

*National Defence Act Amendment*

heart, that the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces are without peer anywhere in this world. They have served Canada well, in war and peace, and they deserve the deepest gratitude of the Canadian people.

Immediately afterward the minister went out and accused a loyal serving officer of the Royal Canadian Navy of being disloyal over an 18 month period. The minister should read his final words when he appeared before the committee when he said "I mean this with all my heart". It is strange that the minister then would go out and accuse a man, such as Admiral Landymore who has displayed loyalty and performed service to his country, of being disloyal over an 18 month period. This is the approach the minister takes. I might say that his remarks were about as far removed from the truth as they could be.

During the question period in the committee the same Minister of National Defence said that Admiral Landymore was fired for 18 months consistent disloyalty to the policies of the people he was paid to serve. Of course the press reports indicated that the minister made an apology in this regard. Having made the apology he then makes another statement which withdraws the apology he had made. In the first place the apology was not one which should have been publicized in the way it was, because the minister did not emphatically withdraw the charges he had made. Having accused Admiral Landymore of disloyalty over an 18 month period the minister, having been placed in a position where he found it necessary to make an apology, if he were any kind of a man, would have resigned his position instead of attempting to lord it over the serving officers in this country.

Not too long ago, after a briefing of the highest order by admirals and other members of the upper echelon of the NATO command, the minister released information which was classified. This is the type of man who speaks of loyalty and disloyalty. Hon. members on the other side are laughing so I shall repeat what I said: The minister should be behind bars. More drastic action might have been taken in other countries under similar circumstances, yet the minister merely stands and talks about disloyalty among serving officers in this country.

● (9:00 p.m.)

How does he back up his charges of disloyalty? During the committee hearings when he was asked about his charges of disloyalty against Admiral Landymore the minister said

this, as recorded at page 1624 of the committee proceedings:

I do not think that he had any right to call that kind of a meeting. I do not think he had any right to demand personal loyalty from his officers, and now that you have raised the question I want to make this statement. I have never asked a military officer his politics, his religion, or for his personal loyalty. Yet Admiral Landymore in giving testimony before this committee said that he had extracted a promise from his officers.

The hon. member for Halifax then asked the minister the following question:

Mr. Forrestall: What type of a promise?

Mr. Hellyer: The promise was not to resign.

Because a serving officer asked his men not to resign from their commissions in the navy, the minister accused him of being disloyal over a period of 18 months. As recorded at page 1623 of the committee proceedings, the minister said that Admiral Landymore was fired because of 18 months of consistent disloyalty. The minister stated, as recorded at page 1623:

Yes, I think I could. I would say that following a meeting of commanders in Ottawa, as I recall, on November 19, 1964, Admiral Landymore fully understood what we had in mind. We planned to develop in this country a single service concept and that he was unalterably opposed to it at that stage and that he went back to Halifax to do everything he possibly could to prepare for an ultimate confrontation on the issue.

In reference to what the minister said regarding Admiral Landymore's understanding of the plans for the development of a single force in 1964, let me point out that the former chief of staff, Air Marshal Miller, indicated to the committee at that time there was no discussion about unification whatsoever. He indicated that there was no complete understanding of unification. He had only been retired for six months. How can the minister truthfully accuse Admiral Landymore of taking the action he took with a full understanding of what was to take place as far back as 1964?

The minister was asked why disciplinary action had not been taken against Admiral Landymore. I suggest that the hon. member who just spoke should read some of these answers in order to understand why we should not be limited in our time of debate, but given as much time as hon. members require. Let me remind the committee that the minister and the Prime Minister promised that ample opportunity would be provided for the discussion of this bill. In spite of that promise the Liberal majority on the committee rushed the conclusion of the committee's