

May I state that I very forwardly put forth the fact that, in my view, it could not be on the basis of representation by parties, but on the potentiality of this committee being able to get advice and opinion.

I object to the inference that was made in regard to our party. It was not discussed at all at the last meeting.

Mr. LAMBERT: I exclude Mr. Winch from participating in the support of any such suggestion that the different political parties name their own nominees.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hellyer?

Mr. HELLYER: Mr. Chairman, it is now perfectly obvious that government members of this committee never had any intention of calling witnesses, and I think it is a very sad commentary on the committee that, in fact, their earlier statements were nothing but vain protestations.

We have had weeks and weeks of interminable lengthy statements from the Minister of National Defence and the examination of his statement.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): And, equally lengthy statements by the member speaking now!

Mr. HELLYER: Much of the discussion has been merely a sterile examination of information which already was well known. I feel the committee has lost a great opportunity. When the committee was set up, the country was given the impression that we were going to try and do a full, complete and comprehensive job on this, and that we were going to have every possible opportunity to get all the information we could—

The CHAIRMAN: Such as going overseas.

Mr. HELLYER: —on all sides of the question.

Surely there will be time to go overseas shortly.

Mr. WEBSTER: In September.

Mr. HELLYER: Some of the hon. gentlemen have indicated that at the beginning they were intrigued with the idea of calling outside witnesses. I would like to know what it is that has changed their minds. Why do they feel that the evidence and opinions of other people would be less valuable now than it would have been at an earlier stage in our deliberations? I beg them to suggest why they have changed their minds, and what the actual reasons are behind this change.

Personally, in connection with the calling of witnesses, I cannot see that there would be anything to lose, and there would be much to gain. The only reason I put forward the suggestion on the breakdown earlier was to solve the fears of the government members on this committee. Now, certainly, the witnesses I wanted to call are all non-partisan; I think, if they have any politics, they would be supporters of the government—at least, if not all of them, perhaps all but one.

Mr. WEBSTER: Avro engineers?

Mr. HELLYER: And, I think the imputation of motives on the part of one or two members of the committee, although to be expected, and although unparliamentary, are regrettable; because if this committee has been anything, it has been just a whitewash of a confused governmental situation. And, I do not think that we have anything to fear; I do not think the government had anything to fear. If they did, then that is all the more reason why we should have called more people, in order to find out what the facts are, and to find out, to the greatest possible extent, what the expert thinking is in terms of present-day defence technology and that projected for the years immediately ahead.

So, Mr. Chairman, I must state again my objection to this decision of the steering committee. It is what I believe to be a breach of faith, in that the