

## The Address—Mr. Adamson

was posted to OCTU as an officer cadet, and I eventually served with the 1st Fd. Regt. But although I did not to my knowledge see him again while we were overseas, I was in close and continuous contact with him during most of 1940. The big events of that year, you will remember, were Dunkirk and the battle of Britain; throughout the critical months involved, Jackson and I were in the same regiment, the same battery, the same troop, and the same command post; and in view of the fact that all of us were being kept on the alert against fifth columnist activities as well as against invasion, it is hardly likely that Jackson could have done anything suspect without my knowing it.

He then goes on to give his opinion of Jackson, and continues:

I have made every effort to remember anything at all that might cast suspicion on Jackson's reliability in the insecure world of 1951. Having done so, I cannot recall any such thing. It is significant that when I read his letter to the press, I concluded that some other Jackson must be the man in trouble.

I remember, as his only fault, that he could be stubborn. But stubbornness is a good fault in a soldier, and Jackson was stubborn in a harmless way.

I have another letter from R. B. Dale-Harris of McDonald, Currie and Company, well-known chartered accountants in Toronto, who says:

Dear Mr. Adamson:

It has come to my notice that there has been a considerable amount of disturbance and discussion over the dismissal of a certain employee of the A. V. Roe Canada Limited, one Jackson by name.

I have no knowledge of Jackson's present standing in the community nor do I know whether or not he has any particular political leanings. He was, however, well known to me in the army in 1940 and 1941 when he was serving in the same unit as I in England. At that time he was a satisfactory and dependable soldier, and I should have expected him to become a responsible and loyal citizen on discharge.

In the hope the above may be of some use to you, I am

Yours sincerely,

R. B. Dale-Harris

There are several others, all from responsible persons. There is one from an N.C.O. who served with him. I think it is pertinent to quote the last paragraph. He says:

The state of affairs indicated by this case should be adequately corrected and in a hurry for the protection of the public. Since I doubt most decidedly that anyone can openly point to anything subversive in regard to Jackson, he should be immediately reinstated in his job with suitable public retraction and reimbursement to clear his name. Please note that time counts with the small man. He cannot wait for weeks and months for justice to function. Jackson is already heavily out of pocket. I and my friends will be following closely the steps taken to correct these inroads on our democratic ways and to get justice for Jackson in particular.

Yours very truly,

K. Cooper

ex L/Sgt. 9th Bty., 11th Cdn. A.F. Regt.

The addresses are all given in these letters. I think that shows that at least there is a very grave question as to the position taken

by the government. His commanding officer, battery commander, troop commander and an N.C.O. who served with him, as well as others who know him more recently, have come to me because I was interested in the case and have said that they know nothing subversive whatsoever about Jackson. Apparently he is being accused of some sort of activity that took place during the war and no opportunity has been given this man to refute these allegations which have cost him his job and his livelihood.

The whole question of loyalty and security is a matter of enormous importance to this house and the people of Canada. In my capacity as a security officer during the war I had a lot to do with the matter of security and loyalty and I am perhaps in a position to discuss this matter with a certain background and knowledge of the problems at stake. I want for the sake of illustration to put on the record part of an article in the form of an interview appearing in the *U.S. News and World Report* of November 23. It is an interview with Hiram Bingham, chairman of the United States loyalty board and is entitled, "Catching the Disloyal". He gives certain very definite answers to questions which I think are of great importance to us in Canada.

I am not one who advocates that we should in any way follow what they are doing in the United States. In fact I have been, if anything, one who believes in our standing on our own feet more than we are. However, they have this problem and they have been trying to meet it. They have had it to a far more serious degree than we have in Canada, and I commend to the house the whole article and the answers given by the chairman of the board. It reads in part:

Q. As chairman of the loyalty review board, Mr. Bingham, your work is to review the work of the 100 or more loyalty boards—is that right?

A. Our first job is to lay down rules and regulations so as to make the whole procedure of the loyalty program uniform. The department and agency boards had been doing different things, so we were instructed by the president to lay down the rules and regulations for the entire program. Also we are the highest board of appeal for any persons adjudged ineligible by lower boards and by the heads of the different departments and agencies. Also we review under what's known as "post audit" cases that are cleared by the lower boards after full field investigation.

Q. Your board doesn't have any investigating machinery itself?

A. No. The F.B.I. is the sole investigating agency under the loyalty program. Loyalty boards don't investigate; they weigh the reports received from the F.B.I., hold hearings as necessary and decide loyalty cases.

Q. You have two main considerations, loyalty and security?

A. No, we have nothing to do with security.

Q. What is the difference between the two as you see it?

A. Security is much broader than loyalty.