

I do say in general terms the regulation should be tied in with the sort of thing which is set out in regulation 18-B. Unfortunately I have not yet made myself quite clear on the one phase of the representation which I am now making, and that is that the Minister of Justice necessarily must act to the most extreme limit, so to speak, in dealing with situations that might conceivably come within public safety and safety of the state unless there is some directive given to him. Now 39-C, as I started to say a short time ago, was not in existence when regulation 21 was passed. There was no such thing as a list of illegal organizations. There is no conceivable basis for 39-C except that. It relates to matters of public safety and safety of the state; that is all in the interests of matters related to the war. It was necessary or deemed necessary then to declare these particular organizations illegal. There is the manifest statement by the Governor in Council that these bodies have something to do, have some relation to the question of public safety and safety of the state. With 39-C before the Minister of Justice and with the power conferred by regulation 21 and the responsibility that goes with it, what is he to do about people who are known to have been members of these organizations? There is the express declaration that these organizations are in some way prejudicial to public safety. He may feel himself driven to the conclusion whether he agrees with it himself or not that any set of communications that any of these organizations who have been declared illegal may get out is sufficient to enable him to make an order under regulation 21 and without going into detail of any case because I do not think that would be proper here. I think it is correct to say that there are men to-day detained under 21 against whom the particulars alleged nothing more than the fact that they were at one time members or associated with those parties or with these organizations.