

to examine and cross-examine them. If someone files a brief on a matter of this kind it places the members of this committee in an awkward position. It is a matter of interpretation. You have to ask questions of the persons who draw up these documents to get more information, but if you take exception to some of the things they say, and they are not here in person, you have not an opportunity to re-examine them. I think the same thing applies to a considerable extent to the provinces if they see fit to come here and give evidence. They can submit written briefs, but my suggestion would be, not that we have written briefs or written representations, but that an effort be made to call these people before the committee and allow them to give us the benefit of their opinion and of their knowledge of the subject.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. HACKETT: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible for this committee before dissolving to express the hope which might be forwarded to the people we would like to hear that they be summoned by the committee which is going to be named next session we hope, and go further and express the hope that these people to whom we are sending the notice, come prepared to discuss this question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, I strongly support Mr. Diefenbaker's viewpoint. Most of the members of this committee are laymen and are not acquainted with the legal aspects of the situation and if we had the briefs of the attorneys general and of the various law schools we would have something concrete in front of us to consider and to inform ourselves upon. After that these gentlemen could be called before the committee and a discussion could take place. We would then hear the different provincial viewpoints and approaches. I do believe that if we accept a resolution from Mr. Diefenbaker we would have something concrete to work on and the committee next year would start in on a very sound foundation.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: As a layman I would like to support that view, because to me these things are confusing, and I hope we have the briefs first in time to consider them and then the witnesses. This matter may be plain to brilliant lawyers but it is not so plain to some of the rest of us, and we need a little time to look over these briefs before we can ask intelligent questions on them.

Mr. MICHAUD: I agree with Mr. Hazen as to representations being made by the provinces; I think we should have the provinces represented here personally if we are going to hear them.

Now, with the material which should be filed with us, according to what we learned at our last hearing, I think we shall have plenty of reading matter for the recess. I dare say that very few of us will struggle through all the material that will be available for us to read. The suggestion has been made that we have not done very much yet, but we have made a start. It has been insinuated that the committee may not meet next year, but if this committee is not to meet next year we are discussing these things for nothing. I am hopeful that the committee will be reconvened, or a similar committee, and then if it does reconvene I think we should hear representatives of the universities and provinces. They could file their briefs and then come before us. After all, we have to deal with the constitutional aspect of the question which has already been dealt with by Mr. Varcoe. There will, perhaps, be different opinions expressed, and for that reason it seems to me that the briefs that will be filed and the evidence which will be given by these people—the attorneys general—could be much more advantageously used by study at the time of the presentation. I feel that it is too early to ask them to make any representations, because we might meet next year and decide on something different.