

Mr. FORRESTALL: I have no objection to the tabling of the briefs, but I would like to have, in its proper context, the other side of a certain inference and I agree with Mr. Deachman that indeed—

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we should table these and make them part of the record of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of today?

Mr. LANIEL: Mr. Chairman, as long as someone does not come along later and say, "Well, I have written a brief about the Navy or about the Air Force; could it be included in the evidence?"

An hon. MEMBER: We deal with them as we see them.

The CHAIRMAN: The Admiral would like to read now. Have you outlined how far you wish him to read?

Mr. FORRESTALL: Oh, just that portion dealing with the meetings. He can paraphrase it; it is not necessary for him to read it or, if he chooses to read it, that is all right.

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: Prior to that I endeavoured to show you in the brief that I was very seriously concerned about the morale of the officers and that I felt it necessary to take some action with respect to it. Now, quoting from the brief, page 8, bottom line—

I decided to act, to check this deterioration of morale amongst my officers. The way I acted, and it is this that caused the Minister's "spokesman" to hint I had intimated my officers and men, was to call to a meeting all officers of my Command of the rank of Commodore, Captain and Commander. This meeting occurred in July last year.

That was the year 1965.

At the meeting I made these points clearly, emphatically and with conviction.—

*First*—That unification had not been defined so we were allowing ourselves to be demoralized by an unknown quantity.

*Second*—The National Defence Act called for three services which couldn't be changed to a single service without an amendment to the Act in Parliament and I was certain that good sense would prevail in this important matter.

*Third*—I traced the events concerning unification up to that time in precisely the same way as I've traced them for you today.

*Fourth*—I told them I could see no merit in forcing the navy to lose its identity and referred to our dress, our traditions, our rank structure, and the designators for our ships. Finally, I told them regardless of my personal views I would represent their viewpoint and that they would have an opportunity to indicate to me what their point of view was. I then asked them to stand to signify agreement with the following points.—

*First*—That they wished me to represent their viewpoint.

*Second*—That they wouldn't feel they couldn't speak openly and frankly about their views on unification in the service and outside. I pointed out that this would be the state of affairs until the law was changed in Parliament. I told them not only was it quite proper to talk about it but that I encouraged them to do so.