

whole thing should be dismissed.

By MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Do you claim a decision in a case like this should settle the whole question of Jehovah's witnesses? A. Now I say the effect of this order in council is that it forbids entirely, strikes out entirely for thousands of Christian people in Canada the right to worship God.

BY MR. HANSELL:

Q. And the right to function as an organization in these things? A. Yes,

Q. Celebrating the Lord's supper, the ceremony of baptism and so forth and so on? A. Yes.

BY MR. MAYBANK:

Q. This simple question occurred to me. You and a number of others could assist in circumstances such as you have indicated, the Thessalonian story and the Welland story -- the better case is that of the one family -- but you realize it is not incumbent upon the Crown in such cases to show that you were then doing or at any other time something subversive. It is not incumbent -- A. No, it is not.

Q. They only had to show you are members of an illegal organization. But I should like to ask you this, whether or not there has ever been a case where in the course of the prosecution an endeavour has been made to show something, some overt act of a subversive nature. Has the Crown undertaken to show at any stage anything like that? I know they would be going outside the powers of -- A. Partially I deal with that on page 23 from the point of view of disaffection, but I think I can answer that and say that there never has been a case where they have engaged in any act of a subversive nature, not at all, there never has been any such thing as that.

Q. What about this? You are not a Jehovah's witness,