

The Sub-Committee received hundreds of letters and briefs in the course of its hearings. They were submitted not only by veterans, veterans' organizations and historians, but also by journalists, documentary producers and concerned citizens. The vast majority of this correspondence - over 80% - was critical of the film. In selecting witnesses the Sub-Committee gave first priority to veterans' organizations and to those veterans who had researched and prepared substantial briefs or who had intimate, first-hand knowledge of the events and personalities referred to in the films. The Sub-Committee's second priority was to take testimony from a number of specialists in the history of Canadian participation in the Second World War and, in particular, the bomber offensive and the Normandy campaign.

From the beginning the Sub-Committee stressed its desire to provide those responsible for writing, directing and producing *The Valour and the Horror* - Brian and Terence McKenna, Galafilm, the CBC and the NFB - with a reasonable opportunity to defend the film series. There was a particular interest to hear from those who were credited for the research that went into the series because none of the specialists the Sub-Committee had contacted were prepared to defend it, in private or in public. On 16 June 1992, Arnie Gelbart of Galafilm, the producer of the films, suggested a list of five historians and nine veterans as well as Mr McKenna. Only two of the recommended historians were knowledgeable in the field. Professor Brian Villa from the University of Ottawa failed to respond to the Sub-Committee's invitation to appear as a witness, while John Keegan was sent a post-production script of the film and was asked for his comments. He also failed to reply. Likewise, Max Hastings, mentioned by Mr. McKenna as a supporter of the Bomber Command episode, did not respond to the Sub-Committee's invitation to offer his opinions. The Sub-Committee did hear from Professors Michael Bliss and Graeme Decarie, neither of whom has any expertise in Canadian military history. Professor Bliss, as well as a number of other individuals and organizations, spoke at length about the issue of freedom of expression.⁽²⁾ Finally, a number of veterans were invited to speak in favour of the film series, among them some who had participated in the filming.

Throughout its hearings the Sub-Committee had scheduling difficulties which resulted from changes to the Parliamentary calendar. Consequently, the Sub-Committee was not able to hold to its original plan of hearing almost all its witnesses in June. Left with only two days of hearings in June, the appearance of most witnesses had to be postponed until November. In re-arranging the schedule for June the Sub-Committee decided, in consideration of its objectives, to concentrate on hearing from panels of outside experts in the field of Canadian military history and from some of the veterans who felt that their opinions had been ignored first by the film-makers and then by the CBC and NFB. When the Sub-Committee reconvened in November it

(2) Professor Bliss, one of the most vocal critics of the Senate Sub-Committee, labelled the investigation of *The Valour and the Horror* an "inquisition," and argued that it was a "menace to the liberal, unfettered flow of controversial opinions that is, and ought to be, the glory of a free society..." Proceedings, 8:94-95.