

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: All that he has to prove is that he is not a member of that unlawful association. That is an entirely different thing.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: It is pretty much the same thing. He is presumed to be a member of it until he proves that he is not guilty of an offence.

Hon. Mr. MACDONELL: That is ordinary law.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not think so, but if lawyers say so, I shall have to give in. I have always thought a man was innocent until he was proven guilty.

Under subsection 6 a Justice of the Peace can issue a warrant authorizing entry into any man's library and the seizure of all his papers, and they can be taken away. Is that necessary? This subsection places too much power in the hands of officials who enforce the law. As I said before, I would not object to punishment for the offences enumerated, although I do not think we need to worry about them; but I am opposed to giving so much power to officials who have to administer the law.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: Of what use are officials unless they have power?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: A little while ago—if I may be permitted to make a personal reference—I was liable to deportation without trial, because it happened that I had come from Great Britain fifty years before. I made some inquiry as to my legal position, and the only answer I could get was: "Oh, well, don't get excited; you will never be deported." But it seems to me that is no argument in favour of retaining such a law. Why should we empower any official to put a citizen to a great deal of inconvenience in order to prove himself not guilty of any of the crimes that are here enumerated? I agree with my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Murdock) that if you magnify these matters you make heroes of those who violate the law, and you thereby do a great deal more harm than they are capable of doing. Undoubtedly the strikers lost their heads in 1919, and so did those who were trying to put an end to the strike.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: Some people lost their lives.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Who were guilty?

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: The strikers.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I am not going into that. I know something about the strike, because I was in Winnipeg at the time. The sooner we forget it, the better.

Hon. Mr. MACDONELL: We are willing to forget it.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Question!

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: As I listened to the reading of the clauses by my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Willoughby) it seemed to me that many of them were of such a wide range and so loose in phraseology as to cause apprehension to the labouring classes and other citizens who have no special prestige or authority in their communities. It is all very well for some honourable member to say that there is no harm done by the section. Those who take that attitude know that they have such a standing in the community that they are in no danger of having to defend themselves from the provisions of the section. But labour organizations throughout the land know that police magistrates and constables are placed in a position where they may abuse their proper powers. It is feared that police officers may on some occasions make too wide a use of their power to appear at meetings and arrest those in attendance, on the ground that the assembly is unlawful. It is extremely difficult to determine what is an association, or membership in an association, such as is referred to in the section. What responsibility attaches to a citizen who has to attend a meeting where someone delivers a speech that is declared to violate the terms of this section? Organized labour in this country is sound and sane and it feels that this law implies a lack of confidence in it. Labour associations have protested against the enactment and asked for its repeal. The people of Canada respect the law. No doubt certain classes may have radical or socialistic opinions, but I believe that our people, taken as a whole, are desirous of obeying the laws. In some of the countries of Europe the parliaments are made up of members whose views range from reactionary conservatism to radicalism and communism. When I am talking to citizens of these countries I tell them of the harmony and happiness that we have in Canada, where we have no class consciousness nor even a radical—far less a socialistic—party in our Parliament. My European friends wonder whether we have not attained the millennium. When it is considered that from the Atlantic to the Pacific we have a law-abiding people, who are desirous of living and letting live, it seems that this section does imply an unjustifiable mistrust of some classes of our population.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? To what ex-