently responded to this statement by telling him that everything had been taken care of, as they were giving money and support to Manning and his group in the upcoming Federal election. The individual advised CSIS that he thought that the Board Member's reference to giving money and support to Manning and his group, meant that the foreign government was contributing money and support to Preston Manning, leader of the Reform Party, who was running against Joe Clark in the Alberta riding of Yellowhead.

The Regional Investigator commented in his report to CSIS Headquarters that if in fact true (i.e. the foreign government was providing money and support to Preston Manning and the Reform Party), this would appear to be a classic foreign interference operation.

The Regional investigator, however, cautioned CSIS HQ about the source and the veracity of the information. The individual was an unknown quantity, who was both self-serving and very opportunistic, particularly if it benefitted himself. However, notwithstanding the reliability of the above information and given that it may have had some, as yet unconfirmed, validity, it was reported for information purposes.

A few days later, on November 21, 1988, a CSIS' Regional office learned of another conversation the individual had had with a close associate of the Board Member's, who he would not identify. The individual learned that the foreign government may have contributed as much as \$45,000 to Preston Manning and his Reform Party in trying to defeat Joe Clark in his riding of Yellowhead.

The Investigator immediately provided CSIS HQ with the information.

CSIS Headquarters analyzed the information provided by its office later in December. In January 1989, the Desk at CSIS HQ provided the Regional office with HQ's analysis of the information

- ▶ given Canada's firm position on this international issue, the possibility remained that a foreign country would have had much to gain in providing money and support to Preston Manning and the Reform Party to defeat Joe Clark, External Affairs Minister;
- ▶ research revealed that foreign funding of a candidate was not in itself illegal;
- ▶ if it was shown that the foreign government indeed contributed as much as \$45,000 to Manning's campaign, CSIS could in time attempt to make the argument that the foreign government was unduly influencing Canadian politics; and
- ▶ the individual had stated that he believed that it was the foreign government which contributed money and support to Preston Manning; but the contact actually said: "we" which, in HQ's opinion, could most likely have referred to a group of Canadian businessmen who belonged to the association.

CSIS Headquarters also requested any new information the Region might have learned about the issue.

8.2 The International Environment

In 1988, Canada was a leading advocate on an important international issue. The foreign government particularly resented Canada's position and engaged in covert operations in this country and provided funds to support those operations.

8.3 The Targeting Decision

On October 17, 1989, the Service decided to formally investigate the alleged \$45,000 contribution. CSIS said that they could not go back to the informant as all contacts had ended on December 31, 1988.

The Service authorized a three-month Level 1¹ investigation entitled: "*LNU*² *FNU*³ (*Unknown Contributor(s) to Preston Manning's Electoral Campaign*)". The Service cited section 12 and paragraph 2(b) of the *CSIS Act* as the legal basis for the investigation.⁴

To support its investigation, the Desk Head cited the following facts:

- ▶ a contact of unknown reliability indicated that the foreign government may have contributed \$45,000 to Preston Manning and the Reform Party;
- ▶ the foreign government would have had much to gain in contributing to the electoral defeat of Canada's External Affairs Minister;
- ▶ a meeting was to be held between the Ambassador of the foreign government and Preston Manning. The meeting was cancelled, however, at the last minute by the Embassy; and
- ▶ a CSIS target was also showing interest and making overtures to the Reform Party prior to the election.

The Unit Head remarked that the Level 1 authorization was requested in order to undertake a regional check of public records. He wanted to determine if indeed any sizeable monetary contribution was made to Preston Manning by either sympathetic groups or

¹ Level 1 investigations are the least intrusive. They are restricted to the use of public information and access to government and police records.

² Abbreviation for "Last Name Unknown".

³ Abbreviation for "First Name Unknown".

⁴ Section 2(b) of the *CSIS Act* defines foreign influence activities.

"Threats to the security of Canada means:

(b) foreign influenced activities within or relating to Canada that are detrimental to the interests of Canada and are clandestine or deceptive or involve a threat to any person."

individuals, or the foreign government. To paraphrase, he wrote that:

"We do not, at this time, suspect Mr. Manning of any complicity with the foreign government concerned and/or their supporters. Due to the manner in which the CSIS Targeting Policy is drafted, we cannot conduct the necessary enquiries of public records of electoral candidates' financial election statements without an appropriate TARC authority."

Under the targeting policy at the time, the Service could not examine public records of the electoral candidate's financial election statements without TARC authority. The Unit Head had the authority to authorize the necessary Level 1 authority without further consultation. However, because of the sensitivity of the issue, he first discussed the matter with the Director General (Counter-Intelligence), CSIS Senior Legal Counsel, the Chief of the Counter-Intelligence - General Desk, and the TARC Coordinator for counter-intelligence. The Director General (Counter-Intelligence) stipulated, in a written note, that the investigation was not to *"proceed beyond a search/review of public records without referral"* back to him.

8.4 The Investigation

The Service did not use intrusive techniques, such as Federal Court warrant powers, physical surveillance, informants, etc., for this investigation. CSIS restricted its investigation solely to the collection of public documents from Elections Canada to ascertain if a sizeable contribution had in fact been made to Preston Manning's Electoral Campaign; it then checked the names of contributors against its databases. CSIS did not enter the names of the contributors into its databases.

8.4.1 Access to Elections Canada Public Information

On October 17, 1989, CSIS Headquarters tasked its Ottawa Regional Office to obtain a copy of Preston Manning's auditor's report: *"... containing detailed statements of all election expenses, etc. and the amount of money or services provided for the use of the candidate by individuals, governments, businesses, etc..."*.

On October 26, 1989, an investigator met with a Legal Advisor at Elections Canada who provided the CSIS investigator with the following documents:

DOCUMENTS OBTAINED BY CSIS FROM ELECTIONS CANADA

1. **CANDIDATE'S RETURN RESPECTING ELECTION EXPENSES (Part 1);**
Electoral District of Yellowhead, Candidate Manning, form signed 20 March 1989.
2. **SUMMARY OF REVENUE (Part 2);** (no names listed).
3. **LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS OF GOODS, SERVICES AND DISCOUNTS (Part 3);**
(no names listed).
4. **LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS OF MORE THAN \$100.00 (Part 4);**
(many names listed; see Annex B).
5. **SUMMARY OF ELECTION EXPENSES (Part 5);** (no names listed)
6. **DETAILS OF EXPENSES (Part 6);** (many names listed).
7. **DETAILS OF AMOUNT NOT INCLUDED IN ELECTION EXPENSES (Part 7);**
(many names listed).
8. **STATEMENT OF CANDIDATE'S PERSONAL EXPENSES (Part 8);**
(no names listed).
9. **AUDITOR'S REPORT PURSUANT TO THE CANADA ELECTIONS ACT.**
10. **REGISTERED PARTY RETURN IN RESPECT OF ELECTION EXPENSES,**
including:
 - Part 1(a) - Limitation of Election Expenses
 - Part 1(b) - Summary of Election Expenses Incurred
 - Part 1(c) - National Office Costs
 - Part 2 - Reimbursement
11. **ELECTIONS CANADA NEWS RELEASE (May 25, 1989)**
"Federal Parties Submit Election Expense Returns" including,
for all registered federal political parties:
 - Number of candidates;
 - Number of electors;
 - Basic election expenses limits;
 - Indexed election expenses limits;
 - Election expenses reported; and
 - Amount of reimbursement.

These documents are all available to the general public.

The Ottawa Region investigator's report then added the following:

"Documentation regarding the Reform Party's Return will not be available until July 1990 [...]. The Candidate's documents indicate that Manning incurred a total of \$112,366.41 in expenses during 1988, the majority of which was spent on "advertising". Manning received a total of \$23,390.15 in donations from individuals and \$25,975 from businesses. He received seven \$1,000 and one \$1,500 donations from individuals. From businesses he received three \$1,000, two \$2,000 and one \$5,000

donations. Other donations were of smaller sums."

To paraphrase, the Investigator concluded that until they were able to obtain the returns for the Reform Party in July 1990, they would be unable to draw a conclusion as to whether Manning and/or the Reform Party may have received a financial contribution either directly or indirectly from the foreign government. It appeared from these records that a contribution of this size would have been a substantial addition to Manning's campaign. Since Manning was competing in Joe Clark's riding of Yellowhead, however, it would have certainly benefitted the foreign government to support any candidate who might have ousted Clark from his position.

The Head of the Counter-Intelligence General Desk in Ottawa Region added that, from the available evidence it was clear that Mr. Manning's election campaign did not receive any sizable sums of money from the foreign government through its intermediaries."

8.4.2 CSIS Checks Contributors' Names

The CSIS Ottawa Region Investigator checked the names of the contributing individuals and companies against the CSIS databases but found nothing. CSIS HQ sent hard copies of Preston Manning's return to three of its offices and all responses were similarly negative.

8.4.3 Interviews of Casual Sources and Community Contacts

In September 1990, a CSIS District office conducted an interview about the foreign embassy's dealings with the association and about the foreign mission's ties to the Reform Party. He answered that he *"is not aware of any connections/contacts between the foreign Embassy and representatives of the Reform Party of Canada."*

8.5 Findings

8.5.1 The Targeting Decision

First, we considered whether funding and support to a political party from a foreign government would constitute a threat to the security of Canada. In our opinion, the preliminary information and the foreign government's plans seemed to have all the ingredients of a foreign influence operation.

We have not seen any political instruction regarding that investigation. There is no documentation on file to indicate that the Solicitor General's Office either had any knowledge of the investigation or provided direction to CSIS.

8.5.2 The Investigation

We assessed whether CSIS took the appropriate measures to minimize the potential impact that this investigation could have on the Reform Party.

CSIS did not investigate the Reform Party or its membership. In 1988 and 1989, CSIS had a Level 3 investigation against the activities of the foreign intelligence service and its agents in Canada. In the course of its investigation, CSIS collected some information about Reform Party contacts with that foreign country's embassy. The information collected on the Party's contacts with the Embassy was very limited.

Overall, we believe that CSIS had reasonable grounds to suspect a threat to national security from the foreign government's intelligence service, as defined by section 2(b) of the *CSIS Act*.

IX. THE METZGER AND MAGUIRE INCIDENTS

In this section, we examine two specific events that were subject to much media speculation, the arrest of Sean Maguire, and the visit to Canada of Tom, and his son John, Metzger. We also deal with some extraneous matters relating to Bristow's involvement with foreign White Supremacists.

9.1 The Arrest of Sean Maguire

Sean Maguire was a leading American White Supremacist who entered Canada in 1991, and, during a short visit, stayed at Grant Bristow's home. He was arrested, based on information provided by a CSIS Source, and was subsequently deported.

A Toronto Region Investigator said that he passed information about Sean Maguire's whereabouts to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force who then made the "take down". Prior to the arrest, the Service's Investigator said he notified the police that there were guns in the trunk of Bristow's car. Bristow was described as a member of the Heritage Front. The CSIS Investigator was present when the police strategy session took place before the arrest.

Service officers knew, from a source, that Bristow had guns in his car. We learned that Peter Mitrevski was a little surprised to learn that Bristow carried guns in the car. Droege mentioned it was not illegal because he had a Firearms Acquisition Certificate (FAC) and there was no ammo in them.

On September 20, 1991, Sean Maguire and Grant Bristow were travelling in the latter's car, when they were stopped at gunpoint by the heavily armed Metro Toronto Emergency Task Force. Sean Maguire was arrested on an Immigration warrant. RCMP and Immigration officials were on hand for the arrest, as was a CSIS investigator from Toronto Region. Grant Bristow, when he was stopped, had guns in the trunk of his car. Both men were taken to police station 41.

The operation was a cooperative effort involving CSIS, Immigration, Metro Toronto Police and the RCMP.

In the trunk of Bristow's car, police found two guns in their cases: a 12 gauge shotgun and a semi-automatic rifle that was inoperative. At the arrest scene, the CSIS Investigator was dressed in civilian clothes and he was well back of the immediate site of the arrest. Bristow was brought back to station 41, and he was berated for having weapons in the car by a police officer at about the time that Wolfgang Droege came to pick him up.

When the police officers discovered the weapons in the trunk of the car, they took Bristow to the police station pending a decision on whether to charge him. They concluded that no criminal or illegal act had taken place:

- * the weapons were not transported dangerously (i.e., they were in their cases in a locked trunk);
- * they were not altered (sawn-off);
- * there was no ammunition; and
- * Bristow had valid Firearms Acquisition Certificates.

Also found were a red light (not illegal unless flashing), a flashlight, walkie talkies and a set of handcuffs. Bristow said he was a Loss Prevention Investigator and this was his equipment.¹

Droege came to pick Bristow up while Maguire was still being processed by a Detective.² A police officer strongly cautioned Bristow about his having guns and being a white supremacist, while at the same time the Metro Toronto Police were searching through Bristow's car for more weapons or other contraband.³

The Metropolitan Toronto Police Force (MTPF) pointed out that Immigration had served the police with a warrant for Maguire's arrest and this was the sole basis for the arrest. That is, the arrest did not result from an MTPF investigation and, save for the weapons in Bristow's car, there were no grounds upon which to hold him.

The incident report was thin because the MTPF only acted on an Immigration warrant. Bristow was not mentioned because he was not targeted by the warrant and he did not commit any illegal act.

According to Bristow, he owned two firearms, a shotgun which was operable and an inoperable semi-automatic rifle. He acquired these from Glengarry Transport after an investigation, and he also acquired Firearms Acquisition Certificates. He had the guns in the trunk because he didn't want them in the house when Maguire was visiting. CSIS was aware that Bristow had the guns,

¹ SIRC interview of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force.

² SIRC interview of Toronto Region Investigator.

³ SIRC interview of Toronto Region Investigator.

and knew how he had come to possess them.⁴

A former Immigration officer who was on the scene, Harold Musetescu, informed SIRC that there was a "heated discussion" at station 41 about charging Grant Bristow for "dangerous weapons" and "unsafe storage of firearms". Musetescu said that the police thought that they had "got two birds with one stone", and were keen to lay charges. Musetescu alleged that Bristow was not charged because of CSIS intervention.⁵

The Review Committee did not find any corroboration for the former Immigration Officer's statements. According to the Metropolitan Toronto Police, no one, including the police, argued about whether to let Bristow go. If there had been a criminal offence, the police would have charged Bristow but, as previously stated, nothing illegal had been found.

The former Immigration officer stated that the Toronto Region Investigator wore a police jacket at the arrest. The CSIS Investigator said that he wore a police jacket only once, at a later arrest of Tom Metzger. At that time, he had it on for only five minutes, at the request of the police, so that he would not be accidentally shot if a fire-fight broke out.

The Toronto Region Investigator added that he thought that the possession of the guns and the arrest were reported in an administrative report. The incident was mentioned briefly in a report but, to the best of our knowledge the report did not mention that guns were involved.

Press Accounts. According to one press account, Sean Maguire was arrested at gunpoint on September 20, 1991. When arrested, officers found in the car a 12 gauge shotgun, and an FN Semi-automatic assault rifle.⁶ The driver and owner of the car, not reported, was Grant Bristow.

According to a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation broadcast, "the police were really hot to trot to lay gun charges against Grant. But Al Treddenick was going around saying, Hey, he's a friend of ours, which basically means this was our source."⁷ Member of Parliament Tom Wappel put it more succinctly to the

⁴ SIRC interview of Bristow.

⁵ SIRC interview of Harold Musetescu.

⁶ Saturday Sun, September 21, 1991.

⁷ The Fifth Estate, October 4, 1994.

Committee:

"I would like to know, has CSIS a source [who]...committed acts contrary to the Criminal Code with the knowledge of CSIS and did CSIS protect the source from charges being laid?"⁸

The Review Committee has found no evidence that any criminal or illegal act was committed by Grant Bristow or a Source of the Service in relation to the arrest of Sean Maguire and, consequently, the media accounts are wrong.

9.2 The Metzger Visit

In June 1992, Tom Metzger, founder of the White Aryan Resistance (WAR) and his son John, among the most violent white supremacists in the United States, came to Canada at the behest of Wolfgang Droege.⁹ Their arrival, arrest and departure was the basis for further allegations following the *Toronto Sun's* August 14, 1994 article about a purported CSIS source.

9.2.1 Arrival and Deportation

Canada's Immigration Branch had a country-wide alert out to stop the Metzgers at the Border. CSIS knew that the Metzgers were coming, but they did not have the travel details. We have learned that three days before the Metzgers' arrival, CSIS attempted to learn the travel details of Droege's guest, the Metzgers. Droege, however, was holding the specific details close to his chest. CSIS was aware of discussions about the Metzger's arrival, but they were not sure of the meeting place. Droege disclosed that someone would be there (to bring them across the border), location unspecified. CSIS commented that it was possible that it was Drew Maynard who was meeting the Metzgers to bring them across the Canada-US border. The time and meeting place were still unknown.

According to CSIS information, the Source played absolutely no role in bringing the Metzgers to Canada in June 1992. The Source knew they were coming up but he had no idea of how they were to come, and he backed off from the project for fear of arrest.¹⁰

⁸ Sub-Committee on National Security, September 13, 1994.

⁹ The Metzgers were successfully sued for US\$13 million for instigating the beating death of an Ethiopian student.

¹⁰ Lincoln said Drew Maynard drove the Metzgers to Canada.

At a debriefing with the handler, the Source was told not to worry about it and not to ask any questions.¹¹ The handler believed that the Source would have provided details if he had had them concerning the arrival of the Metzgers, and said that he would have been negligent not to ask for that information. He added, however, that he did not want the Source running around asking people what was going on and thus jeopardizing his credibility. He subsequently learned that the Metzgers slipped across the border at Fort Erie, but he never did discover who drove them across the border.¹²

CSIS was unable to uncover the specific travel plans of the Metzgers. The handler had no details on how the Metzgers entered Canada. The Source's involvement at the time was to tell the handler when the Metzgers were in Canada. Immigration knew that the Metzgers were on their way, and they wanted to find out where and when they were coming, and to find out what they were wearing when they arrived.¹³

The handler was asked if the Source encouraged the Metzgers to come to Canada. He noted that the Source did not encourage Droege to invite big name White Supremacists but he would not have discouraged it either.

A television program alleged that there was a plot by the Metzgers and Heritage Front members to "*storm*" the Ontario legislature. According to the Source, there was some discussion in the Front about a "*storming*" and also about the possibility of the Metzgers presenting a petition. He noted, however, that there was little or no planning for either.¹⁴ We have learned that Droege stated that obviously there was no intention of storming the Ontario Legislature. The intent was to cause a confrontation rather than commit an illegal act.

¹¹ SIRC interview of Source.

¹² SIRC interview of Investigator.

¹³ SIRC interview of Investigator.

¹⁴ SIRC interview of Source.

On June 26, 1992, Tom and John Metzger travelled to Toronto in order to speak at a Heritage Front meeting scheduled for June 27. In the early hours of June 28, a joint police-Immigration operation led to the arrest of the Metzgers on charges related to the *Immigration Act*. An immigration adjudicator ruled, on July 2, 1992, that the Metzger's were guilty of entering Canada intending to break Canada's hate laws. Ninety minutes after the decision was made, the Metzgers were escorted out of the country.

After their deportation, Bristow returned the Metzgers' luggage to them in Buffalo, New York at 11:30 in the evening. According to the Source, Bristow spent approximately 15 minutes with them at the bar and then another 15 minutes in the Metzgers' room. He then drove back to Toronto because he had to work the next morning.¹⁵

Wolfgang Droege was with the Metzgers when they were arrested on the Immigration warrant. Droege, as was the case with Bristow in the Maguire arrest, was not detained by the police.

When asked whether Bristow had provided any money, the Source indicated that Bristow did not provide money to the Metzgers but he shared with others the extra money required to change the Metzgers' plane tickets to return to California, after having been deported to Buffalo. No cash was given to the Metzgers.¹⁶ CSIS' records indicate that the tickets were paid for using Droege's credit card.

9.2.2 Information on Jewish Groups

The Source said that Bristow absolutely did not pass money or personal information on members of the Jewish community to White Supremacists in the United States. Nor did Bristow provide information on any Heritage Front target groups or individuals to Tom Metzger; and, in any case, Tom Metzger had more information on American Jewish groups than the Heritage Front did.¹⁷

Media allegations were that Bristow visited the Metzgers in California. He told us that he had never been to California, but his wallet, which had been lost or stolen, had ended up there in the 1970s; Bristow learned this when he was detained in Chicago on the return flight from Libya in 1989. Bristow said that Tom Metzger had not asked him for a list of Canadian companies in

¹⁵ SIRC interview of Source.

¹⁶ SIRC interview of Investigator.

¹⁷ SIRC interview of Source.

California, but Gerald Lincoln had sent one down, possibly provided by British Columbia racist, Tony McAleer.¹⁸ Lincoln said he never provided any information to the Metzgers.

The information provided to the media by the Metzgers was fabricated.

We learned that on August 17, 1994 Tom Metzger suggested to Droege that, in the wake of the Dunphy article three days before, it would be the perfect time to leak that that traitor up there was a bag man for some heavy action down in the US. Droege could claim that the guy was carrying money back and forth in order to get the story on the American scene. Droege later told Metzger that the best way would be to transfer the media to Metzger and say Bristow was running across to the US and using Droege's name to make connections.

We learned that on August 24, 1994 Wolfgang Droege informed Tom Metzger that he would receive a call from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Droege told Metzger to tell them (CBC) that Bristow also gave Metzger documents on Jewish groups in Canada and on Jews and on other leftist type organizations and members. Metzger said he knew the story would grow. Droege said that in Canada there are the Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC), the B'nai Brith and the Simon Wiesenthal Centre and Metzger could say that Bristow supplied him with information on these groups and also some of their people. Droege told Metzger to say that he was given information on various leftists, too numerous to mention and that would drive them up the wall. Metzger agreed. Metzger should give him (a CBC reporter) a good story on that or maybe on Bristow giving Metzger money, or about giving Metzger files on people.

Droege concluded by saying that Bristow supplied somebody with information on the Jews. This was a reference to Ernst Zundel.

Later, Tom Metzger told Droege they (CBC) had just contacted him and Metzger 'gave them a line of crap a mile long.' Droege suggested that Metzger should watch the CBC news that evening and asked Metzger, if they really bit. Metzger said it sounded like it, but Metzger had not pushed the money part so much.

The Review Committee has confirmed that the above exchanges took place as described.

¹⁸

SIRC interview of Bristow. The source handler indicated that the account concerning the request for information involving Canadian companies was confirmed.

9.2.3 Publicity for the Racists

On the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation television program, *The Fifth Estate*, the announcer noted that:

*Metzger had inspired his followers to commit some of the worst Neo-Nazi violence in the U.S. Metzger had spent six months in jail just prior to his planned trip to Toronto. His criminal record and his Neo-Nazi views would be enough to bar him from Canada. Metzger's plan was to fly to Buffalo from California, then try to drive into Canada on Friday, June 26th.*¹⁹

On the program, Tom Metzger said that Droege and Bristow had invited him to Canada, and that Bristow knew the specifics of the trip, adding that Bristow paid for half the cost of the airline tickets. According to *The Fifth Estate*, CSIS was to use the eventual arrest to "make themselves heroes in everybody's eyes", while "they manufactured the entire incident". According to Tom Metzger, Bristow had been a CSIS agent in this plan.

Tom Metzger made some additional statements. He alleged that Bristow had subsequently visited him in California in December 1992, bringing with him the names, addresses, and sometimes phone numbers of people "we consider top Zionists": people to be "targeted". Bristow had also given them money, "Believe me, it was enough money that the average Canadian taxpayer would be shocked".²⁰

As noted earlier in this section, we saw no evidence to confirm any of Metzger's statements. What we did find was that Droege and Metzger collaborated on what was to be said in advance of the CBC interview, presumably to discredit Grant Bristow, CSIS and, at a minimum, to instill fear in the Jewish community in Canada.

We have learned that Droege's agenda was to keep the flame lit and let people know they were out there. Droege said that was why he always sought a lot of media attention and he was making sure there was stuff in the media all the time. He noted that certainly the first thing that needed to be done was that the system needed to be undermined and a good start would be to go after CSIS.

9.2.4 Defacing Synagogues

¹⁹ The Fifth Estate, CBC Television, October 4, 1994.

²⁰ The Fifth Estate, CBC Television, October 4, 1994.

The Heritage Front hotline threatened revenge for the deportation of the Metzgers, and on the following Monday, three synagogues in the Toronto area were defaced. CSIS issued a general Threat Assessment on June 26, 1992 which stated that protests and demonstrations in support of Metzger were likely to occur as a result of his arrest. Sporadic and spontaneous acts of violence were possible. The arrest and deportation were also expected to attract a great deal of publicity in the Toronto media. The Metro Toronto Police, OPP and RCMP were advised and worked with Immigration on this operation.

According to the CSIS Investigator, he received no specific warning about the vandalism. He added, however, that whenever there is an action by the Government against the far right, a Threat Assessment is put out to warn that isolated acts of vandalism might take place.²¹ Regional police forces are aware that after white supremacist rallies, vandalism often takes place at Jewish cemeteries and synagogues.

The Source said that he did not have any specific knowledge of who was responsible. He noted that he may have reported that problems were brewing and that people were upset, but he had no information that the vandalism was going to take place.²²

We found no indication that CSIS had any foreknowledge of the attacks on the synagogues.

9.2.5 The Former Immigration officer

A former Immigration Officer, Harold Musetescu, alleged that CSIS manipulated the entry into Canada of prominent international white supremacists. This idea was also conveyed by The Fifth Estate program:

"A few days later, the Metzgers were deported across the border. The whole operation looked like a smashing success for CSIS."

Harold Musetescu has indicated that, for foreign white supremacists, CSIS followed a pattern of allowing the individuals into the country, and then having them arrested and deported to bloat their own (CSIS') importance. Musetescu suggested that this was intended in the case of Dennis Mahon, but was thwarted by Immigration, and that this was the situation for the first Maguire trip to Canada: "CSIS would withhold information about their

²¹ SIRC interview of Handler.

²² SIRC interview of Source.

arrival from Immigration until after they arrived".²³

Based on our review of CSIS files, and our discussions with the principals, including senior officials at Immigration, we found no evidence of CSIS knowingly withholding information from Immigration about the arrival of foreign white supremacists.

In fact, in the Metzger case, Immigration put out an alert to Immigration officers across the country. This action was taken as a result of information provided by CSIS.

²³

SIRC interview with Harold Musetescu.

X. THE SOURCE, BRISTOW AND THE LEGAL PROCESS

In this section, we examine allegations pertaining to the Source's and Grant Bristow's involvement in various legal processes. We also look specifically at information provided by a Source or otherwise obtained by CSIS, that might be considered to fall under the rubric solicitor-client privilege.

10.1 Zundel's Legal Plans

In early February 1992, the Source told a Toronto Investigator of a discussion with Zundel concerning a "Toronto Star" article on the "Anniversary of the Wannsee Conference". In the Wannsee Conference in January 1942, the Germans approved the "Final Solution". According to the Source, Zundel was interested in having Droege lay a private prosecution against the paper and reporter for spreading false news. Zundel had already had discussions with Doug Christie to find out about all the ramifications of such an action. Zundel felt that if he pursued the prosecution, he would be in violation of his "gag order".

This information was not passed to anyone outside CSIS.

10.2 A Discussion about David Irving

David Irving is a British writer who denies that the holocaust ever happened, and who has visited and lectured in Canada a number of times. During a November 1992 visit, the Government undertook deportation procedures. According to a CSIS assessment, Doug Christie advised that although Zundel had returned to Toronto to assist, Irving requested that he (Zundel) not appear directly connected to him. Apparently, Zundel agreed to this request as Doug Christie had advised that such a connection would not help if Irving challenged the Canadian Immigration position. The Source further learned that Christie had told Irving to hold a press conference to tell people that he had left Canada after receiving his departure notice by travelling from Vancouver to Seattle. In effect he had violated his departure notice and was challenging the Canadian government to act. Christie strongly denies giving such advice to his client.

The information was obtained prior to the Deportation hearing. Doug Christie was Irving's counsel, and Irving did, indeed, use the defence of his having left Canada and then returned. The information, however, does not appear to have been

forwarded by CSIS to anyone. The information is not identified as having been forwarded to anyone outside CSIS.¹

10.3 Doan Discusses Legal Strategy

On June 24, 1993, the Source learned that Droege had discussed with his lawyer, Harry Doan, how to avoid bail restrictions which forbade him to have any contact with Heritage Front members. The Committee learned that the lawyer Harry Doan had suggested that all the members of the HF resign their membership. This would allow Droege to have contact with his associates and not be in contravention of his bail release conditions.

Doan categorically denies having made such a suggestion, and added that he has never given any advice to clients on how to evade a court order. He said that his involvement with the group was limited to legal work.

Before the Committee, Wolfgang Droege noted, *"Right now, you see, to get around my bail conditions, actually there is no actual membership. There is no membership, you see, right now what we are doing is we are only running a group of supporters"*.²

There is no evidence that this information was passed to anyone by CSIS.

10.4 Defence Creativity

The Review Committee learned that Fischer's lawyer, Harry Doan, will use the Defence that ... [possible infringement of solicitor/client privilege]³. We have also learned that the information was not provided to anyone other than the Review Committee.

10.5 Solicitor-Client Communications

We discussed any possible infringement of solicitor-client privilege with the source handler. The Source considered that some conversations were not solicitor-client information, and brought them to the handler. He, in turn, decided if the information was threat-related and thus whether the information would be reported. He added that no solicitor-client information

¹ The "Record Tracking" section is blank. Messages when forwarded to domestic departments, agencies, or police forces, are tracked.

² pp. 119-120, Testimony before the Committee, November 16, 1994.

³ (Deletion of text by SIRC).

was ever reported to anyone else; not to the police, and not to the prosecution. In effect, the handler was a screening control similar to that used by CSIS for the screening of Court-approved intercepts.⁴

We saw no other references to conversations, possibly covered by solicitor-client privilege.

⁴

SIRC Interview of Handler.

XI. BRISTOW AND CSIS ALLEGED SPYING ON POSTAL WORKERS

11.1 Introduction

On September 7, 1994, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Prime Time News stated that:

CBC News has learned some of the most closely guarded secrets of Canada's spy agency, CSIS. They are contained in documents retrieved by the RCMP last week...The documents reveal operations that could seriously damage the agency's reputation.

CBC News has learned that a handful of the documents were in fact very sensitive.

In one, CSIS worries that people will find out that the security service spied on postal workers and passed that information on to Canada Post managers - all this during a labour dispute."¹

The CBC said that the papers were among those seized by the RCMP from Brian McInnis, the press secretary to former Solicitor General Doug Lewis. The material was among the several boxes of sensitive papers which contained Top Secret information about CSIS operations.

The program elicited an immediate reaction from CSIS, the Government, and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers.

The Director of CSIS stated unequivocally that "CSIS has not and is not investigating the Canadian Union of Postal Workers".²

Darryl Tingley, Head of the Canadian Postal Workers' Union called for a judicial inquiry into the allegations, based on the television report.³

On September 8, 1994, CSIS publicly denied the allegations. According to CSIS, the CBC based its story on a November 1992 briefing note to then Solicitor General Doug Lewis, informing him of the impending release by the National Archives of old RCMP Security Service documents.

¹ CBC Prime Time News, Transcript, "Information leak on CSIS", September 7, 1994.

² Rosemary Speirs and Derek Ferguson, "CSIS denies snooping on postal workers", Toronto Star, September 10, 1994.

³ Jeff Sallot, "CBC accused of making mistake in saying agency spied on CUPW", Globe & Mail, September 10, 1994.

The CBC's Executive Producer, Tony Burman, admitted that the CBC story was "put together quickly on Wednesday night on the basis of documents and that CSIS had not been contacted."⁴

The Ottawa Bureau Chief of CBC-TV News, was quoted as saying "that CSIS is wrong in assuming the CBC report on Wednesday night was based on the 1992 note to Lewis." He said the CBC story "was based on a collection of documents."⁵ A spokesman was quoted by the Toronto Sun as saying the CBC would:

"stand by the story although it won't release the document it apparently used to make the allegations, which CSIS called 'without substance and foundation.' The head of CBC News invited 'CSIS to make public the briefing note.'⁶

11.2 The Briefing Note

On September 9, 1994, CSIS took up the CBC challenge and released the Briefing Note, which referred to the "Security Service Investigation of CUPW" and was dated December 11, 1992.

The Briefing Note stated that in response to an Access to Information request:

"the National Archives released a number of records concerning the RCMP Security Service investigation of the 70s, relating to 'subversive activities' within CUPW."

The Note described the contents of the RCMP Security Service records and said:

"The released documents have been taken from the 'inherited files' which CSIS took over from the RCMP Security Service in 1984.

CSIS established a unit to review the files and destroy information not meeting the requirements of sections 2 and 12 of the CSIS Act. The review of these files was completed in 1991, with the

⁴ Jeff Sallot, "CBC accused of making mistake in saying agency spied on CUPW," Globe & Mail, September 10, 1994.

⁵ Rosemary Speirs and Derek Ferguson, "CSIS denies snooping on postal workers", Toronto Star, September 10, 1994.

⁶ Robert Fife, "CSIS denies charge." Toronto Sun, September 9, 1994.

majority being destroyed and others being provided to the National Archives of Canada for historical purposes."

The writer added:

"There is further concern that one document reveals the Security Service was providing advice to the Post Office Management on the activities of some CUPW members during contract negotiations."

It was clear from the Briefing Note, therefore, that the activities in question took place in the Seventies, and were conducted by the former RCMP Security Service. CSIS replaced the RCMP Security Service in 1984.

11.3 The CBC's Second Story

On October 3, 1994, the CBC broadcast new information:

"Now new evidence places Bristow inside Canada Post while he was on the CSIS payroll.

Now CBC News has learned that five years ago it (Gateways postal plant) was also a target* for Grant Bristow. Sources say Bristow spent about three weeks in 1989 in and around the plant, around postal workers, almost every day for at least six hours. At the time Bristow was a security officer for this Toronto shipping firm tracking missing packages. It was also the period he was working for CSIS as a paid informant...sources say at the plant Bristow would walk the mail sorting lines, weigh packages, watch workers handling them."

* (our emphasis)

Darryl Tingely, President of CUPW was quoted in the television newscast as saying there would have been a lot of information of use to Canada Post as the Union was absorbing another one at the time, and a "nasty reorganization was going on." The CUPW President stated that the CBC report would place Bristow in the plant at about the time they were preparing for a strike and

for amalgamation with another union. He accused Bristow of spying on postal workers for the Tory government.⁷

On December 2, 1994, CBC Prime Time News said that:

"Since the original story CBC News has also conducted its own investigation of a possible CSIS-Post Office connection, one that has found no evidence to corroborate the suggestion of spying."

11.4 The SIRC Investigation

SIRC has investigated the allegations about CSIS spying on the postal workers and CUPW.

11.4.1 Spying on CUPW

We have conducted detailed reviews of all CSIS activities and of all its targets for ten years. We were aware, therefore, that the CBC's story that CSIS was spying on, or had spied on, the Postal Workers was not true. However, we tried to find out how the CBC could have been led to make such an allegation.

The CBC's September story reflected, almost word-for-word, the briefing card to the Minister concerning events which took place in the late Sixties and early Seventies.

We can only conclude that it is more than probable that the original news story was based entirely on a misreading of the briefing note to the former Solicitor General.

11.4.2 Grant Bristow at the Post Office

Grant Bristow was sent to a Canada Post sorting plant by the shipping company he worked for, Kuehne and Nagel. Bristow was an Investigator who worked in the Loss Prevention Department, a section that handled theft, Workman's Compensation claims, building inspections, and oil spills in the Brampton area.⁸

The genesis of Bristow's activity took place when a Department Store bought into the specialty catalogue business; in this case a high-fashion catalogue, "La Redout". The Company negotiated an agreement with Kuehne and Nagel whereby the latter would provide facilities for a telemarketing operation. The Company

⁷ David Pugliese, Postal spy worked for shipping firm, not CSIS, Ottawa Citizen, November 4, 1994,

⁸ SIRC interview of Don Wallace, Vice-President, Kuehne and Nagel.

received the orders and Kuehne and Nagel shipped them. They decided to use the Post Office instead of a courier for the home delivery service because it was less expensive and required less paper work.⁹

The Head of the catalogue operation received complaints that customers were not receiving the goods they had ordered, and she passed the complaints on to Kuehne and Nagel. Without bills of lading (not available with items sent via the Post Office), individual parcels could not be tracked, although the company's records indicated that the material had been shipped.¹⁰

In the late Spring of 1990, Kuehne and Nagel management instructed their Loss Prevention Department to check whether items had been shipped properly to the Post Office. The Security Manager at Canada Post was contacted and arrangements were made to have Kuehne and Nagel security personnel at the Gateway Plant to check the shipments as they arrived from the company warehouse. Without letting their own shipping people know, the company sent the Head of its Loss Prevention department, Bob Tye, and his subordinate, Grant Bristow, down to the Post Office to verify that the parcels were actually shipped as ordered.¹¹

The two mens' job was to ensure that the packages were not disappearing at Kuehne and Nagel's end of the process.¹²

Bristow and Tye or other staff went to the Gateway plant every day for two weeks. When Kuehne and Nagel shipped a Monotainer of 1,000 parcels, Tye and Bristow would go to the Gateway Plant prior to its arrival. They would then check the contents of all the packages that had arrived at the Post Office against an inventory list. They spent three to four hours a day doing this. Their investigation revealed a computer error.¹³

⁹ SIRC interview of Don Wallace, Executive Vice-President, Distribution, Kuehne and Nagel.

¹⁰ SIRC interview of Don Wallace, Executive Vice-President, Distribution, Kuehne and Nagel.

¹¹ SIRC interview of Don Wallace, Executive Vice-President, Distribution, Kuehne and Nagel.

¹² SIRC interview with Don Wallace, Vice-President of Kuehne and Nagel.

¹³ SIRC interview of Don Wallace, Executive Vice-President, Distribution at Kuehne and Nagel.

The procedure used by Tye and Bristow was explained by the former Security Manager at the Canada Post Gateway facility. The Security Manager would sign-in the Kuehne and Nagel employees at the start of the day, and he would escort them to a locked room in the bulk mail facility, a room sealed off from the Post Office proper.¹⁴ They would then check the arriving parcels against the inventory list.

The former Security Manager at the plant said that he never saw Bristow at the Terminal alone, he was always with someone. If Bristow had showed up alone, said the Security Manager, then he would have had to help him "because the volume of the packages to be checked was too large for one person to do it."¹⁵

Bristow's former Loss Prevention Supervisor at Kuehne and Nagel, Bob Tye, described the Gateway Terminal operation. Tye frequently checked the parcels with Bristow. Tye said they were restricted to one location and the only "wandering around" possible was through one aisle to exit and enter the facility, accompanied by postal security. He emphasized that there was no access to any other location, save a bathroom.¹⁶

The former Security Manager said "the union employees here (Gateway) were the most self-protective and security conscious of the postal workers". If Bristow had tried to obtain information from them, the workers would never have answered his questions. If a stranger had appeared on the shop floor, the Postal Workers would have called the Union immediately. In any event, people on the floor did not have any knowledge that would have been of use to management, and Bristow would have had to go to a union hall to collect any useful information.¹⁷

11.5 Summary

The Review Committee saw absolutely no evidence that Grant Bristow investigated the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. Neither did we see any evidence whatsoever that CSIS investigated the Canadian Union of Postal Workers.

¹⁴ SIRC interview of Former Security Manager, Canada Post.

¹⁵ SIRC interview of Former Security Manager, Canada Post.

¹⁶ SIRC interview of Bob Tye, former Loss Prevention Supervisor at Kuehne and Nagel.

¹⁷ SIRC interview of Former Security Manager, Canada Post.

In our other investigations concerning CSIS over the past ten years, involving hundreds of thousands of pages, countless interviews, and constant cross-referencing of the Service's material, we have seen no evidence whatsoever that CSIS investigated CUPW. Whenever a person who worked in the Post Office may have been peripheral to a CSIS investigation, that person's status as a postal worker would have been irrelevant. In other words, such an investigation would have taken place because of a lawful inquiry into terrorist or intelligence activity, entirely unrelated to the person's vocation.

The CBC has now concluded, from its own investigation, that there is no corroborating evidence to support the allegation that CSIS, or Grant Bristow, spied on Postal Workers.¹⁸

¹⁸

Prime Time News, December 2, 1994.

XII. SPYING ON THE CBC

We examined the allegation that CSIS spied on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). The story was first published by the "Toronto Star". The newspaper wrote:

*"The Canadian Security Intelligence Service has been spying on the CBC, according to a highly-classified document obtained by The Star."*¹

The Review Committee obtained a copy of the document leaked to the newspaper. The document, classified "Secret", is a House of Commons Briefing Card CSIS prepared for the Solicitor General. These cards are used widely, and are intended to help Ministers answer questions in Parliament.

The Briefing Card stated that CSIS learned from a reliable source that the CBC's "Fifth Estate" was to air a story on racism in the Canadian military. The Briefing Card reads:

"The Service has also learned from a reliable source that Howard Goldenthal, a 'Fifth Estate' researcher, recently contacted Heritage Front leader Wolfgang Droege, in an effort to determine whether the Canadian soldiers involved in the recent deaths of Somalis were linked to any racist group in Canada. Droege stated that none of the military people he knew were in Somalia.

Goldenthal was persistent in his attempts to obtain from Droege the names of individuals involved in the white supremacist movement and to determine the existence of a Ku Klux Klan (KKK) cell in the Petawawa area. Our source stated that Droege reluctantly identified [one individual] as the leader of a small Klan cell near Petawawa. He also stated that the individual was affiliated with a Québec group linked to the 'Invisible Empire Knights of the KKK', in North Carolina, led by James Farrands.

The source also stated that Droege agreed to be interviewed by Goldenthal for the CBC television but told source he would be vague about the involvement of military personnel in the Heritage Front as he could not damage careers by exposing individuals to the media. Although Droege has claimed privately to colleagues that there are members of the military in the Heritage Front, the Service has no information to corroborate this. The Service has no date for the airing of the

¹ Toronto Star, August 19, 1994.

interview."

The Review Committee carefully investigated the "Toronto Star" allegations. Our inquiries sought to answer the following questions:

- ▶ Did CSIS spy on the CBC?
- ▶ How did CSIS learn about the Fifth Estate story?
- ▶ Can CSIS collect and provide the Minister with this kind of information?

12.1 Did CSIS Spy on the CBC?

We reviewed CSIS material and found that the Service did not investigate the CBC, "The Fifth Estate", its journalists or other employees. CSIS learned about "The Fifth Estate" story in the course of the lawful investigation of a white supremacist target.

12.2 Did CSIS Lawfully Obtain the Information about the Possible CBC Program?

CSIS incidentally learned about the CBC's story through a lawful authorized investigation of white supremacists. The information was not obtained from a human source. We concluded that the information was lawfully obtained.

12.3 What Did CSIS Know Prior to Reporting the Information?

CSIS compiled a chronology of events for the period 1989 - 1993. The chronology indicates that CSIS was aware of the probable presence of white supremacists in the Canadian Armed Forces as early as July 1989. The Service was in contact a number of times with the Department of National Defence in relation to information on the issue which the two agencies had collected. Some discussions took place in Alberta in March 1992 and at Canadian Forces Base, Downsview in June 1992, and involved one case of a soldier who was sent to Somalia. He was not charged in relation to the death of a Somali teenager. None of those charged or convicted in the death were linked to the Heritage Front.

The Committee learned that, circa September 1992 Eric Fischer, a member of both the Heritage Front and the Church of the Creator, was actively recruiting within the military for the COTC.

The Service's investigations against the white supremacist leadership in Canada revealed "that leading racists believe that the military is a good recruiting ground." The Service's investigations have uncovered "general information

pertaining to racists in the military. Most of this information relates to individuals in contact with CSIS targets who claim to be past or present members of the military.

12.4 Can CSIS Collect Such Information?

Section 12 of the CSIS Act defines CSIS' primary mandate - its authority to collect, retain and report security intelligence information:

s. 12 "The Service shall collect, by investigation or otherwise, to the extent that it is strictly necessary, and analyze and retain information and intelligence respecting activities that may on reasonable grounds be suspected of constituting threats to the security of Canada and, in relation thereto, shall report to and advise the Government of Canada."

The key question is: can CSIS collect and retain such information? In other words: was that information "strictly necessary" to the successful prosecution of the investigation against a lawful target? If the information was "strictly necessary" to the investigation, then it is clearly legal to pass that information to the Minister.

s.12 "... shall report to and advise the Government of Canada."

The Review Committee does not believe that CSIS should be able to collect and retain information absolutely legally, but then decide that pertinent information should be kept from the Government. Such a practice could lead to a lack of accountability and would be contrary to the major thrust of the McDonald Commission: political control and accountability.

On the other hand, if it was not "strictly necessary" to collect the information, it should have been destroyed and could not, therefore, have been passed to the Minister.

Clearly, when technical and human sources are directed at a lawful target, a great deal of information is collected. Much of it would not normally meet the "strictly necessary" test, but the Review Committee does not believe that it would be practical to try to ensure that every single piece of information passed the test. However, when information is received which touches upon "sensitive institutions": solicitor/client, the universities, political parties, or the media, for example, the "strictly necessary" test should be met.

12.5 CSIS and the Minister

The Service said that the former Solicitor General

"stated a preference that when CSIS had material in its possession related to its mandate that affected the topical issues of the day that he wished to be briefed on this material through the Housebook Card system."

As a Minister, the Service pointed out, the Solicitor General *"adopted the system noted above. The Service, however, was careful to limit its briefings to its legitimately mandated activities."*

The purpose of this Housebook Card, said CSIS, *"was to brief the Minister on any possible relationship that may exist between members of the Heritage Front and the Canadian Armed Forces."*

CSIS pointed out that the second page of the briefing note deals *"almost exclusively with information that the Service had on the subject of racism and relationships that the Heritage Front membership had with the Canadian Armed Forces."*

12.6 Strictly Necessary

In this case, the only *"security intelligence"* information obtained from the CBC's contacts with Wolfgang Droege was about the presence of white supremacists in the military. At the time, the Government and CSIS were already aware of the problem, and so the information was not new. The Service believes that it bore the onus to put the information in a proper context.

The Review Committee believes that the portion of the information that related directly to the possible television program did not meet the *"strictly necessary"* test and, therefore, it should not have been retained.

As a consequence, the Committee believes that CSIS should not have been in a position to report this aspect of the information it had collected to the Minister.

12.7 Conclusion

CSIS did not spy on the CBC, its journalists or any other employees. The information referred to in the Briefing Card came from a lawful CSIS investigation.

However, the Review Committee considers that CSIS should not have retained that portion of the information concerning the possible television program because it was not "*strictly necessary*" to do so. Had the information been destroyed, it could not have been passed to the Minister.

XIII. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

We have considered and discussed the information we collected from the interviews, hearings, written documents, videotapes, and audiotapes which we amassed during the investigation of the "Heritage Front Affair". In this chapter, we provide our conclusions.

13.1 Source in the Heritage Front

We found that CSIS had placed a human source in the Heritage Front and its associated organizations. We concluded, furthermore, that CSIS was correct to investigate the leadership of the extreme right and we were satisfied with the level of targeting which the Service approved.

We believe that CSIS made the right decision when it re-directed its Source to the extreme right from the investigation of a foreign Government's attempts to influence domestic activities in Canada. The Service, in our view, used the investigative technique which offered the best value for money when it instructed the Source to report on the white supremacist targets. Consequently, we agree with the decision to place a human source in the white supremacist movement to investigate what we conclude was and is a threat to the security of Canada.

We concluded too that the data shows that Wolfgang Walter Droege founded the Heritage Front. We have no doubt that whether Droege's acolytes, Gerald Lincoln, James Scott Dawson, and Grant Bristow, were present or not it was Droege who had conceptualized the plan, and he would have acted to form the new organization; he told us that he would have done so with or without their support.

The record shows that prior to, during, and after the trip to Libya, Droege wanted to establish a new group - a group to be more public and to appeal to a wider population than previous organizations. His new group would be designed to appeal, as do other white supremacist groups, to the meanest and basest sentiments of Canadians.

We noted that the Heritage Front was not the first organization which Droege managed successfully. His Ku Klux Klan group thrived fourteen years ago, before Droege's exploits in conspiracy, drugs and weapons landed him in American prisons (see chapter I).

13.2 Leadership of the Heritage Front

Although Droege seemed to operate on a more consensual, or at least stable, basis than Don Andrews and the Nationalist Party of Canada, Droege ran, nevertheless, an authoritarian top-down organization.

We observed that Grant Bristow, Gerald Lincoln and James

Dawson actively supported Droege's initiatives. Grant Bristow as the confidante of Droege, was part of the inner leadership of the Heritage Front.

We concluded that Bristow instructed Heritage Front members about security and counter intelligence methods. The instruction was given at the direction of Droege and took the form of techniques which either represented simple common sense or were ineffectual.

For the most part, we think that the Source which CSIS infiltrated into the Heritage Front did not initiate programs, though he would suggest alternatives or refinements. In the early years, he was involved in counter intelligence, and was often given other tasks by Droege. Eric Fischer, formerly of the Airborne Regiment of the Canadian Armed Forces, assumed the physical security responsibilities. We learned that the Source often provided misleading information to his Heritage Front associates, whether in terms of his conduct in harassing opponents, or when he was directed by Droege to pass on information on these Heritage Front "enemies."

Although he first tried to avoid appearing in public meetings as a speaker or master of ceremonies, we noted that the Source was obligated to do so in order to maintain his credibility within the movement. The speeches he gave, however, involved reporting information rather than inciting the audience to violence. At the meetings of which we are aware, he did not make racist statements. We acknowledge that he made crude, abrasive, and probably racist statements in the presence of his racist associates in order to maintain his position in the group.

13.3 Recruiting and Funding

We concluded that statements which portray Bristow as an excellent recruiter and fundraiser for the Heritage Front are exaggerated or, when asserted by extremists, deceptive.

Bristow exhibited a manifestly abrasive and offensive attitude towards most of his extremist colleagues, especially the younger ones. This approach was both a reflection of his personality and was also purposely enacted to discourage younger racists from staying in the group, we were told. We found no evidence that Bristow recruited anyone into the Heritage Front.

Much media attention has focused on the funds which Grant Bristow provided to the Heritage Front and to white supremacists in the United States. We have shown in chapter VIII that the allegations that Bristow provided funds to US white supremacists Tom and John Metzger are false, and represent a successful attempt to mislead the media.

The funding which Bristow did provide to the Heritage Front was not significant and represented his share of the expenses incurred, which were divided between all executive members of that group. We noted too that from 1989 through to the end of 1992, Bristow earned a modest salary from his full time employment and this, supplemented in a minor way by the jobs he carried out for Droege and others, did not allow for lavish spending.

We concluded that Grant Bristow made some direct and indirect contributions to the movement over a seven year period. But we also ascertained that these contributions had no substantial impact on the viability of the Heritage Front, a group that had no office, no staff, and no capital costs.

The CSIS Source, on the other hand, received little money for most of his reporting career and it was only for one year that the Service provided major funding. In this case, as well, the cost of living in Toronto, and supporting a family, make a mockery of the allegations that CSIS supported the extremist group in any significant manner. The majority of the group's funds, we were informed, came from membership and magazine subscription revenues. During the heyday of the Heritage Front, Droege was earning substantial income from his bailiff work and Gerald Lincoln was said to be the major financial contributor to the magazine.

13.4 The Harassment Campaign

The CSIS Source played a major role in the Heritage Front's harassment campaign. This commenced with the racists and the anti-racists gaining access to the messages on each other's answering machines.

We accept the premise that the Source's activities in this area began on the instructions of Wolfgang Droege. As described in chapter V, the harassment campaign against the anti-racists in particular was, at one point in early 1993, rapidly escalating out of control and threatened to result in physical violence between the two groups. The Source, with the permission of his handler, redirected the previously uncoordinated threats of the Heritage Front members into an information collection program.

This approach had several results. The Source became the repository for the information which the Heritage Front collected.

After learning the technique from Droege, the Source would instruct Heritage Front members on how to collect the information from the answering machines and then he told them how to deal with the targets in order to collect information about other anti-racists. The Source told others that he had harassed some opponents when, in fact, he had not; the threats to a school principal being a case in point. The Source would also alter some of the information on Heritage Front opponents when Droege told him to share it with other persons or groups.

We have described in chapter V how we understand the process worked. The information which we received indicates that the decisions concerning the "IT" campaign were made by the handler and the Source. If the program had been limited to a minor level of harassment, we would not take issue with it. But we consider that the campaign did have a substantial detrimental impact on those who were its targets.

The conflicts between the racists and the anti-racists in the streets of Toronto were well known. The media gave considerable attention to these events and CSIS senior management should have been sufficiently alert to ask what was going on behind the scenes; the harassment program would then have been brought to their attention. We saw no evidence that this was the case.

We are mindful of the mutual harassment between racists and anti-racists which characterized this period. Nevertheless, the Source was involved in a campaign which tested the limits of what we believe Canadian society considers to be acceptable and appropriate behaviour from someone acting on behalf of the government. We concluded, for example, that the around-the-clock harassment of individuals, at least one of them a woman, tested the bounds of appropriate behaviour. We similarly believe that calling an employer to discredit an employee, the alleged stalking of targets, and the other examples that we describe in chapter V required a higher level of decision making from CSIS than was evident in this situation. Though CSIS management should have taken the initiative on this issue, it would have been useful if a fuller account of the complexity of the situation had been forwarded to Ottawa from the Toronto Region.

We do not hold the Source responsible for the omission. He did the best he could under the circumstances to transform a situation clearly headed towards violent confrontation by transforming it into a less vicious program. Had CSIS management been engaged in assessing the best possible options, less harassment and intimidation might have occurred. We do not believe that senior management was sufficiently involved in what was obviously a very difficult situation.

In any event, CSIS senior management at Headquarters in Ottawa apparently knew little or nothing, at the time, of the harassment program that occurred in late 1992 and early 1993.

Jewish organizations and individuals experienced considerably less harassment than the anti-racist activists. When asked to collect and provide information on Jewish leaders and groups, the Source obtained the information from publicly available sources such as telephone books. When asked to provide information on residences or other personal data, the Source either equivocated or again gave open source material.

When information on the Jewish community was provided to the Heritage Front by other white supremacists and the Source had access to it, the material was handed to CSIS. If required, police agencies were alerted. We are convinced that if he had wanted to, he could have collected personal information on Jewish leaders. But he did not want to and, to the best of our knowledge, he did not.

The Source did engage in individual acts of intimidation or harassment, as we described in chapter V. They elicited concern or fear from those who experienced the oral attacks. The Source said that these episodes were necessary, at the time, to support the role he was playing with the racists. When the handler was informed about the incidents, he told the Source to desist and he did so.

We concluded that the Source should not have intimidated members of the Jewish community. We are also of the opinion that in handing over information to CSIS, which in several cases was then communicated to law enforcement agencies, he may have prevented physical violence.

Overall, our analysis of the "balance sheet" is that the Source's efforts ultimately worked to enhance the protection of the Jewish community against the racists.

13.5 Infiltrating the Reform Party

Though we did not conduct an intrusive investigation of people unconnected to CSIS, Bristow, or the Heritage Front, we did follow every lead we discovered regarding the infiltration of the Reform Party.

We concluded that CSIS did not spy on the Reform Party. Further, we saw no evidence that the Progressive Conservative Government instructed CSIS to investigate the Reform Party of Canada.

An issue was whether Grant Bristow signed up Heritage Front members and other undesirables for the Reform Party. Those persons who are closely associated with the fringe right or the extreme right have stated that Bristow actively encouraged Heritage Front people to join the Reform Party. Private information exchanged between Droege and his trusted cohorts clearly shows that Droege and Overfield wanted their associates to join the Reform Party as a means to encourage white supremacist policies (Overfield) or to effectively discredit the Party (Droege).

The statements made by Droege and his associates to the media and to the Review Committee that Grant Bristow signed people up, whether at Paul Fromm's C-FAR meeting or elsewhere, are contradicted by reliable information we obtained.

As regards Grant Bristow and the Conservative Party, he did work for David Crombie in the mid-1980s. As a favour to his supervisor, Bristow worked for several hours in the 1988 election campaign for Otto Jelinek. His activities on behalf of Jelinek were marginal at best, according to people who worked on Jelinek's campaign.

The initiative to establish a security team to provide protection for major Reform Party rallies and small constituency association meetings in Ontario was developed and carried out by Alan Overfield. His objective was to increase his influence within the Reform Party in pursuit of a racist agenda. His intention was to take over, if possible, some twelve constituency associations in order to persuade the Party to implement white supremacist policies. Overfield was elected to the Beaches Woodbine riding executive. The President of the constituency association, knowingly or otherwise, permitted Overfield to exercise considerable influence over him; to the extent that other Heritage Front members or associates also joined or tried to join the executive.

Overfield has been involved with racist groups since the 1970s and he and some of his associates were determined that they would not repeat the mistakes which previously resulted in their being expelled from the national Social Credit Party of Ernest Manning. Overfield enlisted the support of his long-time friend and employee, Wolfgang Droege, to staff the security team. Among those Droege asked to participate were key members of the Heritage Front including the Source. But the Source was not instrumental in forming the group; on the contrary, we have seen evidence that he objected to the involvement of Heritage Front members in this activity. The Source said that he attended four Reform Party meetings or rallies in total.

Toronto Region was advised by the Source that Bristow was involved with the security group after the first Beaches-Woodbine constituency information meeting in 1991. At the large rally in Mississauga, Grant Bristow provided protection for Preston Manning but he was not privy to sensitive Party discussions. Mr. Manning's Press Secretary and others have confirmed this categorically. Mr. Manning himself does not remember meeting Bristow.

Our review of the documentation at CSIS and our interviews of employees have established beyond a reasonable doubt that the CSIS Source did not report on any Reform Party activities. There was absolutely no credible evidence that CSIS was acting on the basis of political direction when its Source reported on the activities of the Overfield security group. This is not to say there were no politically oriented plots at work by others.

We concluded that Wolfgang Droege had a plan which differed from Al Overfield's. Droege saw the Reform Party as his competition and his statements and actions, right from the inception of the security group, were directed toward eventually discrediting that Party before the 1993 federal election.

It was early August 1991 before Service Headquarters instructed Toronto Region that the Source was to have nothing more to do with the Reform Party. In our opinion, the two month time lag was too long. We think that the Source should have been instructed to cease all such activity during the same month that Headquarters learned of it.

As mentioned above, the Source was instructed to cease all activity with the Reform Party in early August. Yet he participated with Overfield's group at the January 1992 Pickering rally. Both the Source and the handler stated, convincingly, that such activity immediately stopped when the instruction arrived to that effect.

We concluded that the August instruction from Headquarters was not sufficiently precise. The message reiterated that there was to be no reporting on the Reform Party, but it did not explicitly state that the Source was to leave the security group. The managers at CSIS HQ and Toronto Region all interpreted the August communication to mean security group activity was to stop, but the Source read his instructions differently, and we can see why.

We examined the reasons why CSIS did not inform the Minister that Heritage Front members had infiltrated the Reform Party. We took into account the fact that the period in which the decision was made was one of transition for the executive level of

the Service, and that the Deputy Director of Operations was the Acting Director for most of the Summer and Fall of 1991.

The Acting Director at the time believed that there was no obvious threat to the security of Canada. However, our view is that the decision was of major importance, and should have been taken by the Director himself, not his second-in-command. We are not prepared to second guess what the Director's decision should have been; he may well have come to the same conclusion as his Deputy Director Operations and Analysis.

In any event, the Solicitor General of the day was not informed about the infiltration issue.

Our investigation revealed that in the Summer of 1991, a person known to some Reform Party officials as a CSIS employee raised doubts about Wolfgang Droege's participation in the Overfield security team. In addition, Wolfgang Droege was identified as a supporter of the Reform Party on June 19, 1991, in the *"Toronto Star"*. The information that Droege was a white supremacist was brought to the attention of at least two Ontario Reform Party officials. Overfield was apparently confronted about the information and confirmed Droege's white supremacist credentials. We think it is likely that the Executive Council of the Reform Party was not given the information by its Ontario officials. Some members of the Party started to investigate infiltration by racists in early 1992, but an investigative committee was not established until the media exposé of February 1992.

In the course of our review, we investigated the many questions posed by the Heritage Front's activities in relation to the Reform Party. We learned that lawyer and former Reform Party member Louis Allore paid Droege \$500 to try to enter an Oshawa meeting at which Preston Manning appeared, in order to embarrass him. Michael Lublin, a former Reform Party member, probably was involved in and definitely knew of the transaction.

We believe that Michael Lublin suggested to Droege that he attend John Gamble's Reform Party nomination meeting in the Don Valley West riding to demonstrate support. That gesture would again serve to discredit the Reform Party. Lublin informed us that he alerted the media in advance of the event.

We believe that Lublin and Droege communicated on a number of occasions in order to enhance their credibility in their respective communities.

We conclude that Conservative Party officials were certainly interested in what the Reform Party was doing and,

further, that a number of Reform dissidents were formerly associated with the Conservatives. We saw no evidence, however, of a Conservative Party conspiracy, with or without CSIS' participation, to discredit the Reform Party through the use of the Heritage Front. Nor did we see any evidence that the Reform Party used the Heritage Front to discredit Reform dissidents who were previously associated with the Conservative Party.

13.6 The Reform Party and a Foreign Government

During our investigation of the Service's actions in relation to the Reform Party of Canada, we learned of a CSIS investigation which took place from October 1989 to January 1990. See chapter VII.

We concluded that the Service had an obligation to investigate whether the Government of the foreign country was involved in attempting to influence the outcome of a Canadian election.

13.7 Maguire and Metzger

In the wake of the allegations in August 1994 that CSIS had an informant in the Heritage Front, considerable attention was paid by the media to alleged CSIS interference in the police arrests of Sean Maguire and of Tom and John Metzger, all notorious American white supremacists.

In the arrest of Sean Maguire, we concluded that CSIS did not intervene to protect Grant Bristow. A CSIS Source had informed the Service that Maguire was in Bristow's car and that there were guns in his car trunk. When the police arrested Maguire, they found the guns and they detained Bristow. He was subsequently released when the police concluded that he had not broken the law.

After talking to the Police of jurisdiction, we are convinced that had Bristow's possession of the firearms proved to be illegal, he would have been arrested and charged. No infractions were associated with the properly stored firearms in his car. The Toronto police file on the incident is thin because Maguire was arrested on a federal Immigration warrant which did not involve a local police investigation.

We concluded that the media's allegation of CSIS interference in the arrest was wrong. We also noted that the arrest of Maguire took place on the basis of CSIS information.

The arrest of John and Tom Metzger is a more complex case. Neither CSIS nor the Source had details of their illegal entry into Canada. When the Service learned that they had arrived,

the police were informed and a joint Police-Immigration task force arrested them after a Heritage Front meeting. As in the Maguire arrest, the persons found in the car with the Metzgers were released, Wolfgang Droege prominent among them.

The Metzgers were the subject of an Immigration alert in advance of their arrival, but they slipped across the border from the United States. After their arrest, they appeared before an adjudicator and, ninety minutes later, they were deported. The Source informed CSIS that Bristow took their luggage to them in Buffalo, New York, prior to their departure for California. The Source stated that Bristow, who had to work the next day, spent approximately thirty minutes with them.

The intense media interest following the "*Toronto Sun*" story on August 14, 1994 led to Tom Metzger appearing on "*The Fifth Estate*" television program. He stated that Grant Bristow came to California to give him money and the names of leftists and Jewish community leaders. The broadcast provided an uncritical forum for Metzger and other white supremacists to freely publicize their activities and to seriously frighten the Jewish community in Canada.

We learned of discussions that took place between Droege and Tom Metzger prior to the CBC interviews. We concluded that, as a result of Droege's instructions, Tom Metzger lied about receiving money and information on Jewish groups from Grant Bristow. The broadcast aired uncorroborated information from notoriously violent and unreliable sources. Metzger's statements were prepared in consultation with his neo-Nazi associate in Canada, Droege, and the comments were designed to - and had the effect of - increasing the climate of fear within the Canadian Jewish community.

Despite allegations to the contrary, the Service had no advance notice that synagogues in the Toronto area would be defaced after the Metzgers were arrested. As we mentioned in chapter IX, CSIS issued a Threat Assessment which warned of vandalism, but this is standard practice after the extreme right suffers a blow, and police forces are well aware of the risk to Jewish and other institutions in such cases.

We further believe that most of the other comments aired during the CBC broadcast were provided by a former Immigration Officer who provided confused and ultimately misleading information. This approach discredited CSIS, the Government of Canada, and the various Police Forces and other agencies involved in opposing the racist groups in Canada. Not incidentally, the television program provided an unprecedented opportunity for

violent racists in both the United States and Canada to be portrayed as credible, honest, and truthful witnesses.¹

13.8 Spying on the CBC

We concluded that the information which the Service collected concerning the CBC was obtained in a lawful investigation. Of greater importance, CSIS did not spy on the CBC, its journalists, or any of its other staff. The information reported to the Solicitor General was not obtained by the Source.

Taking into consideration all of the extenuating circumstances concerning the information requirements of the Minister and the nature of the information collected, we are of the opinion that some of the information collected and reported was not "strictly necessary." If the Service wanted to update the Minister on the threat to national security presented by white supremacists in the Canadian Armed Forces, it could have done so without reference to a CBC program.

13.9 Spying on the Postal Workers/Union

We reviewed the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation exposés of CSIS spying on postal workers or the Canadian Union of Postal Workers which aired in September and October 1994. We concluded that the allegations were completely without foundation.

We believe that one or more CBC journalists misread a leaked Housebook Card to the Minister.

Following the completion of its own investigation, the CBC has, in effect, withdrawn its allegation that CSIS spied on the Postal Workers.

13.10 The Media and the Heritage Front Affair

We could not fail to notice the intense media interest in the wake of allegations that a CSIS informant infiltrated the Heritage Front. We have taken all the allegations seriously, because we have a responsibility to the people of Canada to do so.

¹ A Fifth Estate producer said: "the implication that we just accepted their (white supremacists') statements is false - we did everything humanly possible ... but we don't want to make any further comment on anything that will affect the outcome of the report."

In several cases where the print and broadcast media have made mistakes and we have asked for corrections, we were pleased to find them responsive to our requests.

In some cases, the media have produced stories about "*The Heritage Front Affair*" which attempted to place issues in context and they clearly sought to corroborate the sources they used. We acknowledge the considerable obstacles attendant on any story which involves the intelligence community. Nevertheless, most journalists have, in our opinion, behaved responsibly in producing their stories, despite the disadvantages imposed by the secrecy associated with the case.

That said, we feel obligated to point out that one edition of "*The Fifth Estate*" about the *Heritage Front Affair* was not balanced.

This edition of "*The Fifth Estate*" broadcast presented the testimony of violent racists without any serious attempt, that we could determine, to corroborate the statements.

13.11 Ministerial Direction - CSIS and Policy Concerning Sources

All human source activities are governed by the limits of the *CSIS Act* and direction issued by the Solicitor General under section 6(2) of the *CSIS Act*. It is also governed by CSIS internal direction in the CSIS Operational Manual. In their directions to sources, CSIS officers are bound by the limits of sections 2 and 12 of the *CSIS Act*.

Under the *CSIS Act*, the Minister can provide written direction to the Service. On October 30, 1989, the then Solicitor General released comprehensive guidelines for the use of Human Sources. In the direction, the Minister notes that "*a special responsibility rests with the Service to do everything reasonable to ensure that its confidential sources operate within the law, and do not behave so as to bring discredit on the Service or the Government*".

The Minister further stated that confidential sources shall be instructed not to engage in illegal activities in carrying out their work on behalf of the Service and that they should be instructed not to act as 'agents provocateurs' or in any way incite or encourage illegal activity.

However, the level of policy guidance available to CSIS officers is, we believe, seriously deficient.

We believe Direction and Policy in this area should be re-examined. It should at a minimum provide full assistance to CSIS staff by providing thoughtful answers to a number of important questions. Among them:

- o what kind of a proactive role is acceptable for a source in an organization targeted by CSIS?
- o is it appropriate to have a source direct or be a leader within an organization or movement?
- o should sources be engaged in counter measures which would serve to destroy, rather than maintain terrorist groups or movements?
- o do the benefits of maintaining a source outweigh the benefits to be gained by taking measures (i.e. with Police Forces) to destroy the group?

We recognize that the answers to these questions are not simple. As we have stated in our report, the members of racist groups, for example, go from one organization to another for a variety of reasons and the groups form and re-form under different names. Today's Heritage Front member is tomorrow's Nationalist Party of Canada member or a follower of Ernst Zundel or, more likely in view of recent court cases in North America, an aggressive racist who claims that he belongs to no particular group in order to avoid prosecution.

If CSIS were to use only "passive" sources in the racist right, then the quality of the information available to the intelligence community and to police forces would be considerably less useful at best or useless at worst. Most good sources are active. In the case of the present Source, the information he provided contributed to eighty Threat Assessments over five years, hundreds of reports, the deportation of no fewer than five foreign white supremacists, and the weakening of some racist efforts against Jewish groups, anti-racists, and minority groups.

We note too, in response to the question of "countering" or eliminating extremist groups, that the 1981 Royal Commission under Mr. Justice D.C. McDonald took a dim view of RCMP Security Service practices.²

While the Commission referred specifically to direct actions by employees of the old Security Service, we are not inclined to support such activities if performed by a source of the CSIS. We are also cognizant of the danger that in destroying one group, as opposed to watching it, another one which is worse may be created.

Our investigation of the *Heritage Front Affair* made us aware of the fact that there was insufficient policy direction available. For example, we observed no clear direction concerning what was taking place in relation to the harassment campaign; there was no "global picture" of what was going on.

We consider that the Service should regularly draw up a "balance sheet" on the benefits of a particular source operation. In other words, the management and staff associated with a high level source should regularly stand back from day-to-day transactions to assess the operation in its totality. To a certain extent this takes place during the application process for the renewal of targeting authorizations. But in the current case, a major activity of the Source, the "IT" campaign, was not brought before Senior Management and so was not discussed; we think that this was an important oversight.

Our conclusion is that current directions from the Solicitor General and the Director should be expanded and improved to deal with some of the issues we have described.

We realize that the best way to avoid criticism is to do nothing. Therefore, we do not advocate detailed rules that would unduly limit CSIS in its duty to protect the Canadian public and State. We recommend, rather, Ministerial guidelines that require CSIS management to carefully weigh the benefits and the dangers of each human source operation on a regular basis; taking due account of the special circumstances of each case.

We believe that the actions of sources should not bring discredit to the Service, nor the Government, nor the society in which we live. That said, we understand that, for the most part, targets of CSIS or of the Police are not generally among the

² Commission of Inquiry Concerning Certain Activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (McDonald Commission). Second report - Volume 1, Freedom and Security Under the Law, August 1981, page 270.

highest moral levels of our society. Employing any source, whether among drug dealers or terrorists, becomes a risk management situation in which the intelligence benefits must be weighed against the risk of disclosure and any inappropriate activities of the source.

13.12 Overview

There is some direct or indirect criticism in this report about elements of the *Heritage Front Affair*, but there is one aspect of the operation that deserves praise. That is the work of the Source in close cooperation with the Toronto Investigator who was his contact with CSIS.

The work of sources is important and sometimes vital to the well being of Canadian Society. We are satisfied that both the Source and his handlers in this "*affair*" discharged their duties in a competent and responsible manner.

Both men, throughout this period, believed that they were doing valuable work helping to protect Canadian society from a cancer growing within. They deserve our thanks.

Finally, we would like to put on the record our unshakeable conviction that the Government of Canada, through all means at its disposal, should continue to ensure that it is always aware of what is going on within extreme right wing racist and Neo-Nazi groups. Canadians should never again repeat the mistakes of the past by underestimating the potential for harm embodied in hate-driven organizations.

How the Targeting Process Works

The primary role of CSIS is to provide the Government of Canada with information concerning threats to Canada's security. The Service's mandate is articulated in section 2 and 12 of the *CSIS Act*, which states that the Service "*shall collect, by investigation or otherwise, to the extent that it is strictly necessary, and analyze and retain information and intelligence respecting activities that may on reasonable grounds be suspected of constituting threats to the security of Canada*".

Section 12 of the Act describes the Service's responsibility to "*report to and advise the Government of Canada*".

Section 2 of the Act describes what constitutes threats to Canada's security: (a) espionage, (b) foreign influenced activities, (c) acts in support of terrorism and (d) activities directed towards undermining or overthrowing Canada's constitutionally established system of government.

In passing, the *CSIS Act*, Parliament recognized that, in order to collect information relating to threats to Canada's security, CSIS had to be given investigative powers. To balance this, limits were imposed. For example:

- * there must be "*reasonable grounds to suspect*" that the activity constitutes a threat to Canadian security;
- * information collected must adhere to the "*strictly necessary*" principle; and
- * threats to Canada's security do not include "*lawful advocacy, protest and dissent*" unless carried on in conjunction with activities referred to in section 2 of the Act.

Further guidelines, or limits, were established through Ministerial Directives, which are written into CSIS Targeting Policy. In particular, CSIS must conduct its investigative activities and formulate its operational policy according to the following five fundamental principles:

- * The "*rule of law*" must be observed.
- * The investigative means must be "*proportionate*" to the gravity of the threat posed and the probability of its occurrence.
- * The need to use various investigative techniques must be weighed against possible

damage to civil liberties and valuable social institutions.

- * The more intrusive the technique, the higher the level of authority required.
- * Except in emergency circumstances, the least intrusive techniques of information collection must be used before more intrusive techniques.

CSIS has developed a targeting policy to implement the Act and Ministerial Directives, and to ensure consistency and control over investigations. This policy can be found in Chapter I.3 of the CSIS Operational Manual (OM).

The targeting policy is composed of an approval process for the use of investigative techniques at different levels of intrusiveness. There are three basic levels of investigation:

Level 1

A Level 1 can be approved by a CSIS manager for a period of 90 days. Level 1 involves the least intrusive techniques, for example, open sources of information, police and government holdings, querying allied agencies.

Level 2

Level 2 can be approved by senior managers for a period of 12 months in total. It covers all techniques of a Level 1 as well as various information collection techniques such as physical surveillance.

Level 3

A Level 3 authorizes the use of the most intrusive investigative tools available to the Service. Level 3 includes all the techniques included in Levels 1 and 2 as well as the option of applying for Federal Court warrants.

The applications for Federal Court warrants are prepared under the new procedures recommended by Mr. Justice Addy, in his review of the warrant development process.

The TARC Committee is chaired by the Director of the Service, and the members include: the Assistant Deputy Solicitor General, General Counsel, and senior managers. TARC issues written approval authorizing TARC Level 1, 2 or 3 investigations for a specific time period of up to 24 months.

GLOSSARY

ADR	Assistant Director Requirements
AIM	American Indian Movement
AN	Aryan Nations
ANC	African National Congress
ARA	Anti-Racist Action
BBS	Bulletin Board (Hate Line)
BN	Briefing Note
btb	Believed to be
C-FAR	Canadians for Foreign Aid Reform
CARP	Coalition Against the Reform Party
CEIC	Citizenship and Immigration Canada
CJC	Canadian Jewish Congress
COR	Confederation of Regions
COTC	Church of the Creator
CPIC	Canadian Police Information Centre
CPP	Canadian Pension Plan
CSIS	Canadian Security Intelligence Service
CT	Counter-Terrorism
CUPW	Canadian Union of Postal Workers
DDG OPS	Deputy Director General Operations
DDO	Deputy Director Operations and Analysis
DFA	Department of Foreign Affairs
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FNU	First Name Unknown
HF	Heritage Front
HQ	CSIS Headquarters

HRC	Canadian Human Rights Commission
IGC	Information Gathering Committee
JDL	Jewish Defence League
JSN	Jewish Students' Network
KKK	Ku Klux Klan
LNU	Last Name Unknown
MTPF	Metropolitan Toronto Police Force
NPC	Nationalist Party of Canada
NSR	Narrative, Storage & Retrieval System
OHIP	Ontario Hospital Insurance Plan
OHS	Operations - Human Sources
OM	CSIS Operational Manual
OMS	One Man Show
OPP	Ontario Provincial Police
PC	Progressive Conservative
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
RCMP	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
RCT	Counter-Terrorism Branch
RP	Reform Party
RPC	Reform Party of Canada
SIRC	Security Intelligence Review Committee
SPWR	Society for the Preservation of the White Race
TARC	Targeting Approval Review Committee
TR	Toronto Region
UIC	Unemployment Insurance Commission

WACL World Anti-Communist League
WHF White Heritage Foundation
ZOG Zionist Occupation Government

