

Mr. ANDRAS: But would you not agree that it would be reasonable for people reading that statement, which you have told us now is reasonably accurately quoted, to take the implication that the political people, the civil authorities, simply should not or actually have no business disagreeing with the military professionals or the military establishment on even military matters. Is that not a reasonable implication to take from your remarks?

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: No, I do not think that is a reasonable implication to take from my remarks. I think that the reasonable thing to take from my remarks is that Canadian forces recognize that the Minister of National Defence is charged under the law for the management of the armed forces and that he, through the government, sets the policy for the armed forces—as long as he does not take steps which as a result of ill-considered judgments reduce the effectiveness of those forces—and I do not think that is a part of his responsibility—and there is some justification in encouraging others not to follow our example.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Churchill, I have made a note of the time.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would like to make a comment following the interjection which has occurred. As a citizen of this country, not without some military experience, I think that it is a very serious matter indeed when any Minister of the crown, whether he is minister of defence or not, whether he has military experience or is a non-combatant, should refuse to accept the advice and the specialized knowledge that rests with senior officers of the three services of our country. At the appropriate time I will make certain charges against the Minister. I have made them before and I will make them again. I cannot be scared off very easily.

I would like to direct my attention to the bill itself which was introduced in the House on second reading by Mr. Hellyer on December 7, page 10835. After going through a long series of confusing statements in which he told us, on the one hand, that there would be no change and, on the other, that there would be, he drew his remarks to a close. I quote from the bottom of page 10835 where he deals with what he calls the essence of this bill:

—It has nothing to do with the question of naval forces, land forces, air forces or even space forces. Rather, it has to do with the management, the strategic and operational planning, the training and support, the capacity of the force to adjust to changing requirements, and the ability of the force to provide meaningful, challenging and rewarding careers for service personnel.

Do you see anything in that statement, Admiral Landymore, dealing with the essence of the bill, that has to do with the fighting efficiency of our forces or of training men to fight?

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: I think if one tried hard enough one could find some indication that something of that sort might have been in mind; but to take your inference, I would agree that we are looking on the armed forces more as an industry than as armed forces, and that the emphasis is on what happens in the offices as opposed to what happens in the fighting environment.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much. I have searched those immortal words time and time again and I could find nothing in there which would induce me to believe that the object of our defence forces was to fight.