

Q. Why not? A. Well, just -- yes, they would.

Q. I say that there was that presumption, and that they could have cleared themselves had they come forward and said that they were not members of an illegal organization.

A. I suppose that would have been the result.

Q. And these people never did take the stand in their own defence to make their position clear? A. I think Mrs. Powley went into the witness box, and I believe she was there for something like five hours; as I remember the case, she was held to be a Jehovah's witness, I mean, a member of the organization.

Q. She <sup>could</sup> give her evidence in contradiction to the presumption by saying, I am not a Jehovah witness, I am not a member of the gang; that would have cleared her? A. Yes.

Q. But, at any rate, they did have an opportunity of going into the box and didn't do it, excepting in this one case; and therefore it would look as though she gave rather equivocal evidence on that point. A. She was in the witness box for five hours

Q. Yes, but on that point I am suggesting that she was more than a little equivocal. A. I would not like to put it in that way. I do not know whether you will appreciate this fact, but there is not a court in Canada that will accept the answer that I am a witness of Jehovah within the meaning of the scriptures, and I am not a member of any illegal organization. That has been the great difficulty with this whole regulation.