

taking the onus off the minister in relation to what might be doubtful cases, in which he does not want to take the responsibility. For example, one has heard suggestions that various organizations ought to be banned, organizations of a dubious nature. In those cases where there is no need for immediate action we feel there again the court procedure could probably be adopted.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. That is leaving the discretion to the minister?

A. Yes, leaving the discretion to the minister, quite so. But if he has that procedure available just as a matter of policy we believe he would very often prefer that method of procedure.

Q. If an association is, in the opinion of the minister of the Crown, bad enough that it should be banned, taking into consideration the fact that we are at war and that we have to move fast, I do not know how we can do otherwise. A. We agree with that, sir, but we feel that he should have the right if he does not want to proceed rapidly, to proceed by motion to the court. It would give the accused parties a chance to have their cases reviewed.

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. From your point of view you would be safer with the Minister of Justice than with the ordinary Supreme court judge at this time? A. Our point of view is not that the organization should not be banned if they are performing or doing anything prejudicial to the safety of the state; we think they should, but we think care should be taken to give them the opportunity of stating their case if possible.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Would you be satisfied if this committee decided to adopt your viewpoint? Would you be satisfied if the committee