

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: No, it is not possible. We always have to depend on making a contribution to the United States to ensure our defence and, I think, to collective defence arrangements, rather more to demonstrate a willingness to prevent war than an arrangement that gives us all the security that we need.

Mr. McINTOSH: With your understanding—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McIntosh, will you make this your last question at this time.

Mr. McINTOSH: My last question to the Admiral will be this then: Where the Minister refers at all times to a single service—which I cannot understand, and I have never found anyone yet who actually understands it, including the presentation made by Air Marshal Sharp, the Vice Chief of the General Staff do they not more or less mean the funeral service for the armed forces? Please put me down for the next round, Mr. Chairman.

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: I think I could comment on that. I think unification having a single service—would make a good deal of sense if the Canadian government decided we would have only one role; a very limited single role. But it makes no sense if we are going to continue to carry out the roles that are indicated in the White Paper.

Mr. McINTOSH: We would have to opt out of these collective defence agreements that we have?

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: Well, unification has serious disadvantages to continuing with the present commitment as laid down in the White Paper. This leads me to suggest that someone has it in mind to change the role, because if unification does make sense, then it also means that it is based on having only one role.

Mr. McINTOSH: I will continue my questioning on that line in the next round.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harkness, you are next.

Mr. HARKNESS: I was concerned over the statement you said Admiral Hennessy had made, that the amount of equipment required for the maritime role or the amount of manpower would have to be reduced. Either one or the other would have to, I think was the phrase.

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: I do not think Admiral Hennessy was referring specifically to the maritime role. I would think he was talking about the armed forces across the board; there was not enough money both to buy the total capital program and to maintain the size of force required to operate what would come out of that program, and that something had to give.

Mr. HARKNESS: In other words, your assumption from this statement would be that the number of personnel is going to be further reduced or, otherwise, the equipment to be secured is going to be reduced and, therefore, it would not be possible to carry on the roles now laid down in the White Paper?

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: I would assume so, or else there would have to be a budgetary increase to cover the discrepancies.

Mr. HARKNESS: Now, as far as the navy itself is concerned—from this point of view—with the 28 ships still in commission, how many naval personnel are required to operate these ships; in other words, to keep them at sea?