

or such other relative or something of that kind? Would you not accomplish what you are after much better than by trying to amend 3 (a) and (b)? A. I mentioned there was the matter of emphasis involved. I was going to make two suggestions for the purpose of making the point clear. To start with I took the one point and I was going to go on and make a secondary point. First of all, explaining that if there is a court procedure the safety of the individual rests in the independent judiciary. Here we have seen fit, for reasons which I accept, to wipe that out completely. It is a very drastic thing. In its place we have put a discretionary executive power vested in the Minister of Justice. Now the only safeguard we retain, and I think under these circumstances it is the best safeguard, conceivably the only reasonable one, is the common sense of the House of Commons. With that I am perfectly satisfied.

Q. That has been questioned at times. A. Since the protection would only be effective from the moment that parliament meets, my second point would be, if you think well of the first one, that you might then consider the desirability of saying that during the session the report should be to parliament and during the recess the report should be made by some other device -- I would suggest publication in the Canada Gazette, or some simple way of making a public report.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Do I understand your point to be that the family and friends of the internee are not informed? A. They may not be. They are not required to be informed. That is one point, sir, and the second point is, the people on whom we rely, the members of the House of Commons are not given such information as they might be given; in other words, they are not given names.

Q. Therefore you would be satisfied if the family and friends were informed in whatever way possible outside of this