

*The Address—Mr. Adamson*

an opportunity to appeal and to be heard by the security board of the department in which he is employed. Nothing like that procedure exists in Canada. He has no opportunity at all. He is discharged and he has no redress and no opportunity to answer, not charges that he knows of but charges that he does not know of. In my opinion that is an intolerable miscarriage of justice. As to the question of loyalty and security, there are basic differences between them but both can be treated by the same machinery. I want to say that nothing I propose to suggest will in any way give away the hand of the security officers or the subversive activity officers engaged in the various departments of government or in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The thing can be done without in any way disclosing the operations of any undercover individual who may be working at the present time in Canada.

There are today three basic freedoms: freedom of life; freedom of the person, generally known as habeas corpus; and the freedom to work. To take away any of them in this modern age results in a failure of essential justice. In fact, it is much worse; it is the act of a dictatorship. Today if a man is discharged for security or loyalty reasons he finds it virtually impossible to obtain further employment. When he goes to a prospective employer the first questions he is asked are: Where did you work before? Why did you leave? Then the immediate answer to the employee discharged for security reasons is: Oh, we want no communists here; and that is the natural answer. The result is that the man does not get a job. Unless that man has an opportunity to hear the charges raised against him, and answer them if he can, it is impossible for him to obtain a livelihood in Canada today. If he is a communist, I have no mercy on him. He is a declared enemy of mine, and nothing I can do or would advocate doing to keep him out of our society could be sufficiently drastic. But it is basic that you cannot accuse a man of anything, and thus deprive him of his right to make a living, without letting him know what he is accused of doing. That, Mr. Speaker, is a basic principle of justice. It is the third great freedom; and in this economic age of our civilization it is as basic as the other two.

I want to make a suggestion to the government, and it is this. I suggest that there be established panels of personnel available to sit on security and loyalty boards, and that no man be discharged for security or loyalty reasons without having an opportunity to state his case before one of those boards. I would suggest that the composition of those boards be something like

this. I suggest that there be set up in the department in question a panel of personnel from which the boards may be chosen. In other words the Department of National Defence would have a panel of personnel who could be drawn on to form the membership of these boards; the Department of Defence Production would have a panel of personnel, as would the Department of External Affairs and the other departments necessarily doing secret or what has been called classified work, from which personnel can be drawn. Second, I suggest that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) have a panel of personnel drawn from persons of probity known to him and possibly known either through the mounted police dealing with security or legal counsel or others of good repute and sound judgment. I suggest that the third panel be chosen by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It need not necessarily be chosen from members of the House of Commons, but I feel that it should contain a fair number of members of this honourable house; because if there is any function we have today in Canada, and if there is any function any freely elected parliament has, it is to protect the freedom of the individual. The freedom of an individual can be in jeopardy from his own government just as easily as it can be in jeopardy from the government of an outside power. I suggest that these three panels be set up. When there is a case for investigation, one member from each of the three panels could be chosen as a board to review the case. The evidence against the individual could be given to the board, and he could appear to reply. Under this system there need be no disclosure of the methods by which the evidence was obtained. The board would deal with the case of each individual who appealed against his dismissal.

Under this method, Mr. Speaker, you would have security through the departmental member of the board who would know the type of work being done by the individual; you would have loyalty through the board member appointed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson). Furthermore, through the appointment by the Speaker of this house you would safeguard the liberty of the individual. My knowledge of security, loyalty and subversive activities during the war was reasonably extensive. As district intelligence officer for the largest military district in Canada my office worked with the mounted police, who were entirely responsible for loyalty, security and subversive activities. The fact that there was so little subversive activity in Canada during the war illustrates the