

*National Defence Act Amendment*

sittings, even though it had been indicated that the members wished other witnesses to be heard. Surely this government will not propose closure on this matter in the face of that promise. This committee of the whole house is entitled to all the time it requires to delve into the matter of unification. I accept the Prime Minister's promise and I expect he will live up to it, regardless of what the Minister of National Defence may wish to do. His obligation means nothing. I have not depended on his words or promises for a long time, and in this instance I put my trust in the Prime Minister's promise that we will have an ample opportunity to examine every angle of this proposal for unification.

In answer to questions as to why disciplinary action was not taken against Admiral Landymore the minister said this:

No. I said if the issue involved had been anything less serious or less comprehensive than the single service concept and he displayed the disloyalty which he did throughout that period, then I would have had to insist that he be court-martialled.

If I have ever heard a ridiculous statement, that surely is it. The minister implied that if the matter was less serious he would have taken more serious action. Where is the logic in that approach? Since the matter was apparently extremely serious he did nothing about it.

I am afraid I can see no logic in that approach. If someone can point out its logic, then I must have a complete misconception of law and justice. Why should a less serious charge for similar action in respect of a less serious subject demand more serious action by the minister? That is an idiotic approach; yet, so is the minister. This is the same type of logic he has shown throughout. The minister has consistently refused to face up to the facts and pay attention to the advice of his senior advisors.

Without further reference to the minister's answers, I should like him to consider again his remarks relating to the incompatibility of Admiral Landymore and his second-in-command. As I recall the situation, the minister said on several occasions that these two officers were incompatible. He was asked where he obtained this information and he indicated that the information came through official channels. Air Marshal Miller was asked to give his understanding of what official channels might mean. He replied that the commanding officer would necessarily initiate communications through official channels.

[Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

In view of what Air Marshal Miller said, the reference by the minister to his information coming through official channels must be ridiculous, because this information must have come from Admiral Landymore. It is not the custom in the services of this country for subordinate officers to bypass their commanding officers when sending in reports. The commanding officer is always aware of what passes through official channels. In spite of this the minister has told us that he heard certain things about Admiral Landymore through official channels. Again I suggest to the minister that this is a lot of nonsense.

It is also interesting to note that the minister in referring to his source of information indicated that he spoke to junior officers. When asked where and when, he replied that he had met these people on many different occasions. The implication was that he could have met them at a cocktail party or something like that. I say to the minister that if he discussed anything in respect of this particular matter with a junior officer anywhere, whether it was at a meeting, a cocktail party, in his home or somewhere else, he was inviting that officer to break the written rule that is laid down which forbids any officer in the services to discuss political matters. Therefore the minister has been contributing to junior officers in the Canadian forces breaking the rules. Of course, what can we expect? What would the minister know about rules?

• (9:10 p.m.)

I understand that the minister is so determined to bring about unification that he is prepared to put his seat on the line on this question. Not everybody in the minister's party supports him. I would remind him that cocktail parties are held around here at which people drop the odd word. Some fellows get pretty loose in the lip at these cocktail parties. The minister should check this out, because he has not the support in his own party that he thinks he has. Perhaps on an occasion such as this somebody overheard the minister threaten to resign his seat and impose another calamity on this government, as though it had not suffered enough calamities already, unless the party saw fit to back him completely on the question of unification.

Having read the evidence of the recently retired chief of staff, according to the press reports the Prime Minister said he thought this matter required further looking into. The press immediately indicated that there would probably be some kind of saw-off in respect of unification. But apparently the minister