

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any concrete examples to support that statement?

WITNESS: We think that section 21 in itself is, with proper safeguards provided to allow making an appeal within reasonable time -- after all, the Minister of Justice is a busy man and he cannot hear every case -- we think section 21 in itself is not particularly offensive; as a matter of fact, I think it probably could be rescinded. I believe appeal boards have been constituted now and I understand hearings are proceeding more rapidly than they did originally. But originally, three years ago, men were detained ten months or a year or a year and a half before they finally got a hearing and were released. As you know, there were then only two judges; one for the western part of Canada and one for the eastern part of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you state that there were some people interned who had to wait a year or over a year before they could make an application for appeal?

WITNESS: I cannot say as to when the actual date of the hearing was. I do know that there people who were interned who were released after a hearing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh yes.

WITNESS: There are three stages: they are entitled to apply and they are supplied with a form which is filled out and filed; later on the hearing takes place -- I know of a case in which my own office was interested in which there were quite long delays in getting hearings; and, even after the hearing there was a considerable time before a decision was rendered, and there was reluctance on the part of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to act upon it.

MR. DUPUIS: Which one did you have in mind?

WITNESS: I had not intended to cite a particular case, but there is the case of Colonel Carneil, and there is also