

The Address—Mr. Adamson

I shall recapitulate briefly the facts concerning Jackson. He was discharged from the A. V. Roe Company in Malton on the orders of the security officials of the department. He was given no reason whatsoever for his discharge, and all attempts he has made so far to find out the reason for his discharge have failed. I might add that all attempts I have made through the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) have also failed, because of the policy of the government.

I believe that policy is wrong, that it is basically unfair and unjust and, furthermore, that it does not improve either security or loyalty. In fact it is the very opposite. I left Malton this morning where I was interviewed by one or two people whose names unfortunately I cannot give. They told me that the case had caused considerable unrest among the workers in this defence plant.

After Jackson saw me I took the trouble to go into his background. He served for approximately four years overseas with the Royal Canadian Artillery. I took the trouble to find out from his officers of that time and his associates what they thought of him and with your permission there is certain information which I think would be useful that I should like to place on the record. The first letter I have is from his former commanding officer, Colonel C. D. Crowe, who at the present time is the director of development, department of travel and publicity, government of Ontario. I would not mind tabling this letter if any hon. member wishes me to do so, but I have it here and to save time I shall read the pertinent parts. Colonel Crowe says:

I believe you have taken interest in the case of Mr. G. R. Jackson, 699 Jane street, Toronto, who was recently dismissed from his employment at the Avro plant, Malton, for alleged security reasons, the nature of which he has been kept in ignorance.

I will not recount the details of the case as I believe you have them in full. The iniquity of the matter to me seems to lie in the brush-off this man got at the hands of the security official he succeeded in interviewing at Ottawa.

This official, Jackson states, displayed complete familiarity with his army file, and after talking around that for a while, came out with the statement that the grounds for dismissal had nothing to do with army service but with some alleged devious activity Jackson is supposed to have indulged in in England.

He would not elaborate. My own suspicion is that some ill-wisher has placed a statement on Jackson's record under a promise of anonymity.

At my suggestion, I see that Jackson has given his story to the local press some days ago. I am writing now at his request to express the hope that you will pursue this matter to finality and to tell you that in my belief you can do so with complete confidence as far as Jackson's character is concerned. I simply cannot picture him in the role of communist sympathizer, and I am sure his spare time in England was devoted to his own amusements, like most soldiers, and not to attending subversive meetings.

[Mr. Adamson.]

I commanded his unit for four months in Canada and then for two years in England (11th Canadian Army Field Regiment, Royal Canadian Army). When he came into my office I immediately remembered him very clearly. In my time he had the rank of lance-sergeant and was employed as a "gun-position officer's assistant" which called for a fair education (plane trigonometry) and general reliability and know-how.

I remember dealing summarily with two or three charges against him—overstaying leave, leaving the guard room when in command of a guard and things of that order. His main fault was probably being too mouthy but there was nothing sly about him—a plain extrovert.

I have questioned him at some length here and have formed the conclusion that in this case the present government's celebrated "screening" machinery has slipped badly and that injustice has been done. This injustice could only be corrected if officialdom would come clean and tell the man what they have against him and give him a chance to refute or explain the allegation.

I am certain that in taking up his case you are on sound ground.

Yours very truly,

C. D. Crowe
Lieutenant Colonel RCA (Ret.).

I have another letter from a personal friend of mine, W. E. Fleury, of Fleury and Arthur, well-known architects. Mr. Fleury writes to me personally as follows:

Dear Rodney:

I understand from Jackson that you are investigating the case of his dismissal from the A. V. Roe Canada Limited on grounds of alleged subversive activities in England during the last war.

He dropped into my office on Friday last, November 16, and mentioned that you would be pleased to receive any comments which I—as a former officer of his—would care to make to you.

Jackson was a member of the battery in which I enlisted in December, 1939, and had become a lance-sergeant (C.P.O.A.) before the time when I left the regiment in January, 1941.

During that time there certainly was no indication of any extra-regimental activities by Jackson to my knowledge, and I have since spoken to one or two officers who were in the regiment at that time, and they have indicated that they were unaware of it—if any such activities were taking place.

I may say that Jackson carried out his duties efficiently, and if any criticism were to be made, it would probably be that he had a tendency to be a bit of a barrack-room lawyer and a trifle over-verbose at times.

I should be pleased to hear from you, if it is not too much trouble, whatever developments arise out of your enquiries. For while naturally one cannot know all the circumstances concerning a man's activities outside of the regiment, I should be very surprised to learn that Jackson was indulging in subversive work during the time when I knew him in the regiment.

With kindest regards

Yours very sincerely,
W. E. Fleury

I have another letter from Professor J. Fisher of Victoria University. He states that he is a professor of English and was visited by Jackson who had served under him. He then goes on to say in part:

What I have to say about him (Jackson) relates to the year 1940 only. On Dec. 14 of that year, I