

is the practice in war time. Listening to you I gathered you want to reverse that and bring in our regular British justice administration that a man is presumed innocent and so on. You want to set up the Crown, the police or the minister in this court to start out to make a case de novo against the interned man. Do you go that far, because if you do we would have to consider a very radical change in the whole scheme of the present practice? Do you go that far? A. We go so far as to say that the method of proof must necessarily be entirely different; hearsay evidence has to be presented.

Q. I am speaking to you just on the question of onus. You understand what I mean? A. Yes, I understand. We think there should be some onus, some responsibility of presenting reasons why a man is interned, perhaps not as strong an onus as a criminal case. There you have to prove beyond reasonable doubt, any reasonable hypothesis. Some presentation of material should be the responsibility of the tendering authority.

BY MR. MAYBANK:

Q. Would you put it, as in the nature of a civil case, the balance of probability rather than onus of proof? A. Yes, and leave to the minister the right to tender the amount, apart from that, if he feels it is necessary, and abolish a lot of the rules of evidence, about hearsay evidence and so on and the rules of evidence that you must disclose the source of your information. Various things of that sort might well and we think must necessarily be abolished in war time.

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Q. Is not your whole point the committees at present, although they have the authority, do not give sufficient particulars? If they gave sufficient particulars would not that answer your whole question? A. I can only say that we