CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 34 / PCEMI 34

Master of Defence Studies

THE NATO AIRCREW TRAINING PROGRAM IN CANADA:
An example of Canadian Defence Policy within Alliances

By Lieutenant Colonel MML Rafter

April 2008

ABSTRACT

Canada's participation in alliances and coalitions of like-minded states has long been a hallmark of Canadian defence policy. Of the organizations in which Canada has held membership or contributed forces, none has influenced the direction of Canadian military and political decision making more that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). As a member of NATO, Canada has provided military forces in varying numbers and capabilities over the nearly sixty year existence of the Alliance. While this contribution of forces is well known and recognized as a vital component of Canada's participation in NATO, a more obscure aspect of our involvement within the organization, the training of foreign aircrew under the NATO Air Training Plan (NATO ATP), has been equally important, and in some cases, has had more far reaching effects. This paper therefore argues that in the long-term, this program best exemplified the continuing Canadian tendency to seek the most cost-effective means of meeting international military commitments, and also to maximize industrial and economic benefits, while opting to forego the actual generation and assignment of large forces.

The NATO ATP, which officially ran from 1950 until 1958, was originally intended as Canada's principal contribution to the NATO Alliance when it was formed in 1949. Much like earlier programs in the First and Second World Wars, the NATO ATP was seen as an avenue whereby Canada could contribute to the Alliance, without the need to commit extensive and expensive military forces on the European continent. Not only was it considered a means to achieve savings in personnel and equipment, it was also expected to result in benefits to the Canadian military, Canadian industry and the Canadian economy, as a whole. Not surprisingly, this expectation that Canada could derive significant benefits with

little outlay of effort or funding pervaded all aspects of the NATO ATP until its termination in 1958.

The NATO ATP was considered a success by those who created it, in that it helped to reduce training costs to the RCAF itself, provided opportunities which facilitated interoperability with NATO allies, and ensured the continued survival (in the short term) of large part of Canada's aviation industry. The basic principle of least effort for greatest return, which originated in the earlier wartime training programs, served to showcase Canada's continuing commitment to NATO, and formed the basis of many similar programs which were created in subsequent years, and some of which still are in operation today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Author's Note: ***This paper is based on research done in the preparation of an earlier paper written for the Royal Military College of Canada Master of War Studies program. It was presented to the Air Command annual Air Force Historical Conference in Cornwall, Ontario in October 2000.***

In April 2009, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will mark its sixtieth anniversary. That the Alliance will have reached this milestone relatively unscathed is remarkable, given the varied nature and interests of its members, the transformations that it has been forced to undergo, and as the significant political and military upheavals which have taken place in the world over the past six decades. As one of the original signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty, Canada has been an important contributor and active participant throughout the organization's history. While the considerable influence that Canada held within NATO has waned somewhat over the years, its contributions have nevertheless been important and have helped to shape the Alliance and ensure its continued relevance.

When one thinks of Canada and NATO, images of fighter aircraft flying over the Black Forest region of Germany and troops exercising in snowy northern Norway readily come to mind. More recently, Canadians have come to think of their nation's commitment to NATO in terms of the 1999 Kosovo air campaign, peace enforcement missions in the Balkans and combat operations in Afghanistan as part of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Few are aware, however, of the less glamourous and somewhat more mundane aspects of Canada's role within the Alliance. The little-known reality is that Canada's involvement in the development of political and economic policies, provision of mutual aid, and in the formulation of doctrine and concepts have had a more far-reaching and enduring impact within NATO than any of the instances of actual assignment, basing and employment of military forces have had.

Canada's stance since the creation of NATO has always been that the organization had to be more than a simple military alliance concerned only with security, but instead, one

that also focused on more formal non-military or operationally-focused relationships.[1] As a result, successive Canadian governments have focused a large part of their efforts on the non-operational aspects of the partnership, or more precisely on those more loosely related to security. Canada's efforts have justifiably been lauded during times where sizeable contingents of forces have been made available to NATO, such as during the 1950s and early 1960s. On the other hand, its concentration on economic and social aspects of the defence partnership has also often had the effect of drawing criticism from other members of the Alliance, who accused Canada of demonstrating an apparent lack of dedication to its NATO commitments. It should be noted, however, that Canada is not unique in its approach to NATO – most, if not all of the other members have also demonstrated a willingness to place national interests ahead of those of the Alliance.

The idea that Canada could contribute to the overall effectiveness of an international organization like NATO by means other than the large-scale assignment of military forces is not a new one. On many occasions, nations such as Canada have offset their deficiencies with respect to military capabilities and commitments through the creation of programs whereby natural resources, industrial capacity, equipment loans, or alternate services are provided to an ally or an organization in lieu of dedicated armed forces. Within the NATO context, this policy is best illustrated by the establishment of Canada's Mutual Aid Program. Through this plan, the Canadian government donated surplus equipment, munitions and supplies to NATO nations which were frantically attempting to rebuild their forces in the

[1] John C. Milloy, *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 1948 – 1957: Community or Alliance?* (Montreal: McGill – Queen's University Press, 2006), 4.

early years of the Cold War.[2] One key element of this aid scheme consisted of the NATO Aircrew Training Plan (NATO ATP), whereby Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF) training establishments undertook flying instruction to pilots and navigators from Alliance nations, thus ensuring that sufficient numbers of qualified aircrew were available to meet stated NATO force levels and goals.

The NATO ATP, which officially ran in Canada from 1950 to 1958, graduated 5,575 pilots and navigators from the United Kingdom, France, Norway, Denmark, Italy, Greece, Turkey, the Netherlands, Portugal and Belgium.[3] The program, originally meant to emulate earlier schemes, such as the British Commontwealth Air Training Plan (BCATP) and the Royal Flying Corps - Canada (RFC – Canada) program, borrowed many of the lessons learned from the past and improved upon them. More importantly, however, the NATO ATP was seen by Canadian officials as a more economical and logistically viable means of meeting many of the expectations which came with membership in the NATO alliance. As well, the cost effectiveness of the program made its establishment far more palatable to a population whose focus had turned to economic renewal and growth. Ironically, shortly after the implementation of the NATO ATP, a series of international security crises resulted in a decision by Canada to augment its support to NATO by stationing substantial air and ground forces on the European continent, contrary to its original intentions in 1949. It was this military commitment, which would eventually swell to four wings of day-fighters and an

---

[2] John Gellner, *Canada in NATO* (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1970), 20. During the period of 1949 to 1957, Canada donated materiel and services to the value of just over one and a half billion dollars (actual value).

[3] Larry Milberry, *Canada's Air Force at War and Peace, Vol. 3* (Toronto: CANAV Books, 2001), 462.

army brigade group in Europe, that overshadowed the contributions made under the Mutual Aid Program, and in particular, the NATO ATP.

As stated above, the NATO ATP was but one facet of the larger Mutual Aid Program that was started in 1950. Given Canada's insistence in including articles highlighting largely non-military and co-operative features within the North Atlantic Treaty, it is not entirely surprising that at NATO's inception, this aid scheme was intended to become Canada's principal contribution to the new alliance.[4] Canada therefore sought to focus its efforts on projects that coincided nicely with the provisions of articles 2 and 3 of the treaty – at least until world events caused Canadian leaders to rethink this approach. The fact that Canadian officials were able to significantly influence the content and wording of the draft treaty in 1948 and 1949 in order to reflect this inclination towards economic and collaborative policies is a testament to the influence exerted by Canada in the years shortly after the end of the Second World War. The political 'give and take' and the need for consensus between member nations, which were prevalent during the negotiation phase of the NATO Treaty, foreshadowed the methods which the Alliance would utilize in its decision-making processes and deliberations for the next sixty years.

Despite the lack of widespread publicity afforded to the aircrew training program, it nevertheless remained one of the most enduring and beneficial ventures initiated by Canada in the context of its NATO relationship. In fact, this paper will argue that in the long-term, this program best exemplified the continuing Canadian tendency to seek the most cost-effective means of meeting international military commitments, while foregoing the actual

[4] John Gellner, *Canada in NATO…,* 22. As late as June 1950, the Canadian government continued to believe that it could contribute more effectively to NATO through donations of goods and services, rather than making a specific military commitment.

commitment, generation and assignment of large forces. It can also be argued that decisions to participate in such endeavours were also intended as a way of maximizing industrial and economic benefits within Canada. The author will attempt to demonstrate the validity of this contention through a review of earlier Canadian programs of this type, a detailed study of Canada's role and national interests associated with the creation and implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty, and the elaboration of specific examples showcasing the benefits that Canada actually enjoyed as a result of its willingness to host the NATO ATP. Vestiges of this policy, whereby questions of economics and logistics often held more sway than issues of defence, are still evident today in the form of the Military Training Assistance Plan and the NATO Flying Training Centre Initiative.

RFC CANADA AND THE BCATP

The NATO ATP was by no means an innovative idea when it was first recommended as an instrument through which Canada could play a role within NATO. Previously, foreign aircrew had received basic and advanced flying training in Canada, where they were able to acquire needed skills well away from theatres of operation. Canada's geography and distance from the majority of the fighting in both World Wars made it an ideal location for the establishment of aircrew training schemes of this type.

As early as 1916, following the disastrous battle of the Somme, the British government realized that there existed a need to expand the Royal Flying Corps (RFC), and to ensure a continued, dependable flow of replacement aircrew. The requirement to establish up to thrity-five training squadrons and construct new airfields simply was not viable,

considering the lack of available space and resources in England.[5] In addition, British factories were unable to produce the number of aircraft required to support such an initiative. Since conditions in England were less than ideal for the training of fledgling pilots and observers, another location would have to be found.

In December 1916, discussions began between the British and Canadian governments regarding the establishment of an aircrew training program in Canada. Although training was expected to occur in Canada, with the support of the Canadian government, the program was to be fairly autonomous. Indeed, the prevailing attitude in the United Kingdom at the time was that colonials were incapable of successfully implementing and managing such an undertaking. In the early years of the war, this assessment was not wholly inaccurate, as many Canadians still clung to the idea of blind obedience to the desires of the Empire. Supporting the British war effort in a manner decided by the United Kingdom was virtually pre-ordained, with little thought given to either the difficulties or benefits that cooperation of this nature could engender. Therefore, a cadre of RFC officers were selected to administer and oversee the new training scheme, formally known as the RFC – Canada, or more informally as the Imperial Royal Flying Corps.[6]

It should be noted that some RFC and Royal Naval Air Service (RNAS) candidates had actually received flying training in Canada prior to the implementation of the RFC – Canada program. Earlier in the war, a number of privately-operated flying schools had been opened in Canada to provide instruction for those wishing to join one of the British flying

---

[5] Hugh A. Halliday and Laura Brandon, "Into the Blue: Pilot Training in Canada, 1917 – 1918," *Canadian War Museum Dispatches* (November 1998), 1; [journal on-line]; available from www.civilization.ca/cwm/disp/dis002_e.html; internet; accessed 12 February 2008.

[6] S.F. Wise, *Canadian Airmen and the First World War: The Official History of the Royal Canadian Air Force, Vol. 1*

services, yet willing to pay for their own training. Of those who underwent training in Canada, 129 were eventually absorbed into RFC or RNAS units, of which thirty-five were killed in action.[7] In addition to the training of prospective flying personnel, the RFC – Canada agreement also called for the manufacture of trainer aircraft for use by the new schools. Canadian Aeroplanes Limited was purchased by the Imperial Munitions Board and became the primary supplier of the program's basic training aircraft, the Curtis JN-4 Canuck.[8]

The RFC – Canada program progressed and steadily improved throughout the spring and summer of 1917. The training being performed was constantly adjusted to meet the requirements of the RFC overseas, and although the training scheme had initially been mandated to train pilots in only basic flying skills before progressing to more advanced schools in the United Kingdom, the need for a higher rate of pilot production necessitated a modification to the agreement. Thus, by the summer of 1917, the flying schools in Canada were training pilots at the advanced level, much like the training establishments overseas.[9] This relative ease with which Canadian planners were able to modify the training syllabus to suit operational needs may also have served to instill in both political and military leaders the notion that Canada was in fact well-suited to overseeing and implementing training programs of this type.

When the United States entered the war in mid-1917, an agreement was reached whereby the Americans would receive training at RFC – Canada facilities until such time as

---

[7] Frank H. Ellis, *Canada's Flying Heritage* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954), 112.

[8] Wise, *Canadian Airmen and the First…,* 44.

[9] Halliday and Brandon, "Into the Blue…," 1.

the schools in the United States were ready to begin air training programs of their own. In July of 1917, a detachment of approximately 1,400 American pilots and groundcrew arrived in Leaside to begin training.[10] This exchange lasted approximately four months, until aerodromes in the U.S. were available to accept students. Not only did this arrangement help address existing training gaps and contibute to the overall war effort, it may very well also have proven to be a revelation of sorts for Canadian authorities, who for the first time saw the potential that undertakings of this type could offer to Canada, particularly when seeking alternate methods of contributing to alliances and organizations, both within and outside of the Commonwealth.

In April 1918, the RFC and the RNAS were amalgamated to form the Royal Air Force, and at the same time, the RFC – Canada was renamed RAF – Canada. By the time the RFC/RAF – Canada program ceased operations at the end of the First World War, it had enrolled 9,200 cadets, of which 3,135 completed pilot training and more than 2,500 were sent overseas, as well as turning out at least 7,400 aircraft mechanics.[11] Although the air training plan in Canada was originally intended to run as an autonomous British entity with support from the Canadian government, a number of Canadians would eventually populate its ranks at all levels. The experiences that these men gained in 1917 and 1918 would later prove invaluable when many would be involved in the creation of the RCAF in 1924.

One of the important yet lesser known dividends of hosting the training plan in Canada was the contribution made to the Canadian aviation industry. "Canadian Aeroplanes Ltd. Produced about 1,200 JN-4s for the Imperial Munitions Board [and] if the production of

---

[10] Canada, RCAF Historical Section, "The Royal Flying Corps in Canada: The Aircrew Training Plan Operated in Canada during 1917-1918 by the Royal Flying Corps" (December 1961), D Hist 180.013(09), 6.

[11] Halliday and Brandon, "Into the Blue…," 2.

spares is added to this total, the overall output of the company was at least 2,900 training aircraft."[12] The work carried out by Canadian Aeroplanes formed the basis of an industry which would thrive a few decades later, and demonstrated to the Canadian government that it could reap political and economic benefits by contributing to the war effort in non-combat related roles.

The First World War's RFC/RAF – Canada training scheme achieved successes well beyond initial expectations, despite the largely negligeable direction provided by the Canadian government, whose representatives failed to understand the potential of aircraft earlier in the war.[13] It provided the front-line flying units in Europe with needed personnel, but more importantly, it formed the basis for the establishment of a far more ambitious scheme nearly a generation later. This later training program, which would come to exemplify Canada's attitude towards international military commitments, was made possible only as a result of the First World War's Imperial Royal Flying Corps training system.

The valuable lessons learned in the operations of the RFC/RAF – Canada program were instrumental when Canada was once again called upon to run a new training scheme during the Second World War. Although the RCAF had been formed in 1924, its relatively small stature and the fiscal constraints imposed upon it by the Depression meant that only a limited number of personnel, including aircrew, were admitted to its ranks during the 1920s and 1930s.[14] Recruitment was kept at a relatively low level, even as the international security situation pointed towards the likelihood of a new war. The RAF, on the other hand,

---

[12] Wise, *Canadian Airmen and the First…,* 115.

[13] Halliday and Brandon, "Into the Blue…," 2

[14] Ted Barris, *Behind the Glory – The Plan that Won the Allied Air War* (Toronto: MacMillan Canada, 1992), 9.

had begun an expansion program in 1934 whose aim was to recruit aircrew from the Dominions.[15] Many Canadians, including some who had already earned their wings with the RCAF, joined the RAF. Despite this influx of personnel, RAF officials worried that the intake and training of aircrew would not meet the demand, should hostilities begin anew.

The prospect of another large-scale conflict involving the United Kingdom, though an important concern for Canada, was not the only issue on the minds of Canadians and their government. The Great Depression had been particularly hard on ordinary Canadians, and the varying levels of hardships that it imposed had threated national unity on more than one occasion. Despite the nation's historical ties and perceived commitments to England, Prime Minister Mackenzie King consistently re-iterated that to the Canadian government, "national unity meant the relations between French and English Canadians above all."[16] Therefore, he would not jeopardize that unity by committing Canada to another overseas conflict, which could potentially necessitate conscription. It would not be long before an opportunity to forego a significant commitment of ground forces to the war would present itself.

In late-1938, the Canadian and British governments undertook negotiations regarding a "Trained in Canada Scheme"[17] that would see RAF flying students trained in Canada. The agreement called for the instruction of small numbers of RAF pilots on a yearly basis at RCAF training facilities. Plans for the expansion of the program were announced that same year, and as had been the case during the First World War, the RAF sought to assume full control of its operation. Mackenzie King, however, refused this British request time and

---

[15] *Ibid.*, 9.

[16] J.L. Granatstein, *Canada's War: The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government, 1939 – 1945* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1975), 42.

[17] Larry Milberry and Hugh Halliday, *The Royal Canadian Air Force at War, 1939 – 1945* (Toronto: CANAV Books, 1990), 25.

again. To him, British control of a training scheme in Canada was unacceptable. In a July 1938 speech to the House of Commons, he made it quite clear, however, that Canada would be prepared to host a Commonwealth training program, only if the RCAF was solely responsible for its operation:

> We… are prepared to have our own establishments here and to give in those establishments facilties to British pilots to come and train here. But they must come and train in establishments which are under the control of the government of Canada and for which the Minister of National Defence will be able to answer in this parliament with respect to everything concerning them.[18]

King's stance on this issue necessitated a re-evaluation of the proposal by the British government and a temporary suspension of talks. At the same time, RCAF officials informed the government of another important issue to be raised should further negotiations proceed – accommodations and facilities. In 1938, the existing training centres at Trenton and Borden could barely keep up with the minimal RCAF requirements for aircrew, let alone a large influx of RAF trainees. Should an agreement be signed, new schools would have to be constructed and manned.[19]

When negotiations finally resumed, RCAF and British authorities were surprised by King's unexpected opposition to the plan to have Canadian graduates of the proposed scheme enter the RAF. The Prime Minister anounced his own vision for the program, which would consist of British candidates undergoing training for the RAF billets, and not Canadians. "King's problem was that while he wanted to help the British, he did not want to go so far as to make it appear that he was getting the country involved in a military commitment that

---

[18] F.J. Hatch, *Aerodrome of Democracy: The British Commonwealth Air Training Plan 1939 – 1945* (Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre, 1983), 8; and James Eayrs, *In Defence of Canada – Appeasement and Rearmament, Vol 2*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), 97.

[19] James Eayrs, *In Defence of Canada – Appeasement and Rearmament…,* 98.

would endanger Canadian unity."[20] Thus, from the outset, political considerations far outweighed military ones.

Although King's perspective did not sit well with British representatives, they had no real option but to accept the Canadian Prime Minister's demands. Final negotiations continued into early-1939, and in April of that year, the first instructors reported for training at RCAF establishments, with the first RAF students expected to report in September. The entire process of forging this early agreement had been a painful one, mired in confusion and political posturing. Canadian author Spencer Dunmore aptly described the opposing points of view that resulted in the early confontations and delays:

> Althought the urgency of the matter could hardly be doubted, the ensuing discussions and exchanges of notes and other missives… must have set international records for torpor. Lack of understanding was a major factor. The perspectives of the participants was another. On the one hand were the politicians in London, many of whom still thought of Canada as a colony and expected any proposal emanating from the Mother Country to be acted upon more or less without question. On the other hand, the Canadian Prime Minister… was determined to protect Canada's status as an independent nation.[21]

In addition to protecting Canada's status as an independent nation, by establishing this training program, Mackenzie King was also seeking an alternative to the costly provision of ground troops for an overseas war, and the potential need to resort to conscription. He desperately wanted to limit the number of Canadian casualties, thus avoiding a repeat of the political backlash that had occurred during the First World War as the body count mounted.[22] A Canadian training scheme would afford him this opportunity.

---

[20] *Ibid.,* 10.

[21] Spencer Dunmore, *Wings for Victory – The Remarkable Story of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan in Canada* (Toronto: McLelland & Stewart Inc., 1994), 27.

[22] J. W. Pickersgill, *The Mackenzie King Record, Volume 1 1939 – 1944* (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1960), 40.

Although the planning process had been long and arduous, the groundwork had finally been set, and the training program ready to begin. Unfortunately, events unfolding in Europe in September 1939 meant that the first RAF students scheduled to be trained in Canada never arrived. With war virtually inevitable, the British government opted to keep the trainees in England and assign them directly to RAF units.[23] At the time, it appeared to many that the negotiations to establish the training scheme had been for naught, when in reality, they had actually created the foundation for Canada's most successful and large-scale foray into the training of allied pilots and aircrew.

Following Germany's successful Blitzkrieg campaign in September 1939, Great Britain and her Commonwealth allies wasted no time in beginning preparations for war. Officials in the Dominions were painfully aware of the dire situation in England concerning the ability to train the large numbers of aircrew that would be needed for the anticipated confrontation with the forces of Nazism, and the need for a workable solution. Barely three weeks after war had been declared, Canadian and Australian High Commissioners in England, Vincent Massey and Stanley Bruce, respectively,[24] put forward a proposal for an empire-wide aircrew training scheme.

Now, in October 1939, negotiations were once again undertaken in Ottawa in the hopes of quickly and formally establishing the Empire Air Training Plan, as it was originally to be known. Although its creation had been proposed as a means to support the United Kingdom, the Canadian government was quick to seize on the positive political outcome that could result from such an agreement. "From the beginning to end, the negotiations were

---

[23] Ted Barris, *Behind the Glory…,* 11.

[24] Ted Barris, *Behind the Glory…,* 12.

dominated by Mackenzie King. Realizing how important the scheme was to the United Kingdom, he put on a masterful display of diplomatic manoeuvering – bullying, threatening and cajoling until he had wrung as many concessions as possible from the British representatives."[25] Reluctantly, the British government finally acquiesced, and on 17 December 1939, the newly-christened British Commonwealth Air Training Plan (BCATP) Agreement was signed between Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand.

Plans were immediately set in place for the construction of new airfields and the establishment of the numerous training schools agreed upon during negotiations. The first of the new establishments was scheduled to open in April 1940, with the remainder becoming operational within two years.[26] Although the plan for the construction of training bases throughout the country was an ambitious one, there was no shortage of manpower or competition between companies who vied for the various contracts associated with the implementation of the plan. One concern that remained for the RCAF, however, was Canada's ability to provide aircraft and air force personnel in sufficient numbers to meet the requirements of the BCATP.

In accordance with the agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom, some of the aircraft required for training purposes were to have been supplied by the British forces. The delivery of these aircraft, however, would be disrupted when the RAF diverted numerous aircraft to other duties following the Allies' disastrous retreat at Dunkirk in the

---

[25] Fred J. Hatch, "The British Commonwealth Air Training Plan," *The Canadian Aviation Historical Society Journal*, 9, No. 4, (Winter 1981), 100.

[26] Lieutenant Colonel D.J. Goodspeed, *The Armed Forces of Canada 1867 – 1967* (Ottawa: Directorate of History, 1967), 155.

summer of 1940.[27] In response to the potential crisis, the Canadian government took the initiative and created two new crown corporations, Federal Aircraft Limited and Victory Aircraft Limited, to provide a suitable number of aircraft to meet requirements.[28] Despite this unforeseen yet welcomed need to build aircraft in Canada, the program reached almost full operational capacity by September 1941, nearly seven months ahead of schedule.[29] By early-1944, the output of BCATP graduates exceeded immediate overseas needs, and as such, the program was scaled back.

In the spring of 1945, with victory for the Allies virtually assured, plans to end the program were put in place. The final students graduated in March of that year, and the British Commonwealth Aircrew Training Plan ceased operations. During almost four years of existence, the BCATP had trained 131,553 aircrew, of which 72,835 (or 51 per cent) were Canadians.[30] Besides Canadian and British students, the RCAF had provided instruction to trainees from Australia and New Zealand, as well as smaller numbers of personnel from France, Norway, South Africa, Czechoslovakia, Southern Rhodesia, Belgium, Holland, the United States and numerous other countries. Astonishingly, nearly half of all Commonwealth airmen received all or part of their training at BCATP schools and facilities.[31]

---

[27] I. Norman Smith, *The British Commonwealth Air Training Plan* (Toronto: The MacMillan Company of Canada, 1941), 7.

[28] W.A.B. Douglas and Brereton Greenhous, *Out of the Shadows – Canada and the Second World War* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1995), 58.

[29] Goodspeed, *The Armed Forces of Canada…,* 157.

[30] W.A.B. Douglas and Brereton Greenhous, *Out of the Shadows…,* 44.

[31] Dunmore, *Wings for Victory…,* 345

In addition to alleviating the burden of training on the United Kingdom, the BCATP also had numerous benefits for Canada. First and foremost, as Canada's prime contribution to the war effort, it initially eliminated the need of the Canadian government to resort to conscription in an effort to generate large numbers of ground forces. While conscription would eventually be enacted, it was made possible only because of the results of a national plebiscite held in 1942, and was only carried out on a relatively small scale. Secondly, it provided an economic boost to dozens of small towns throughout the country, still reeling from the effects of the Depression, through the construction of airfields and training centres. Most importantly, it also demonstrated to Canada's allies, and in particular to the British, that Canada was more than capable of implementing and successfully operating a scheme of this magnitude. Two of Canada's pre-eminent historians summed up the significance of this chapter of our military history: "… arguably, the BCATP, its final cost to Canada $1.6 billion of a $2.2 billion total, was Canada's most important contribution to the war."[32]

Although the BCATP may have been Canada's most significant and tangible contribution to the war effort, it also likely provided the basis for more theoretical or conceptual ideas regarding military service and armed conflict. Specifically, it served to solidify the notion that Canada's strengths could lay in spheres other than those which would necessitate the wholesale assignment of military forces as its contribution to international security. Thus, the lessons learned and concepts which emerged as a result of the creation of the BCATP would be instrumental when Canadian officials were called upon to formulate Canada's approach to transatlantic security a few years after the conclusion of the Second World War.

---

[32] J.L. Granatstein and Peter Neary, *The Good Fight: Canadian and World War II* (Toronto: Copp Clark, Ltd., 1995), 3.

CANADA, THE CREATION OF NATO AND MUTUAL AID

The genesis of the NATO ATP in Canada came about largely as a result of the protracted discussions which took place behind closed doors in Washington regarding the creation of NATO. While it would be easy to believe that Canada's offer to host a program of this type originated mainly because of the nation's previous history of providing foreign aircrew training, and the positive image and reputation that could result, the actual reasons are far more complex. In reality, the decision to create the training program was much more intimately tied to Canada's basic philosophy regarding its participation in global organizations or alliances, than to any deep concern for international security itself. In order to fully appreciate the background about how the RCAF came to be tasked to provide aircrew training to NATO nations, a detailed understanding of the process by which NATO itself was established, and Canada's important role in the negotiations and formulation of policy during that period, is needed.

When the Second World War ended, a sense of idealism and renewal descended over the nations that had fought on many fronts since 1939. Optimism flourished, even in the countries that had been so devastated by war, because the great powers had vowed not to repeat the mistakes of the Armistice of 1918 and the Versailles Treaty. Detailed planning by Allied leaders had taken place throughout the war years, in the hopes that the victors could quickly and efficiently establish a new world order, where the political, social and economic chaos that had reigned in the years since the end of the First World War would not be able to once again take root. At the urging of the American government, plans were put in place to create international organizations "to stimulate economic development, look after food and agriculture, regulate civil aviation, set rules and standards for health and labour, and

stimulate education, science and cultural activities around the world. Never in history had so much concentrated planning and wide diplomatic and political effort gone into preparing for peace while fighting a war."[33]

This optimism, however, was short-lived. Nations which had ostensibly been allies and which had cooperated to bring an end to the hostilities in 1945, now faced off in newly-formed power blocks. Though many world leaders attempted to focus their efforts on rebuilding and reconciliation, others sought to extend their influence and make territorial gains. Diverging political ideologies and changing economic interests quickly drove a wedge between the East and West, and fears of another world conflict abounded. "In the first two years after the war, the Communists succeeded in bringing a large part of Europe under the control of the Soviet Government; by the beginning of 1947 they menaced the whole continent."[34]

The Soviet occupation and annexation of territories in eastern Europe in the years immediately following the Second World War cemented fears and caused significant consternation within a number of democratic nations in a still-recovering western Europe. In an effort to counter the growing Communist threat and to protect the fragile stability, many governments sought to ally themselves to other like-minded countries for the sake of collective security. In North America, the Canadian government was cognizant of the aspirations of the Soviet Union, but threat assessments by both the military and External Affairs predicted that it was unlikely that war would return in the short-term.[35] The threat

---

[33] Don Cook, *Forging the Alliance: NATO 1945 – 1950* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1989), 2.

[34] Sir Nicholas Henderson, *The Birth of NATO* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1983), xiii.

[35] Randall Wakelam, "Flights of Fancy: RCAF Fighter Procurement 1945-1954" (Master's thesis, Royal Military College of Canada, 1997), 47.

posed by the Communists seemed less-important in the late-1940s than issues of economic and industrial renewal, and the re-establishment of normalcy after six long years of war. Political and miltary decisions of the day were also coloured by the very real fact that there was little funding available in the federal budget for matters of defence. Unfortunately, for the western European nations who were not separated from their new opponent by oceans, this relative indifference to the Soviet Union was a luxury which they could not permit themselves to enjoy.

In March of 1948, representatives from the governments of the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands met in Brussels to consider the feasibility of a treaty which would assure mutual defence in the event of Soviet aggression. The proposed agreement, which would be modelled on the Rio Treaty of 1947, would commit all members to respond both politically and militarily without hesitation or caveats in order to safeguard the security and safety of other signatories.[36] Despite the significant philosophical and political differences which existed between the potential European alliance members, the brazen and openly hostile attitude and actions of the Soviet Union in early-1948 overshadowed the disparities and helped to speed the pace of negotiations. After consulting for only thirteen short days, the five nations signed the Brussels Treaty on 17 March 1948. One of the most crucial parts of the agreement, Article 4, which "based the defence policies of the treaty partners on the principle of 'one for all and all for one,' without room for

[36] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO Facts and Figures* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1969), 20. This Treaty had been signed on 7 September 1947 by the US and Latin American nations and provided an example of regional grouping within the framework of the UN Charter.

evasion or limitation of responsibilities,"[37] would prove important in later NATO negotiations.

Although the theory of a collective European defence alliance was sound in principle, it was in reality, a military organization with no teeth. In the years immediately following the end of the Second World War, the Brussels Treaty members had demobilized their military forces and cut equipment and infrastructure to such a degree that even as a grouping of five nations, it was recognized that there existed an inability to effectively cope with the power of the military might in the Soviet Union.[38] Large defence expenditures simply were not acceptable to governments of nations who had yet to recover from much of the devastation of the war.

The virtual impotence of the new alliance was showcased quite effectively just a few short months after the signing of the Brussels Treaty. In June 1948, Russian forces began their blockade of West Berlin, and it became evident very quickly that the Western Union, as the Brussels Treaty nations had come to be known, was militarily unable to address the problem on its own. The blockade lasted 323 days, and was only overcome by a massive airlift operation planned, executed and led almost exclusively by the Americans.[39]

The ineffectivess of the Brussels Treaty came as no great surprise to the governments of Canada and the United States, who had been accorded observer status on both the Western

---

[37] John Gellner, *Canada in NATO*, (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1970), 7.

[38] Lawrence S. Kaplan, *NATO 1948 – The Birth of the Transatlantic Alliance* (Toronto: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007), 61.

[39] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO Facts and Figures*…, 20.

Union Chief of Staffs Committee and later the Western Union Military Supply Board.[40] In fact, the concept of a trans-Altantic defence organization that could eventually supersede the Brussels Treaty had actually been discussed in secret even before final signatures had been affixed to the Western Union agreement.[41] The idea of a mutual defence pact of this magnitude and scope, however, was only publicly acknowledged for the first time by Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Louis St-Laurent, in the Canadian House of Commons at the end of April 1948.[42]

Ironically, the original concept of an Atlantic pact of mutual assistance was first suggested by the United Kingdom, even as its representatives continued to negotiate various aspects of the Brussels Treaty. On 9 March 1948, the British Prime Minister approached the governments of both Canada and the United States with the idea for an Atlantic security system designed "to inspire [the] necessary confidence [needed] to consolidate the West against Soviet infiltration and at the same time to inspire the Soviet government with sufficient respect for the West to remove temptation from them and so ensure a long period of peace."[43] The proposal, which provided the impetus for a series of six ultra-secret meetings at the Pentagon between 22 March and 1 April 1948, known as the ABC

---

[40] Canadian High Commissioner in United Kingdom, *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs* (London), Telegram 1996, 10 November 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9980; internet; accessed 12 March 2008.

[41] Sir Nicholas Henderson, *The Birth of NATO…,* 14.

[42] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO Facts and Figures*…, 21.

[43] United Kingdom Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, *Telegram to British High Commissioner in Canada* (London), telegram 220, 10 March 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9983; internet; accessed 12 February 2008.

(American-British-Canadian) or three-power talks,[44] laid the groundwork for the NATO negotiations which began in the summer of 1948. The aim of the discussions was not to produce an actual text of a draft treaty, but rather to cover such subjects as likely scope and membership, definitions of reciprocal obligations, and relationship to the United Nations.[45] The meetings were so covert that the Canadian Ambassador in Washington even went as far as to urge the Department of External Affairs to devise plausible cover stories for the Canadian delegates attending the meetings.[46]

Upon completion of the ABC talks, a report to the governments of the three participating states was released. The document called for the creation of an Atlantic pact, separate from the Western Union, but it also highlighted the need for further discussion prior to inviting potential member states to enter into formal negotiations. Given the secrecy which surrounded the preliminary meetings, the ABC nations also struggled with how they would minimize the repercussions for potential member states, in particular France, who might have felt slighted by their omission from earlier discussions.[47] It is also interesting to note that even at this early stage of negotiations, officials in Ottawa were not only already considering how Canadian interests could best be protected, but also how Canadian expenditures and military commitments could be kept to a minimum. This early tendency to

---

[44] Sean Maloney, "General Charles Foulkes: A Primer on How to be CDS," in *Warrior Chiefs: Perspectives on Senior Canadian Military Leaders,* ed. Lieutenant-Colonel Bernd Horn and Stephen Harris, 219 – 236 (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2001), 222.

[45] Under Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Memorandum to Prime Minister Regarding ABC Talks* (Ottawa), DEA/283(S), 15 March 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9993; internet; accessed on 12 March 2008.

[46] Canadian Ambassador to United States, *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs* (Washington), telegram WA-766, 13 March 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9992; internet; accessed 12 March 2008.

[47] Lawrence S. Kaplan, *NATO 1948 – The Birth of the Transatlantic…,* 69.

seek less costly avenues of partnership contributions is aptly illustrated through the contents of a personal letter from Lester B. Pearson, then Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, to Hume Wrong, Canadian Ambassador in Washington and one of the principal negotiators in the ABC talks. The letter, written after Pearson had heard rumours that American and British planners were already beginning to build up their own versions of a Combined Staff for the new pact, proposed the idea that "it might be better to let the United States and United Kingdom carry the main burden with our [Canada] relationship more or less similar to to that which existed during the war."[48] It was apparent, even at this early stage of NATO planning, that Canadian officials fell back on the legacy of the BCATP and the benefits that resulted from the operation of the program, in framing their approach to the new alliance. This Canadian attitude towards collective security has been more or less consistent since 1948.

Although much progress was made throughout April in further framing the proposed agreement, unexpected objections by American congressional leaders to US participation in any sort of transatlantic defence treaty almost sank the entire concept by the end of the month. For almost six weeks, US legislators debated the merits of participation in an enterprise of this type. Only after the chairman of the US Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, drew up a resolution which recommended the association of the US, by constitutional process, with regional collective security arrangements, was the road

[48] Under Secretary for External Affairs, *Personal Letter to Canadian Ambassador in United States* (Ottawa), 13 April 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10026; internet; accessed 12 March 2008.

finally paved towards the start of formal multi-party talks on the establishment of what would become NATO.[49]

With American resistance to an alliance eliminated by the Vandenberg Resolution, the United States finally was able on 23 June 1948 to invite Canada and the Western Union Powers to enter into seven-power exploratory talks regarding the establishment of the proposed Atlantic defence system.[50] A report on the results of the ABC talks, cleverly disguised as an American document, provided the basis for the early discussions and an initial framework of what shape the pact could take. Meetings were set to begin in the US capital in early-July, with a final report to participating governments expected by mid-September 1948. For two months, delegates debated various aspects of the proposed defensive agreement. In general, ABC members remained faithful to the findings which had been reached during their secret talks, while buy-in by Brussels Treaty participants was slower in coming. Some of the European representatives, namely the French, saw a new pact which included the United States as a further erosion of their influence over European defence matters. Early in the negotiations, some even went as far as suggesting that the Americans, and to a lesser extent the Canadians, should focus their efforts on assisting with the reconstitution of European armed forces, rather than pushing for the establishment of a new agreement that would replace the Brussels Treaty.[51]

---

[49] Don Cook, *Forging the Alliance…,* 163. The resolution, passed by the US Senate on 11 June 1943, made no specific mention of an alliance with Europe. Instead, it was worded in such a flexible manner that it covered almost any action related to security cooperation that the State Department might at some point decide to endorse.

[50] By having the US instigate the discussions, ABC delegates believed that the secrecy of their earlier talks would be maintained. In doing so, potential negative reactions from Western Union nations, especially France, could be averted.

[51] Timothy P. Ireland, *Creating the Entangling Alliance – The Origins of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization* (Westport, CT: The Greenwood Press, 1981), 101 – 102.

From the outset, Canadian delegates, whose participation in the three-power talks was unknown by all but the Americans and British, were seen as a moderating influence who were able to move the negotiations in a direction consistent with the conclusions of the ABC report. The meetings also provided Canada with the opportunity to more publicly and forcefully advocate that any agreement should be more than simply military in nature. In a 26 June 1948 memorandum from the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Canadian negotiators were given their marching orders, and the idea that "the Atlantic Treaty… must create new imaginative types of international institutions which will be outward and visibile signs of a new unity and purpose in the Western World"[52] was re-emphasized. This viewpoint, however, was based as much in economic considerations as it was in ideological beliefs.

In the eyes of many Canadian leaders, including Prime Minister Mackenzie King, Louis St-Laurent and Lester B. Pearson, post-war trading barriers which had arisen between Canada and its two most important trading partners, the United States and the United Kingdom, were as much of a threat to Canada's long-term survival as was the Soviet Union and its military forces.[53] They believed that the successful ratification of a transatlantic pact would likely result in the dissolution of trade obstacles between signatory partners, not only in the field of military goods and services, but also in other areas, as well.[54] Even at this

---

[52] Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Memorandum – Canadian Attitude Towards a North Atlantic Defence Agreement* (Ottawa), DEA/283(S), 26 June 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10041; internet, accessed 12 March 2008.

[53] John C. Milloy, *The North Atlantic Treaty Organiztion 1948 – 1957 – Community or Alliance?* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006), 13.

[54] James Eayrs, *In Defence of Canada – Growing Up Allied* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), 64. The possibility of facilitating trade within a North Atlantic context, rather than simply a North American one, provided the Canadian government with an excuse to withdraw from problematic trade discussions with the United States. Mackenzie King worried that his government could suffer a defeat if it was

point in the process, Canadian officials saw the need to include passages in treaty documents that dealt with social and economic matters as essential if Canada were to experience the greatest benefit from its membership in such an alliance.

The Canadian perspective regarding the expanded nature of the pact was not shared by all national representatives, and was even dismissed outright by certain delegates. Some, including the British, believed that the inclusion of language relating to economic, social and cultural fields in the treaty would complicate the work of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) and detract from the main defensive role of the alliance.[55] American envoys also saw their Marshall Plan as the main conduit for economic aid and cooperation, rather than the North Atlantic agreement.[56] Canadian representatives countered the dissension by arguing that economic collaboration would contribute directly to general security by creating "a dynamic counter-attraction to communism – a free, prosperous and progressive society."[57] In the end, Canadian negotiators did prevail, with references to these aspects of cooperation being included in the final report to governments which was released on 9 September 1948. For the first time, the report also included a recommendation for the inclusion of additional European members to the pact.

---

seen to be entering into agreements with the US which could conceivably negatively impact Canadian economic sovereignty.

[55] Canadian Ambassador in United States, *Report to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs – Proceedings of Washington Exploratory Talks on Security* (Washington), DEA/283(S), 4 September 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10083; internet, accessed 12 March 2008.

[56] John Gellner, *Canada in NATO…*, 14.

[57] Government of Canada, *Commentary on the Washington Paper of September 9, 1948* (Ottawa), DEA/283(S), 6 December 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10141; internet, accessed 12 March 2008.

Meetings designed to finalize the wording of the treaty itself and to create the political and military architecture of the alliance continued throughout the fall of 1948 and into early-1949. The Canadian viewpoint, originally only mentioned in passing in the draft preamble of the North Atlantic Treaty, eventually grew into a full article within the document. Article 2, which identified an agreement to "preserve the common civilization and promote its development by increasing collaboration between the signatories and advancing the conditions of stability,"[58] eventually came to be known, sometimes derisively, as the Canadian article. This article would be closely tied to Article 3 which related to mutual aid between member states, and which would later provide the genesis for the NATO ATP.

The North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington on 4 April 1949 by representatives from Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Belgium, Norway, Iceland, Denmark, Italy and Portugal. It took a further five months for the parliaments of the various member nations to formally ratify the Treaty. Greece and Turkey joined the Alliance in 1952, and they were followed by Germany who acceded to the Treaty in 1955, following the signature of the Paris Agreements of October 1954.[59]

In the months that followed the historic signature of the North Atlantic Treaty, military and political leaders in all member nations faced the task of setting up the machinery needed to run the newly-formed alliance. As expected, diverging views on organizational

---

[58] Acting Under-Secretary of External Affairs, *Extract of Draft of North Atlantic Treaty* (Ottawa), DEA/283(S), 12 November 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10105; internet; accessed on 12 March 2008.

[59] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO Facts and Figures*…, 22.

structures, command relationships and interoperability flourished. Despite the opinion by some that the organization's most pressing need was to quickly establish and ensure its military effectiveness in order to counter the Soviet threat, Canada and the supporters of Article 2 nevertheless pushed for the formation of organs responsible for economic collaboration, and for considering the financial implications of potential military programs.[60]

The Canadian government had also begun to consider more seriously the form that its contribution to NATO would take. Knowing full well the limitations that existed with respect to the military capabilities of the recently-demobilized Canadian forces, the new St-Laurent government sought different avenues for involvement in the Alliance. The focus naturally turned to Article 3 of the Treaty, which "provided that each country, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid would maintain and develop, not only their individual forces, but their collective forces, in order to resist armed attack."[61] Whereas the Canadian-sponsored Article 2 had been intended to facilitate and even encourage economic transactions between NATO members, it was Article 3 that would prove most important to Canada, at least in the short term.

By the end of 1949, the basic foundations of Canada's Mutual Aid Program had been laid. A number of different options, including lump sum payments to a central NATO fund, provision of raw materials to member nations, facilitation of communication with Canadian defence industry representatives and the offer of air training facilities had been studied and

---

[60] Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Telegram to Canadian High Commissioner in United Kingdom – Implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty* (Ottawa), Telegram 977, 27 May 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=8970; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

[61] Major-General J.D.B. Smith, "Canada and NATO," in *The Empire Club of Canada Speeches 1955-1956,* ed. Dr. C.C. Goldring, 293 – 305 (Toronto: The Empire Club Foundation, 1956), 299; available from http://www.empireclubfoundation.com/details.asp?SpeechID=2646&FT=yes; internet; accessed 12 February 2008.

prioritized.[62] All that was required was to confirm informally, and quickly, which offers would be considered a useful contribution by the North Atlantic Defence Committee.[63] Canadian officials believed that "there was nothing to be gained by waiting until asked [by NATO] and much to be gained by announcing [its mutual aid] position on its own initiative."[64] Once this information had been received, and with input from the Ministers of Finance, Trade and Commerce, and National Defence, as well as the Chief of the General Staff, the Canadian government was ready to make preliminary offers of mutual aid to NATO. As always, the offers were tied more closely to the benefits that could be enjoyed in Canada, versus the needs of the Alliance.

Elements of Canada's proposed contributions to mutual aid were first presented to NATO delegates during a series of Alliance defence meetings in Europe between 26 November and 14 December 1949. Aside from military training, some of the other types of assistance that Canada initially envisioned offering to NATO included transfers of surplus military equipment to European nations, the provision of military radar equipment, the preparation of shadow facilities in various Canadian aircraft plants, anti-submarine escort

---

[62] Minister of Trade and Commerce, *Telegram – Extract from Minutes of Meeting of Cabinet Defence Committee – North Atlantic Treaty Mutual Aid* (Ottawa), Telegram WA-3178, 23 November 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9016; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

[63] Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Letter to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Next Meeting of Defence Committee* (Ottawa), DEA/50030-T-40, 29 November 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9019; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

[64] Canadian High Commissioner in United Kingdom, *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Canadian Contribution Under Article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty* (Lo, Belgium), Telegram 2389, 12 December 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9025; internet; accessed 8 February 2008. Apart from other political and commercial disadvantages, it was felt that a 'wait-and-see' policy would probably result in Canada being pressed eventually to contribute in a less satisfactory form to that already contemplated.

vessels and minesweepers, and the production of picrite at plants in Canada.[65] Initial mention of a NATO training scheme for both army and air force officers in Canada was well received by Defence Ministers of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium and the Netherlands. This was not surprising, given the shortages in qualified aircrew and training aircraft, as well as lack of suitable infrastructure in those nations. Member states saw such a plan as one method of partially overcoming the anticipated training shortfalls of 4,000 aircrew per year,[66] which would in turn impede NATO's progress towards full operational capability. More importantly, however, Canadian Defence Minister Brooke Claxton estimated that the acceptance of such a proposal would help to stand Canada in good stead within the alliance without having recourse to any great expenses and without significant commitments of forces.[67] In very short order, arrangements were in place to accept the first intake of aircrew students in Canada. This was the outcome that Canadian leaders had hoped for.

An original assessment by Air Force planners in March 1950 had led to the conclusion that aircrew instruction could be provided at a rate of 50 pilots and 50 navigators per year without any significant increases to existing RCAF training resources.[68] Proposals called for all costs related to personnel administration, accommodation, and training to be the responsibility of the Canadian government, while aircrew salaries, national benefits and

---

[65] *Ibid*., n.p.

[66] Privy Council Office, *Extracts from Minutes of Meetings of Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions* (Ottawa), 15 November 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7587; internet; accessed 11 January 2008.

[67] Minister of National Defence, *Extracts from Report on NATO Defence Meetings November 26 to December 14, 1949* (Ottawa), L.S.L.Nol 234, 21 December 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9030; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

[68] Privy Council Office, *Memorandum from Military Secretary, Cabinet Defence Committee to Cabinet – Offer of Training Facilities* (Ottawa), Cabinet Document no. 8-50, 4 May 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7520; internet; accessed 28 January 2008.

travel to and from Canada from home stations were to be borne by the countries filling the training billets. The training scheme was originally designed to operate on a year-to-year basis, with a re-evaluation of the requirement to run the program being taken each year.[69] The first round of requirements identified by NATO nations and accepted by Canada totalled 69 pilots and 48 navigators.[70] The specific agreements to train these original NATO aircrew candidates were concluded on a bilateral basis with the nations concerned due to the fact that the NATO structures charged with the management and allocation of training slots had not yet been formally established by the time the RCAF was ready to begin instruction in late-1950. This capability on the part of NATO would not be available until the creation of the principal bodies responsible for training were created by the Military Committee at the end of that same year.

From the outset of NATO's creation, one of the most important structures within the Alliance has always been the Military Committee (MC). Established through the provisions of Article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty, and comprising the Chiefs-of-Staff of the member nations, the MC was initially tasked with providing the North Atlantic Council (NAC) with policy guidance of a military nature, advising the NATO Defence Committee (DC) and other agencies on military matters and recommending military measures for the defence of the North Atlantic area.[71] The MC was also responsible for a number of sub-committees or

---

[69] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Acting Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs – Expiration of NATO Air Training* (Ottawa), 17 May 1956; taken from Department of National Defence, Directorate of History and Heritage, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223), Ottawa (hereafter: DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[70] Royal Canadian Air Force, *Memorandum – NATO Air Training by the RCAF* (Ottawa), 450-100-90/1 (DAPP), 17 May 1955; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[71] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Final Communiqué,* 17 September 1949; available from http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c490917a.htm; internet; accessed 16 March 2008.

groups, including a Military Standing Group (SG) responsible for facilitating the rapid and efficient conduct of the work of the MC.[72] As required, the SG would convene ad hoc or permanent committees responsible for specific defence issues important to the conduct of Alliance operations. The committee which would eventually exert the most influence over the NATO ATP would be the SG Committee on Flying Training (SG CFT). At the behest of the US Chairman of the Joint Staff (CJS), Canada would become one of the four members of this important committee, which met for the first time on 15 November 1950.[73]

Unfortunately, the timing of the inaugural meeting of the SG CFT was too late to provide any guidance to Canadian officials responsible with launching the NATO ATP in 1950. From 1951 onwards, however, the committee oversaw the allocation of most training billets in Canada to NATO nations and negotiated any changes to agreed training levels with the Canadian government and military representatives.[74] The only exceptions to this rule occurred when Canadian interests were best served by accepting small numbers of aircrew trainees over and above those formally offered to the SG CFT.

One of the first major tasks of the SG CFT was to undertake a more detailed evaluation of the scope of the aircrew training problem, and propose changes to the various programs offered within NATO. The early findings of the committee painted a bleak picture, predicting that the number of graduate aircrew members was expected to fall quite short of

---

[72] The original Military Standing Group Committee comprised representatives from France, the United Kingdom and the United States. Membership on sub-committees of the SG could be expanded to include representatives from any NATO nation, as approved by the SG and as requirements for specific expertise or knowledge dictated.

[73] US Chairman of the Joint Staff, *Telex Message – Establishment of SG CFT* (Washington), CJS523, 091745Z Nov 50; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[74] Secretary, Chiefs of Staff Committee, *Memorandum – NATO Aircrew Training in Canada,* (Ottawa), CSC 1284-1, 28 June 1951; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

requirements for the Alliance. As a result, the SG sought to significantly expand the entire training program by both attempting to compel European nations to increase the output of their national aircrew programs and to expand production capacity of the existing North American training schemes. Despite Canada's early reservations about increasing the number of training schools within the RCAF, due mostly to cost and personnel issues, the decision by the Canadian government to accept the SG's request to significantly enlarge the NATO ATP in Canada was met with relief and gratitude within NATO circles. Under the revised plan accepted in mid-1951, Canada agreed to train 1,400 aircrew candidates per year starting in 1952 – 850 navigators and 550 pilots.[75] Small numbers of radar observers from Belgium, France, Italy and the Netherlands were also included in the training program in 1953 and 1954.[76] The change of heart came about largely due to a bi-lateral agreement for air training which had been concluded between Canada and the United Kingdom earlier in the year. This arrangement had already resulted in the opening of additional schools and training establishments, which were expected to have the capacity to take on the additional numbers of students.[77] .

The NATO ATP in Canada was not the sole scheme of this sort within NATO in the early-1950s. The United States operated a similar program, albeit the pre-requisites for participation and allocation procedure for seats on training courses were more stringent and often far more convoluted due to the overly bureaucratic nature of the American system.

---

[75] *Ibid.* When this agreement was concluded, plans were still in place to terminate the entire NATO ATP by the end of 1954.

[76] Deputy Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Chairman, Canadian Joint Staff Washington – NATO Aircrew Training in Canada* (Ottawa), CC:1030.1 (D/CJS), 8 September 1953, 1; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[77] Details of the agreement with the RAF are elaborated upon in much greater detail later in this paper.

Though the programs were operated in different manners, both had been created in 1950 in order to "provide training for the initial entries of the NATO countries for the build up of the air forces to be achieved by December 1954."[78] In Canada's case, the agreement with NATO to provide the training was renewed in 1951, 1952 and 1953, with the actual liability periods beginning in the year following the renewal date. By September 1953, however, it became apparent that some of the European NATO nations would not be in a position to fully provide their own integral aircrew training by 1954, as previously envisaged.[79] This reality would necessitate a reconsideration of the Canadian government's plan to reduce the program and re-allocate RCAF personnel to the front-line units which were still being established for service on the European continent.

At the request of the NATO SG, Canada once again undertook to re-evaluate its capacity to continue providing aircrew training post-1954. On 16 October 1953, the Canadian government agreed to continue the NATO ATP for a fixed period of three years commencing in 1955, albeit at a reduced production rate of 1,200 aircrew per year.[80] This decision to impose an end-date on the program was confirmed in June 1956 when the Canadian Cabinet endorsed the recommendation of the Minister of National Defence to terminate the formal NATO ATP upon completion of the 1957-1958 training program.[81]

---

[78] Acting Chief of the Air Staff, *Memorandum – NATO Pilot Training* (Ottawa), 30 December 1952; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[79] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Report – NATO Aircrew Training* (Ottawa), CC 1030-1(CJS), 25 September 1953; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[80] Chief of the Air Staff, *Letter to Chairman, Chiefs of Staff – NATO Air Training* (Ottawa), TS1072-1-9 (CAS), 1 February 1956; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223). The proportion of pilots, navigators and air observers within the 1,200 was not fixed, and would be determined and changed, as required.

[81] Cabinet Defence Committee, *Record of Cabinet Defence Committee Decision – Reduction of NATO Aircrew Training, 110th Meeting* (Ottawa), 13 June 1956; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

Provisions were made, however, to allow for a limited number of aircrew from Denmark, Norway and the Netherlands to continue to utilize vacant slots within the RCAF air training system after 1958, on a cost-recovery basis. Canadian officials were careful to ensure that the decision to end the program was not seen as a sign of a reduction in Canadian dedication to NATO, but instead "as a way to apply the savings in manpower and other resources to enhancing NATO's strength in other fields, particularly the defence of the [Alliance's] deterrent striking power."[82]

The decision to terminate the NATO ATP was not taken without considerable forethought and concern for the impact that such a choice could have on NATO. The termination of the NATO training scheme was expected to "result in manpower savings of approximately 495 officers, 1,870 airmen, 580 civilians and an annual financial saving of about $31,000,000, comprised of personnel and aircraft operating costs."[83] Though the program was deemed an unqualified success, having trained sufficient aircrew to allow for the manning of 80% of the operational forces assigned to the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), it was also a significant drain on Canadian resources.[84] Although Canada's decision to look for savings as a more cost-effective means of supporting the Alliance coincided with that of other NATO nations, political leaders wanted to avoid a negative backlash from NATO, and in particular from those countries which benefitted the

---

82

most from the NATO ATP. As outlined in the table that follows, the training scheme was one of the most expensive elements of Canada's Mutual Aid Program.

Expenditure on Mutual Aid Program by Fiscal Year (Thousands of Dollars)

	ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM	
	NATO Aircrew Training	Total Mutual Aid
FY 1950-51	0	195,417
FY 1951-52	48,552	126,416
FY 1952-53	104,628	235,053
FY 1953-54	71,340	289,707
FY 1954-55	152,890	253,380
FY 1955-56	51,056	174,966
FY 1956-57	47,753	133,553
FY 1957-58	26,418	118,164
	502,637	**1,526,656**

Source: Minister of National Defence, *Memorandum to Cabinet – Canadian Mutual Aid Program* (Ottawa), Document No. 235/59, 7 August 1959; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=10922; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

While the financial and personnel aspects of the program were cited as some of the main drivers for the termination of the training scheme, the knowledge that certain NATO nations had reduced their own training facilities in order to take advantage of the vacancies in the Canadian program did not sit well with government officials in Ottawa.[85] As well, the growing number of unfilled vacancies as some nations undertook training at home also made the program exceedingly expensive, for questionable returns. At the time the decision was taken, the cost to train each candidate amounted to approximately $75,000, and the overhead

[85] Privy Council Office, *Extract from Minutes of Meeting of Cabinet Defence Committee – Aircrew Training Program* (Ottawa), 19 April 1956; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

expenses resulted in a net loss of about $20,000 per candidate for spaces left unfilled.[86] In the end, Canada believed that the monetary savings experienced by ending the NATO ATP would be much more useful to the overall Mutual Aid program if the funds could be spent on aircraft and equipment intended for fellow Alliance members.[87]

On 19 July 1958, a wings parade was held at RCAF Station Winnipeg to recognize the final students to graduate from the NATO ATP. Since the start of the program, 5,575 pilots, navigators and air observers from ten NATO countries[88] were trained to basic wings standard at various RCAF training schools and facilities throughout Canada. Although the training scheme contributed greatly in decreasing the gap between requirements for aircrew and the capacity within NATO for actual production, it also profited Canada in many ways. The program allowed Canada to contribute to NATO in such a way that economic and military benefits were felt by the RCAF and the Canadian aircraft industry. The most revealing examples of the positive returns on Canada's investment in the NATO ATP become even more evident when the support to specific nations is elaborated upon.

THE NATO ATP TAKES SHAPE

As a result of the success of the earlier air training schemes and the benefits that they generated, it is not entirely surprising that the Canadian government saw the establishment of a similar program as a means of meeting its new NATO commitments by building on previous experience. Canada would have few difficulties in convincing fellow Alliance

---

[86] Government of Canada, *Extract from Minutes of meeting of Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions* (Ottawa), DEA/50030-K-40, 14 May 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3195; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

[87] *Ibid*.

[88] H.A. Halliday, *Chronology of Canadian Military Aviation* (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975), 130.

members of its ability to have a positive impact on NATO's struggle to achieve planned levels of operational capability, particularly in the realm of air defence, within the desired timeframe. The Berlin Blockade of 1948 – 1949 and the Korean conflict only served to reinforce the importance of air power in addressing communist aggression or expansionism.

Although the architects of the NATO ATP in Canada applied many of the lessons learned from the past in creating the framework of the training program, the plan did have some important differences which distinguished it from both the BCATP and the Imperial Royal Flying Corps. Whereas both previous air training schemes were intended to mirror the instruction being provided by British flying services, the NATO ATP conformed solely to the RCAF aircrew training syllabus. This distinction applied to both pilot and air navigator training courses. This approach was very much in line with the government's low-key principle of least effort and cost for most gain. Thus, trainees would not be segregated into NATO or specific nation-only classes, but rather, they would be integrated with RCAF students into mixed courses. It was also hoped that by mixing the students, greater possibilities for later cooperation and networking within the Alliance would ensue.[89] There were some minor exceptions to this rule, because certain students required specialized training which could not be provided by the standard RCAF training curriculum. These modifications to the norm were more prevalent in the later-stages of the NATO ATP, or in cases where specific bi-lateral agreements with a special operational focus existed between Canada and particular NATO nations. In most of these exceptional cases, it proved to be in

[89] Department of External Affairs, "NATO Air Training Plan," *External Affairs – Monthly Bulletin of the Department of External Affairs* 10, no. 8 (August 1958), 189; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

the best interest of Canada, mostly for economic reasons, to deviate from established procedures.

Prior to the start of the NATO ATP, Canadian officials determined that certain existing facilities would need to be expanded, while others, located at former BCATP aerodromes, would have to be re-established in their entirety if the goals of training 1,400 NATO and 1,600 RCAF students[90] per year to wings standard was to be achieved. By the time the flying training program was fully implemented, RCAF instructors were teaching prospective aircrew to fly at a number of facilities throughout the nation. Air Navigator students received their training at the air navigation schools in Summerside (Prince Edward Island) and Winnipeg (Manitoba), while pilots underwent basic flying training at schools in Centralia (Ontario), Gimli (Manitoba), Claresholm and Penhold (Alberta) and Moose Jaw (Saskatchewan), and advanced flying training at facilities in Saskatoon (Saskatchewan) and Portage la Prairie (Manitoba).[91] Students selected to progress to fighter aircraft also attended gunnery training at MacDonald (Manitoba).[92] Upon graduation, newly-minted aircrew normally returned to their nations for final qualifications and further instruction at type-specific operational training units.

As a general rule, NATO nations were expected to assign to the program only those trainees which met a set of pre-requisites established by the RCAF. Canada was not in a position to provide basic military skills or recruit training, as the aim of the program was to produce aircrew to meet the needs of NATO. It is important to recall that the RCAF, as well

---

[90] Larry Milberry, *Canada's Air Force at War…,* 457.

[91] Department of External Affairs, "NATO Training by the RCAF," *External Affairs – Monthly Bulletin of the Department of External Affairs* 3, no. 9 (September 1951), 300 – 301. Gimli was later upgraded to advanced flying school status to meet increased needs of fighter pilot production.

[92] *Ibid.,* 301.

as the Royal Canadian Army (RCA) and Royal Canadian Navy (RCN), were also undergoing significant expansion programs which left little excess capacity within the training system.

Upon arrival in Canada, aircrew candidates were sent to London, Ontario to undergo a four week Canadian indoctrination course which was intended to prepare them for their immersion into RCAF and Canadian life and culture.[93] This course was accompanied by a short period of language training aimed at familiarizing students with technical aviation and military terminology, as well as concepts that they would not have encountered during basic second-language courses taken at home.[94] Since NATO operated primarily in English,[95] combined with the fact that this was the international language of aviation, trainees required at least a working knowledge and functional ability to communicate in English when reporting for training.

Generally, students from the more northern NATO nations exhibited few problems with the verbal and oral communication requirements, however, the same could not be said for trainees from southern Alliance members. Problems were particularly acute for students from Turkey, Italy and Portugal.[96] In some cases, the problems were serious enough that disproportionate numbers of students from specific nations were forced to withdraw from training due to the inability to communicate effectively. In 1955 alone, failure rates for

---

[93] George W. McCracken, "NATO Air Training in Canada," *Current Affairs for the Canadian Forces* 4, no. 1, (1 January 1953), 5.

[94] *Ibid.,* 6. This was similar to the technical language courses provided to French-Canadian aircrew trainees in order to prepare them for the complexities of operating in an English-speaking aviation environment.

[95] George W. McCracken, "NATO Air Training…, 5. While NATO's official languages are English and French, day-to-day operations and most correspondence are carried out in English only.

[96] United States Air Force, *Training in the Royal Canadian Air Force* (Scott AFB, IL: Air Training Command, 1956), 103.

Turkish trainees due to language problems peaked at an unsatisfactory level of 60 per cent.[97] In order to remedy the problem and eliminate the wastage within the program, the RCAF did agree to tailor existing instruction or create additional specialized second-language courses which took into account the difficulties encountered in learning English.[98]

THE RAF IN CANADA

As stated previously, the Canadian government's decision to establish the NATO ATP was as much about the benefits which such a program would provide to Canada, as it was about ensuring that NATO was able to quickly and effectively build up the pool of trained and operational forces needed to counter the Soviet threat. In deciding to include certain NATO partners in the plan, while excluding others, numerous factors had to be taken into account. In vitually all cases, however, the overriding consideration related to the net advantage that would result for Canada in admitting one nation's aircrew trainees over another. An excellent example of this policy is that of the inclusion of the United Kingdom's Royal Air Force in the training plan.

Like other western air forces, the RAF undertook a significant program of rebuilding and restructuring in the late-1940s in order to improve its war preparedness and its ability to address Soviet threats to security. The British aerospace industry was extremely responsive in meeting the aircraft needs of the RAF, with production rates at various factories and depots growing at a impressive pace. So considerable was the increase in the development, construction and delivery of aircraft, that the RAF was unable to train personnel fast enough

---

[97] Chargé d'Affaires, Canadian Embassy in Turkey, *Memorandum – Annual Review and Mutual Aid Turkey* (Ankara), DEA/50030-L-40, 10 October 1955; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=1183; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

[98] United States Air Force, *Training in the Royal Canadian Air Force...,* 104.

to man these newly-acquired additions to its flying inventory. In order for aircrew training to keep pace with aircraft production, the RAF estimated that it would require an annual intake of 2,120 pilots, of which only 1,020 could be accommodated at existing British training facilities.[99] In a July 1950 telegram to the RCAF Chief of the Air Staff (CAS), Air Marshal Wilf Curtis, the RAF's CAS, Marshal of the Royal Air Force, Sir John Slessor, predicted that "the production of substantial reserves of fighters… [would] be largely unprofitable unless the RAF [could] produce the men to use the material both in the air and on the ground."[100] In his estimation, Canada could alleviate some of the training burden on behalf of the RAF.

It is interesting to note that when the Canadian Minister of National Defence (MND) first offered training slots to NATO nations only a few months before, the United Kingdom had held the belief that no such assistance would be required for the instruction of RAF personnel.[101] In fact, because of the decision by British officials to ignore Canada's initial offer, the slots which had been made available for 1951 within the existing RCAF aircrew training program had already been spoken for by other NATO allies by the time the RAF leadership approached the RCAF in July 1950.

Similar to the RAF, Canada's air force had also launched an expansion program of its own, with new squadrons being established and pilots being produced at a fairly high tempo. Though basic aircrew and operational fighter training for the RCAF were not expected to overtax the existing infrastructure and facilities, the opportunity for the newly-formed

---

[99] Chief of the Air Staff, *Memorandum – RAF Training in Canada* (Air Force Headquarters Ottawa, TS.72-1-9 (CAS)), 19 October 1950; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[100] RAF Chief of the Air Staff, United Kingdom, *Telegram to RCAF CAS Regarding Possibility of Training of RAF Aircrew in Canada,* (London), Telegram 299, 27 July 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7552; internet; accessed 08 February 2008.

[101] Department of National Defence, *Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Chiefs of Staff Committee*, Monday, 27 August 1951, 4; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

squadrons to gain experience on jet aircraft, and more importantly to do so in a NATO environment, were causes for concern in Canada. In order for the RCAF crews to become proficient in the new Alliance environment, a solution that would permit them to train and fly from facilities in Europe was needed in short order.[102] While consideration had already been given to the possiblility of stationing one RCAF squadron in Europe on a rotational basis, the news of the RAF shortfalls in aircrew training capacity was seen as a potential way out of the RCAF's own dilemma.

The idea of RCAF crews gaining experience in more advanced operational techniques in close cooperation with other NATO nations had actually already been discussed informally with British officials by both the RCAF CAS and the MND shortly after the announcement of the NATO ATP offer. In July 1950, a more formal request had been forwarded to the British High Commissioner in Canada, Sir Alexander Clutterbuck,[103] but preliminary expectations were kept fairly low regarding the possibility of this proposal coming to fruition. Although it was not pursued further at the time, the Canadian government had also suggested that some of the cost of an exchange of this type could be offset by the provision air navigator training for up to 50 students in Canada.[104] The receipt of the telegram from the RAF CAS in late-July, however, proved both timely and fortuitous, as it provided the impetus for the establishment of a more formal agreement that would serve the purposes of both the RCAF and the RAF.

---

[102] Under Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Letter to the High Commissioner of the United Kingdom* (Ottawa: DEA/10813-40), 10 July 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7540; internet; accessed 08 February 2008.

[103] *Ibid.*

[104] *Ibid.*

Despite the possibilities that an agreement of this type could offer, it did not change the fact that the NATO ATP, in its original form, did not have the excess capacity available to accept additional students from the United Kingdom. The RCAF had been adamant in the lead up to the creation of the ATP that any increases to the student intake would necessitate the opening of additional training facilities, or in the least, expansion of existing schools and the addition of costly infrastructure.[105] Nevertheless, given the favourable opportunities that would be presented to Canada if a suitable agreement could be concluded with the United Kingdom, and the popularity that a scheme of this type would have in Canada, Defence Department and Air Force Headquarters ordered a detailed study of the specific requirements and associated expenditures. It soon became apparent to government representatives that the benefits to Canada, both political and military, would significantly outweigh the costs.[106]

One interesting aspect of the agreement with the RAF was that, with the concurrence of the Department of External Affairs, most of the formal negotiations needed to implement the training of British aircrew were undertaken at the Air Staff level in both Canada and the United Kingdom.[107] While political oversight did exist, the fact that the support to the RAF would be over and above that offered under the NATO ATP, thus necessitating a re-tasking of RCAF resources in Canada, meant that military to military discussions would likely result in an accord sooner rather than later. Without the shackles of typical political machinations to impede their progress, air force personnel in both nations were able to finalize a

---

[105] Chief of the Air Staff, *Memorandum to the MND – Capacity of Flying Training Schools* (Ottawa: 450-60/1), 11 July 1951; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[106] Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Letter to Minister of National Defence – Defence and Mutual Aid Policy* (Ottawa: B.C./Vol.113, 12 August 1950); available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7558; internet; accessed 7 April 2008.

[107] Chief of the Air Staff, *Memorandum to Chiefs of Staff Committee – NATO Aircrew Training in Canada* (Ottawa: 1284-1 (CAS)), 28 June 1951, 2; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

framework of a plan in only a few months. Cabinet officials, including the Minister of National Defence and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, were called upon only to provide final approval of the agreement.[108]

By the end of August 1950, planners on both sides of the Atlantic had worked out most of the technical and financial details for the training of RAF aircrew in Canada and the rotational basing of a RCAF squadron in the United Kingdom. The agreement was amended in October 1950 to increase the number of squadrons based in the United Kingdom under the auspices of mutual aid to three by the end of 1951.[109] It was not until these Canadian squadrons moved to the European continent in the spring of 1955 that the reciprocal understanding would no longer be in effect, and the funding for their accommodations and operations would revert to RCAF responsibility.[110] Though the RAF trainees would undergo training with both RCAF and NATO students, the arrangement would not be made under the formal auspices of the Mutual Aid Program.[111] To the flying students, this feature of the plan would be transparent, as they would be integrated into the existing NATO ATP and would follow the same training as their European counterparts. From the perspective of the Canadian government, however, this bi-lateral contract was the first instance in which the training provided by the RCAF would have very tangible benefits for Canada.

---

[108] Minister of National Defence, *Letter to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Defence and Mutual Aid Policy* (Ottawa: DEA/10813 40, 12 October 1950); available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7580; internet; accessed 7 April 2008.

[109] *Ibid.*

[110] Chief of the Air Staff, *Letter to Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff – Aircrew Training for the RAF* (Ottawa: TS450-200-90/1, 6 April 1956), 2; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[111] The initial allocation of slots in the NATO ATP under the Mutual Aid Program did not result in significant benefits to the Canadian government, other than demonstrating Canada's willingness to shoulder some of the financial burden associated with membership in NATO.

The decision by RCAF authorities to re-activate training schools that had not originally been expected to be required as part of the NATO ATP meant that Canada was able to resolve a part of the United Kingdom's problem concerning the production of qualified individual aircrew candidates on a yearly basis. That said, the additional facilities and instructors assigned to deal with this unexpected arrival of students from England could not realistically cover one hundred per cent of the RAF's needs. Whereas the delta between those requiring training and those able to be trained in the United Kingdom by the end of 1952 was approximately 1,100 personnel,[112] the RCAF estimated that it would be able to accommodate just over one quarter of this number.

The formal agreement for reciprocal training between Canada and the United Kingdom was finalized in late-August of 1950. Under the provisions of the accord, Canada committed to train 300 RAF pilots to wings standard and 50 navigators over a two year period commencing in January of 1951.[113] Trainees were expected to arrive at a rate of 25 personnel every six weeks, until such time as the total number had been inducted into the training system.[114] Any British students undertaking training in Canada in subsequent years were expected to fall under the provisions of the NATO ATP, with slots allocated not by Canada, but by the NATO Standing Group and the Air Training Advisory Group.[115]

---

[112] Chief of the Air Staff, *Memorandum – RAF Training in Canada* (Air Force Headquarters Ottawa, TS.72-1-9 (CAS)), 19 October 1950; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[113] Chief of the Air Staff, *Memorandum to MND – Training of RAF Pilots in Canada* (Air Force Headquarters Ottawa, TS72-1-9 (CAS)), 21 August 1950; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[114] RCAF - Air Force Headquarters, *Draft Telex Message from AFHQ to British Air Ministry* (Ottawa), August 1950; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[115] Chief of the Air Staff, *Memorandum to the Chairman, Chiefs of Staff – Information on Trainees from Turkey* (Air Force Headquarters Ottawa), 17 February 1956; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223). Despite the oversight exercised by these entities, Canada always reserved the right to refuse requests, particularly when they were in the Canadian interest.

Notwithstanding the SG CFT role in allocating training positions, Canada did exert much influence in which nations were provided space in the NATO ATP. For its part, England would host, on a rotating basis, three squadrons of RCAF fighter jets at an already existing RAF air base.[116]

Since the arrangement between both nations was made outside of the formal Mutual Aid process, negotiators went to considerable lengths to try to reduce the complexity of the financial considerations and to the greatest extent possible, eliminate the need for an actual transfer of funds.[117] The preference in both countries was to consider the accord as a form of reciprocal assistance. In general terms, "Canada would assume the costs of those services being provided for the RAF in Canada and the UK would reciprocate for the RCAF squadrons stationed in England on a Service to Service and service for service bases [sic]."[118] Officials in Ottawa lauded this agreement as a shining example of how Canada could secure a positive return from its association with and inclusion in NATO. The new Secretary of State for External Affairs, Lester B. Pearson, even went as far as suggesting that future offers

---

[116] As previously outlined, this commitment was undertaken as part of the reciprocal agreement for mutual aid between Canada and the UK. Squadrons slated to eventually be housed at 1 Wing in Marville, France were lodged at RAF North Luffenham from November 1951 to February 1955. The decision to station squadrons in UK for training purposes proved fortuitous, as it allowed the RCAF to provide a limited air defence capability in Europe as it waited out delays in construction of the airlfield in France.

[117] Department of External Affairs, *Draft Communication from Department of External Affairs to High Commissioner of United Kingdom*, (Ottawa: B.C./Vol.113), 8 August 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=7555; internet; accessed 08 February 2008.

[118] Department of National Defence, *Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Chiefs of Staff Committee*, (Ottawa), Monday, 27 August 1951, 4; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

to NATO nations for aircrew training in Canada should focus on emulating the Anglo-Canadian bi-lateral agreement which resulted in direct benefits to Canada.[119]

THE GERMAN INVASION

While the provision of aircrew training to the RAF resulted in net military benefits to the RCAF and the Canadian government, the admission of trainees from certain other NATO nations also resulted in positive returns to Canada's aviation industry. The best example of this situation is related to the training of West German aircrew in exchange for their commitment to purchase a large quantity of fighter aircraft from Canadian companies.

When the NATO ATP was created, West Germany was not yet a member of NATO. To many, the idea that a nation which had been the sworn enemy of many of the Alliance's members less than half a decade before could be considered for inclusion in NATO was inconceivable. Nevertheless, West Germany did become a full-fledged member of NATO in 1955, and it quickly set about rebuilding its armed forces in order to meet the force goals imposed upon it by the mere fact of membership. In the case of the newly-reformed Luftwaffe, West Germany had consented to a contribution of "60 squadrons and 1,326 aircraft, of which 12 squadrons numbering a total of 300 aircraft were to be IDF (F86 type)."[120] Understandably, this need to equip and train the West German forces from the ground up was seen as an economic opportunity by Canada.

One of Canada's premier aircraft manufacturers in the immediate post-war years was the Canadair Corporation, located in Montreal. Created in 1944, the company had been

---

[119] Department of External Affairs, *Letter from Secretary of State for External Affairs to Minister of National Defence* (Ottawa, B.C./Vol.113), 12 August 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=7558; internet; accessed 08 February 2008.

[120] Supreme Allied Commander Europe, *Telex Message to NDHQ Ottawa* (Paris), SH 29727, 111016Z October 1956; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

contracted by the Canadian government since 1946 to produce, under license, a number of different aircraft for use by the RCAF. The extensive build-up of squadrons in the RCAF as a result of Canada's commitment to both NATO and to North American air defence was extremely profitable to Canadair. By the mid-1950's however, with Canadian units up to strength and orders for additional aircraft reducing significantly, Canadair representatives worried that the company would soon be in dire straits. Officials warned that "Canadair's employment level had dropped to 7,000 and would be further reduced unless additional orders could be found in the immediate future."[121]

When Germany first acceeded to NATO in early-1955, the idea of having German aircrew trained under the auspices of the NATO ATP was not even considered. The program was running at full capacity, and there was little room for flexibility at that time. There was no attempt on the part of the Canadian or West German governments to broach the subject of Luftwaffe participation in the NATO ATP.[122] It was only after a sales representative from Canadair itself met with West German defence personnel in June of 1955 that the potential to secure training billets in the aircrew training scheme against a guarantee for aircraft purchases was identified. Ironically, the discussions and overly optimistic promises of the Canadair representative nearly torpedoed the entire plan. At the meeting, he had informed the Germans that "Canada would allocate 25 million dollars to NATO earmarked to provide three squadrons of military aircraft for Germany, [including] two flying [Canadair]

---

[121] Canadian Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council, *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Allocation of Aircraft to Germany* (Paris), Telegram 635, 13 May 1955; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=1179; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

[122] Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Letter to Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff – Mutual Aid Germany* (Ottawa: DEA/50030-U-40, 9 February 1956); available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3223; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Sabres."[123] Unfortunately, no such plan existed at the time, and significant diplomatic and political discussions between West German and Canadian officials were required to remedy the faux-pas.[124] Nevertheless, the seed of the idea had been planted, and it would grow into a profitable venture for both Canada and West Germany in a very short time.

Despite the negative impact that initially resulted from the erroneous promise by Canadair, the opportunity for Canada to make good on the misunderstanding presented itself in the fall of 1955. Earlier in the year, the United States had tentatively agreed to fund the purchase two-thirds of the fighter force for the Luftwaffe under their own version of the Mutual Aid Program. As 1955 drew to a close, however, it was announced that the Americans would likely provide Germany with only one-third of her aircraft requirements, and that the procurement of the remainder of the fleet would be the responsibility of the West German government.[125]

The Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, C.D. Howe, saw this change in the planned US mutual aid and the possibility of West Germany purchasing the balance of its new fleet itself as an opportunity for Canada. Within Canadian government circles, various alternatives for the delivery of fighter aircraft to the Luftwaffe were considered. Of the options reviewed, the only viable ones included the sale of aircraft as a direct commercial

---

[123] Canadian Ambassador in West Germany, *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Allocation of Canadian Aircraft to Germany* (Bonn), Telegram 136, 24 June 1955; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=1180; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

[124] Canadian Ambassador in Federal Republic of Germany, *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Alleged Offer of Jet Aircraft by Canada* (Bonn: DEA/50030-L-12-40, 28 June 1955); available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=1189; internet, accessed 5 February 2008.

[125] Minister of Trade and Commerce, *Letter to Canadian Ambassador in West Germany – Allocation of Aircraft to Germany* (Ottawa), C.D.H./Vol 3, 26 November 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=1181; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

transaction for dollars, or a donation of between 75 and 130 Canadair Sabre fighters as mutual aid.[126] Discussions and consideration of choices continued into the early spring, until the Canadian Ambassador to West Germany was instructed on 24 May 1956 to offer 75 Sabre V aircraft as part of the Canadian Mutual Aid Program.[127]

At the same time, the Canadian Ambassador in Bonn was instructed to question the West German authorities on the issue of financing by their government of additional capital facilities at the RCAF stations in Zweibrucken and Baden Sollingen. Though these two topics were not dependent on each other, the mention of them in the same breath provided a greater likelihood that the West German government would commit to funding the upgrades at the RCAF facilities in Germany, much to Canada's benefit. At the time of the announcement, the Department of External Affairs also went to great lengths to ensure that the German acceptance of the offer in no way compelled them to purchase additional aircraft in Canada.[128]

The West German authorities welcomed the donation of aircraft from Canada, but for the first time, officially identified the important problems which they were having regarding training of pilots for the Luftwaffe. German military authorities explained that they had already been in contact with other NATO nations regarding excess training capacity, but had

---

[126] Canadian Ambassador in West Germany, *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Sale of Sabre Jet Aircraft to Germany* (Bonn), Telegram 298, 19 December 1955; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=1190; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

[127] Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Memorandum to Cabinet – Report on the Mutual Aid Offer of 75 F-86 Aircraft to Germany* (Ottawa) Cabinet Document No. D-10-56, 12 June 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3234; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

[128] Canadian Ambassador in West Germany, *Letter to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs – Transfer of Aircraft as Mutual Aid to Germany and Support of Canadian Forces in Germany* (Bonn), DEA/50334-40, 19 July 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3246; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

been unsuccessful in securing any training billets to date. If the rate of pilot production for the Luftwaffe could not be increased, the contribution of Sabre aircraft to Germany would be deemed of no use. At a series of meetings between Canadian and German military personnel, West Germany went as far as offering to pay for training in Canada, outside of the auspices of the NATO ATP. The initial Canadian reaction to the informal German request for training support did not bode well for the mutual aid donation. Though sympathetic to the German problems, Canadian officials stressed that "due to its prior claims for training on the part of its other NATO allies, the RCAF [was] not in a position to undertake German training at that time, nor would it be able to do so in the future due to the planned termination of the NATO ATP in 1958."[129] Not wanting to miss out on the opportunity to show continued interest in the overall NATO mutual aid system, Canadian representatives did promise to try to find a solution to the training difficulties, whether in Canada or elsewhere.

Given the German offer to finance the training of its pilots in Canada, the Department of External Affairs put significant pressure on the RCAF to find a way to accommodate the German request for support. The only solution that seemed viable was to delay the termination of the NATO ATP in order to conduct the flying training of the German pilots. Though a plausible solution, the Canadian government found it hard to justify the expenditures related to maintaining the NATO ATP for an additional period, for the minimal benefit that would result for Canada. It wa reK0.00

committed to ordering one complete wing of Sabre VI aircraft from Canadair if the RCAF could provide basic and advanced pilot training for the Luftwaffe. The German commander also added that as before, the German government would be willing to pay for the instruction provided. If this could not be achieved, he predicted that the German view would likely be that it would be a mistake to buy Canadian aircraft.[130]

Following the German offer, Canadian officials in both the government and the military scrambled to find a manner in which the German request could be supported. No one in a position to influence the decision wanted to miss out on the enormous financial opportunity that a purchase of this type represented for the Canadian aerospace industry, at a relatively low cost to Canada. The Cabinet Defence Committee predicted that the value of the order to Canadair would be approximately $150 million, and that the savings in overhead costs at Canadair was apt to translate into additional savings for future Canadian defence orders.[131] The German proposal to fund the training if necessary, made the idea of extending the NATO ATP much more palatable to Canadian planners.

The importance that the Canadian government placed on finalizing an agreement acceptable to both sides in fairly short order was evident through the instructions that were provided to negotiators in Europe and North America. Specifically, Canadian authorities involved in the discussions were instructed that to the greatest extent possible, the potential deal with the West Germans should not be disclosed to other NATO members until an agreement had been concluded and the NATO Council had been advised of the

---

[130] Canadian Ambassador in West Germany, *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Mutual Aid to Germany* (Bonn), Telegram 214, 20 July 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3247; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

[131] Privy Council Office, *Extract from Minutes of Cabinet Defence Committee – Aircrew Training for the Federal Republic of Germany* (Ottawa), 13 August 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3250; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

arrangement.[132] In so doing, the government hoped to pre-empt any action on the part of the United States or the United Kingdom to interfere with the purchase of aircraft for the Luftwaffe.

The method whereby the potential training of German aircrew would be accomplished was a matter of debate in both Canada and in Europe. Proponents of the plan to provide the flying instruction offered two potential options for the training Luftwaffe pilots: utilizing the existing RCAF facilities established for the NATO ATP, or transferring the necessary RCAF personnel and equipment to establish a training organization in Germany.[133] Though training in Canada, dubbed Plan "A," would necessitate a delay in the termination of the NATO ATP, a number of factors related to conducting the training in Germany under Plan "B," including more adverse weather conditions, preparation of airfields, density of air traffic, logistical support and supervision by Training Command Headquarters, combined to make this second option less desirable.[134] Canadian authorities also believed that the time required to set up a training system in Germany would delay the output of German pilots up to ten months past the cut-off date specified by the Luftwaffe, which could conceivably influence the number of Canadair-built aircraft that the Germans would introduce to their inventory in a negative manner. Finally, the precarious political position in which the Adenauer government in Germany found itself at the time was also an

---

[132] Government of Canada, *Minutes of the Meeting of the Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions* (Ottawa), DEA/50030-K-40, 16 August 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3252; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

[133] Minister of National Defence, *Memorandum to Cabinet Defence Committee – Aircrew Training for the Federal Republic of Germany,* (Ottawa), Copy No. 048, 9 August 1956, 2; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[134] *Ibid.,* 4.

issue which favoured a solution which could be implemented more quickly.[135] Thus, Plan "A" was selected as the most viable alternative.

In order to accommodate the influx of German pilot trainees in Canada, the RCAF determined that it would need to extend the NATO ATP for a period of eight and one half months past the planned termination date of the program, and also accept a delay in the formation of three new operational RCAF air defence squadrons in North America for a similar period.[136] As a result of the positive impact that the provision of this training would have on overall operational effectiveness of the Alliance, however, NATO military authorities endorsed the plan to unofficially extend the NATO ATP in September 1956. NATO planners calculated that by permitting the German pilots to train in Canada, the Luftwaffe could reach an acceptable level of operational readiness as much as a year sooner than if they were to be trained in Germany.[137] Publicly, Canadian government officials sought to stress to other NATO nations, particularly those involved in the NATO ATP that no special provisions or favouritism were extended to the Germans in accepting to undertake the program outside of the formlns

instruction after the official termination of the NATO ATP. As well, the already agreed-upon official termination date of July 1958 for the NATO ATP remained unchanged, despite the fact that German personnel will continue training for some months after the end of the program.

Original estimates by the RCAF pegged the cost of training approximately 400 Luftwaffe pilots at $20,943,412.[138] Despite this estimate, government officials did not want to give the impression that Canada's intentions in accepting to extend the training program were based entirely on business motives or an attempt to secure large profits. Behind closed doors, however, it was widely accepted that the purpose of the training scheme was to encourage the sale of Canadian aircraft.[139] The government also did not want to be seen as offering terms more favourable to Germany than to other NATO nations. Following discussions between representatives from the Departments of Defence, External Affairs and Finance, a determination was made that the Canadian government would charge the West German government a set amount for flight training, in exchange for a guarantee for the purchase of Canadian aircraft. This imposed cost was to cover the out-of-pocket expenses which the Canadian government would incur to extend the NATO ATP beyond its planned termination date.[140]

---

[138] Chief of the Air Staff, *Memorandum to MND – German Pilot Training Financial Considerations* (Ottawa), S450-100-90/1 (CAS), 13 August 1956, 1; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[139] Government of Canada, *Minutes of the Meeting of the Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions* (Ottawa), DEA/50030-K-40, 16 August 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3252; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

[140] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Acting Minister of National Defence – Training of German Aircrew* (Ottawa), 31 August 1956. The Canadian plan called for a number of the German trainees to occupy vacant slots in the existing NATO ATP at Canadian expense. The German government would only be charged for the costs of operating the system for the additional time required to train the remaining German pilots.

On 17 September 1956, Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany signed an exchange of notes, which formally constituted the agreement which would see Germany purchase Canadair Sabre VI aircraft and the RCAF provide the training of German aircrew in Canada. The document outlined Germany's pledge to procure 225 fighter aircraft, which would be supplemented by the 75 Sabre V aircraft which Canada had promised to donate as mutual aid, and Canada's commitment to train 360 German pilots for a lump-sum payment of $12 million.[141] The first German trainees were expected to commence training in Canada in September 1957, with all courses to be complete by April 1959.[142] By the time the German training scheme was concluded in the spring of 1959, 288 Luftwaffe pilots had been trained to wings standard by the RCAF.[143]

FLIGHT TRAINING FOR OTHER NATO NATIONS WITHIN THE NATO ATP

By the time the NATO ATP was concluded in 1958, aircrew from ten different NATO nations had participated in the scheme. The benefits which Canada was able to enjoy as a result of the creation of the flight training program were varied and numerous, and both the Canadian government and the RCAF profited in many ways as a result of the NATO ATP. Some aspects of the program, such as the training of RAF and Luftwaffe personnel, provided very tangible returns for Canada in the form of basing support in the United

---

[141] United Nations, *Exchange of Notes between Canada and Federal Republic of Germany Constituting an Agreement Respecting the Contract for the Purchase of F-86 Aircraft and the Training of German Aircrew in Canada* (Bonn), No. 5633, 17 September 1956. The agreement was later finalized by a note verbale in February 1957.

[142] Canadian Permanent Representative to the NATO Council, *Draft Statement – Aircrew Training for Federal Republic of Germany* (Paris), Document ED-13-56, 10 September 1956; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[143] Chief of the Air Staff, *Aide-Memoire on NATO Aircrew Training* (Ottawa), 21 May 1963, 1; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223). Though the pilot trainees utilized the facilities set up for the NATO ATP, those that received training after the termination of the program did so under the auspices of a bilateral agreement between Canada and West Germany.

Kingdom and the sale of Canadian aircraft.. Participation in the program by other NATO member states also proved valuable in less evident ways.

In the case of nations such as Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Turkey, Luxembourg and Greece, the mere fact that Canada was able to provide assistance in the form of the NATO ATP meant that it was permitted to showcase its support for the concept of mutual aid and Article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Specifically, it allowed Canada to make a significant contribution to NATO in a relatively inexpensive manner. Thus, even when material or concrete returns on the investments made were not as evident as in the cases of the agreements with the United Kingdom and West Germany, the Canadian government still saw itself as coming out ahead.

Not all NATO nations who received training support from Canada in the 1950s did so under the umbrella of the NATO ATP. In a situation reminiscent of the Luftwaffe agreement, the Canadian government also entered into a training arrangement with the Belgian Air Force in exchange for a promise to procure Canadian-made aircraft. In this particular case, the aircraft in question was the Avro Canada CF-100 All-Weather interceptor. By late-1956, the company had been unsuccessful in selling the aircraft to any force other than the RCAF, so when Belgian authorities expressed an interest in the platform in May 1957, Canadian officials worked feverishly to ensure that a sale could be concluded before any other NATO nations could pre-empt the purchase with a more favourable deal. It was widely known that Belgium was examining aircraft from both Canada and the United States in their deliberations,[144] and therefore, the likelihood of the agreement being usurped

[144] Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Telegram to Canadian Ambassador in Belgium* (Ottawa), Telegram E-54, 11 January 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3213; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

by another Alliance member was a real one. The potential purchase was further complicated by the fact that Belgium was relying on Mutual Aid for the procurement.

As a result of a series of meetings between Canada and the US, coupled with the fact that American-manufactured aircraft could not be delivered in the timeframe desired by the Belgian government, the CF-100 was selected for delivery to Belgium. Under its own version of a mutual aid plan, the United States committed to furnishing the Belgian Air Force with fifty-three Canadian-built CF-100 Mark V aircraft, constituting three squadrons, starting at the end of 1957.[145] The decision provided a needed and welcomed boost to the Canadian aviation industry.

For its part, Canada would be required to allocate training slots on its applied air interceptor course for eight Belgian fighter navigators in Canada.[146] Although RCAF officials calculated that the cost of training each student would be $8,797, Belgian authorities were only charged a nominal fee of $2,000 per trainee, with the difference being charged to Canada's Mutual Aid Program.[147] Thus, for a relatively minor expense, Canada was able to secure the sale of Canadian aircraft and also continue to show its commitment to the NATO alliance by absorbing the majority of the training costs.

---

[145] Secretary of the Air Force of the United States, *Letter to the Minister of National Defence* (Washington), DND/Vol. 21743, 28 May 1957; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3218; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

[146] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs – Training of 8 Belgian Navigators* (Ottawa), 2-5330-CF100, 21 March 1958, 1; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223). An agreement had also been reached for five Belgian crews (pilot/navigator) to receive conversion training on the CF-100 without charge at the RCAF Air Division in Europe, where RCAF squadrons operated the same aircraft.

[147] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Minister of National Defence – NATO Air Training: Radar Navigator Training for Belgium* (Ottawa), CSC 1030-1, 12 February 1958; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

SUPPORT TO NON-NATO NATIONS

The success of the NATO ATP, which brought great credit to the Canadian government and the RCAF within NATO, was not without its drawbacks. Canada took every opportunity throughout the life of the training program to trumpet the positive impact that the program had on NATO's overall effectiveness, the high standard of aircrew graduates produced and the increased interoperability that it fostered within the Alliance. By doing so, it also opened the doors to requests from sources outside of NATO for assistance in training air and groundcrew personnel of foreign air forces. During the eight years that the NATO ATP existed, none of the inquiries regarding potential agreements with non-NATO nations were accommodated. The NATO ATP was run at almost full capacity for that entire period, and in many cases, the Canadian government did not see the political, military or economic value of undertaking such training. In many cases, Canada was justified in reaching such a decision, however, in other instances, it can be accused of missing valuable opportunities.

From a purely practical and financial standpoint, Canada was fully justified in denying a 1957 request by Indonesia for the training of two navigators under the NATO ATP. Politically, however, the decision could have had serious repercussions. In a despatch to the Department of External Affairs, the Canadian Ambassador to Indonesia warned that the a refusal to provide training "was inconsistent with our [Canadian] efforts to keep this country [Indonesia] from turning toward the Soviet bloc for assistance."[148] In early-1957, however, the Canadian military had been directed to reduce any extraneous commitments

[148] Canadian Ambassador in Indonesia, *Despatch to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Indonesian Enquiry re. Training of Navigators* (Djakarta), No. 418, 17 July 1957; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

which did not relate directly to NATO defence.[149] The Indonesian requirement, while relatively small in comparison to that of other nations, would have nevertheless exceeded the capabilities of the NATO ATP, which at the time was running at full capacity. In the opinion of the Department of National Defence, there was little to be gained by fulfilling the request from Djakarta. Luckily, the dire predictions by the Canadian Ambassador did not come to pass, as the Indonesian personnel were able to secure training in the United States, as the Chairman of the Canadian Chiefs of Staff had recommended.[150]

Similar requests for support were received by Venezuela in 1956,[151] and Burma in 1959.[152] In both cases, the RCAF was unable to accommodate the requests due to a lack of excess capacity in the training system. As well, there was little incentive to expend the effort and staff work required for small numbers of personnel who were not affiliated to NATO in any way. Though the costs would likely be minimal, economic considerations and the overall advantage to Canada were prime factors in the decision to turn down these requests for assistance.

Canada's reputation as a leader in aircrew training also resulted in a mid-1958, request by the government of Israel for assistance in the training of one pilot to flying instructor standard. At the time of the request, the formal NATO ATP had just concluded,

---

[149] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Acting Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs – Indonesian Enquiry re. Training of Air Force Navigators* (Ottawa), CSC 1427-13, 22 August 1957; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[150] *Ibid.*

[151] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs – Request for Training in Canada of Venezuelan Air Cadets* (Ottawa), CSC 1427-12, 31 October 1956; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[152] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Chief of the Air Staff* (Ottawa), S.450-115, 30 January 1959; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

but some excess capacity did exist in the training program where instruction on a cost-recoverable basis was underway for Danish, Norwegian and German personnel. Though Canada enjoyed good political relations with Israel, the request was seen by some in the Department of External Affairs, as part of an "attempt to develop informal yet comprehensive military contacts with individual NATO governments in order to influence [in some way]… arms export policies."[153] Officials also worried that a precedent could be created whereby it would be difficult to turn down similar requests from non-Alliance or non-Commonwealth nations. Nevertheless, the request was forwarded to the Department of National Defence for consideration. Very astutely, military officials determined that an acceptance of the Israeli request would have "wide political implications which could be misconstrued by Arab governments as [Canada] favouring Israel… at a time when Canada was exerting her influence in the United Nations to find a solution to the problems in the Middle East."[154] In this case, it was determined that the disadvantages of providing the requested service far outweighed the potential advantages.

The negative attitude towards the provision of aircrew training to non-NATO nations prevailed for a few years after the termination of the NATO ATP. In fact, the decision to focus almost solely on its relationship with NATO, largely to the exclusion of others, was very myopic on Canada's part. The achievements of the NATO training scheme blinded many Canadian planners to the possibilities that existed outside of the Alliance and proved counter-productive. The best example of a missed opportunity occurred in 1961, when the

---

[153] Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Letter to Chairman, Chiefs of Staff* (Ottawa), 7 October 1958, 2; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[154] Chairman, Canadian Chiefs of Staff, *Letter to Minister of National Defence* (Ottawa), 14 October 1958; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

RCAF and the Canadian government refused a request from the government of Nigeria to provide training to the African nation's air force personnel. In doing so, the Canadian government failed to foresee that an agreement with the fledgeling Nigerian Air Force for training could have resulted in the sale of aircraft to the Nigerian government. As a result of the Canadian refusal, Nigeria turned to West Germany, whose own training system was now operational, for support. The consent by the Federal Republic of Germany's government to undertake the training quickly translated into an order for 78 aircraft, which included new transport and training aircraft produced by the German aviation industry and fighter aircraft declared as surplus to Luftwaffe requirements.[155] It was this miscalculation, combined with the criticism originating in their own aviation industry that caused Canadian officials to rethink their approach to foreign aircrew training policies.

THE LEGACY OF THE NATO ATP

The closure of the NATO ATP in July 1958 by no means signalled the end of Canada's involvement with the provision of flying training to personnel from other nations. To the contrary, the lessons learned and the realization that schemes such as the NATO ATP could prove extremely beneficial, both economically and militarily meant that Canada would embark on a variety of similar projects from the early-1960's onwards. The Canadian government did not want to miss out on the opportunities that programs of this type could offer. In virtually all cases, however, the overriding considerations in accepting or denying requests for training support were tied directly to the benefits that would result.

In the years immediately following the end of the NATO ATP, Canada signed bi-lateral agreements for aircrew training with a number of NATO nations. Whereas at the

---

[155] Minister of Defence Production, *Letter to Minister of National Defence* (Ottawa), 450-85/0 (CAS), 4 December 1963, 2-3; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

height of the NATO ATP, Canada had committed to training up to 1,400 aircrew annually, the new agreements were far less ambitious in scope. Norway and Denmark embarked on a training program for pilots and navigators in 1958, which would see 65 Nordic pilots and navigators trained to wings standard annually.[156] As before, Canada consented to assess only a nominal charge to the applicable nations, namely $5,000 for pilot trainees and $2,000 for navigator trainees, with the remaining costs being covered by the Mutual Aid Program.[157] Upon expiry of the original agreement in late-1964, both Norway and Denmark extended their participation in the training scheme for a further four years, which assured them a pool of qualified aircrew to1969.

By 1967, Canadian military officials had determined that the Canadian Forces would likely experience a severe shortage in pilots, which left unresolved, could affect operational readiness until as late as 1980. Planners calculated that a reduction in slots for foreign trainees could alleviate the problem and eliminate the Canadian shortage by 1974.[158] Consequently, a decision was taken to significantly reduce the scale of training provided to foreign nationals and more closely scrutinize any future requests for extensions to existing agreements in order to address the problem of Canadian pilot production. As well, the government re-evaluated the amount of funding dedicated to its Mutual Aid Program, which resulted in a virtual elimination of foreign aircrew training as an element of mutual aid. As a

---

[156] Chief of the Defence Staff, *Memorandum to Defence Council – Nordic Aircrew Training* (Ottawa), V 4760-0031/240 (DIPlans), 30 May 1967, 1; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223). The breakdown of the 65 aircrew slots was 25 Norwegian and 35 Danish pilot entrants, and 3 Norwegian and 2 Danish navigator entrants per year.

[157] United Nations, *Exchange of Notes Constituting an Agreement Providing for a Continuation for a Period of Three Years of Canada's NATO Air Training Program with Respect to Aircrew Trainees* (Copenhagen), No. 4586, 17 April 1957.

[158] Chief of the Defence Staff, *Memorandum to Defence Council – Nordic Aircrew Training…,* 2; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

result, Norway reached an alternate agreement with the United States for aircrew training, thereby ending its association with the Canadian Forces in June 1968.[159] Following negotiations where a revised costing formula was calculated, Denmark re-signed a final four year agreement with the Canadian government for training of a reduced complement of ten Danish pilots at a cost of $105,000 per student, or the equivalent of the full cost of training for Canadian pilots.[160] The last Danish pilots graduated from Canadian Forces flying schools in early-1972. Finally, in a move which helped finalize Canada's sale of Canadair NF-5 aircraft to the Netherlands, the Canadian Forces consented to train nine Dutch pilots between 1969 and 1971.[161]

Until the beginning of the 1960's, "Canada's provision of military assistance was limited to the Mutual Aid Program under which training and equipment were provided to a number of NATO countries."[162] The growing number of requests for assistance from sources outside of NATO resulted in the 1961 Cabinet approval of an inter-departmental program designed to provide a variety of types of training, including aircrew, to military personnel of newly-independent Commonwealth countries on a limited scale. Responsibility to fund the majority of the share of the Military Assistance Training in Canada Program was assigned to the Department of External Affairs in 1966.[163]

---

[159] Minister of National Defence, *Letter to Secretary of State for External Affairs* (Ottawa), 12 July 1967; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[160] Department of External Affairs, *Telex Message to Danish Government – Danish Aircrew Training* (Ottawa), 12 August 1969; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[161] Vice-Chief of Defence Staff, *Memorandum to CDS – Training of Foreign Nationals by Canadian Forces* (Ottawa), V 4760-1 TD 9283 (DIPlans), 17 November 1969, Annex A; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

[162] *Ibid*., 2.

[163] *Ibid.,* 3. DND continued to contribute to the program on a yearly basis by absorbing some of the training costs which varied according to the courses provided.

In 1991, fiscal restraints resulted in a decision by the Department of External Affairs to withdraw its support to the program, now known as the Military Training Assistance Program (MTAP). As a result, DND opted to assume all costs of the training scheme, albeit at a reduced scale. As was the case with earlier training plans, the principal objectives of the MTAP were to "promote Canadian foreign and defence policy interests, target assistance to achieve influence in areas of strategic interest to Canada and raise the country's independent national profile as a valuable player in the international arena."[164] Aircrew training provided to non-NATO nations was an integral element of the program since its inception. As always, consideration had always been given to the return in investment and benefits that could be felt in Canada, specificially within DND and in the defence industry. Over the years, pilots, navigators and other flying trades from nations such as Malaysia, Jamaica, Singapore and Tanzania, to name but a few, were trained to varying levels of operational readiness under the MTAP. Similar to the NATO ATP, the decision to admit nations to the program frequently was tied to the prospect of Canadian aircraft sales in exchange for flying instruction, as exemplified by the purchase of the Canadair CL-41 Tutor trainer and deHavilland Caribou transport aircraft by Malaysia in the late-1960s.[165] In recent years, the main focus of the MTAP has been language and staff training to foreign military personnel.

Another important aircrew training program shepherded by the Canadian Forces ran concurrently with the MTAP between 1985 and 2006. The Foreign Military Training (FMT) Goose Bay agreement, also known as the NATO Low-Level Flying Training Centre

---

[164] Assistant Deputy Minister (Policy), "Directorate of the Military Training Assistance Program – Background and Strategic Relevance," DND Policy Group, 21 June 2007; available from http://www.forces.gc.ca/admpol/content.asp?id={75991DE6-7D4D-4C4B-988C-0EFE4AB4EE47}; internet; accessed 22 March 2008.

[165] Vice-Chief of Defence Staff, *Memorandum to CDS – Training of Foreign Nationals by Canadian Forces…*, Annex A; DHH, Robert Lewis Raymont fonds (73/1223).

agreement, provided a number of NATO nations with the opportunity to conduct advanced low altitude flight training at levels as low as 100 feet above terrain and practice dropping non-explosive bombs at a controlled target range.[166] Given the airspace congestion and the paucity of facilities allowing low-level flying of this nature in Europe, Canada provided the Alliance with an ideal venue to conduct valuable and necessary training. Thoughout the life of the arrangement, the Royal Air Force, the Royal Netherlands Air Force, the Italian Air Force and the German Luftwaffe maintained detachments in Goose Bay. Unlike previous training schemes, however, all instruction and evaluation responsibilities were those of the applicable signatory nations. The Canadian Forces operated in a support role only, providing the infrastructure, operations and maintenance and personnel required to support flying operations.

In sponsoring the FMT Goose Bay program, the federal and provincial governments in Ottawa and St-John's reaped significant rewards. In 2005 alone, "the base contributed $90 million to Newfoundland's gross domestic product, [generated] $28.5 million in provincial government revenues, and was the largest employer in the area, accounting for nearly $100 million of expenditures on personnel salaries, operations and maintenance; the foreign military participants contributed the largest portion of the costs."[167] From the perspective of the Federal government and the Department of National Defence, the fact that the facilities in Labrador existed primarily due to the injections of funding from the Alliance members, meant that Canadian Forces could also exploit the training opportunities available. As well,

---

[166] Government of Newfoundland, "Industry Profile: Low level Flying," 2001; available from http://www.budget.gov.nl.ca/budget2001/economy/lowLevel.htm; internet; accessed 22 March 2008.

[167] Department of National Defence, "New Investments in CFB Goose Bay," (Ottawa), Backgrounder BG-05.040, 24 November 2005; available from http://www.dnd.ca/site/newsroom/view_news_e.asp?id=1822; internet; accessed 22 March 2008.

Canadian CF-18 units were also able to deploy almost full-time to the Quick Reaction Alert (QRA) facilities at Goose Bay, thereby shortening launch times and transit distances needed to maintain its commitments to the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD) mission.

One current vestige of the NATO ATP is the NATO Flying Training in Canada (NFTC) Initiative, which began operations in June 2000. The NFTC is a government of Canada program undertaken in co-operation with Bombardier Aerospace Incorporated, and intended to offer under-graduate and post-graduate military pilot training for the Canadian Forces and foreign air forces. The NFTC initiative came to fruition as a result of an unsolicited proposal from industry in 1994 to provide contractor-supported pilot instruction. Prior to making any commitment, DND conducted a business-case analysis of the proposal, which "demonstrated that with a potentially achievable level of international participation, the Canadian Forces could train its pilots at a lower cost."[168] The Canadian government also considered the economic impacts that hosting a training plan of this type could have on the principal training base in Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, and to a lesser extent, in Cold Lake, Alberta.

Under the provisions of the NFTC, Canadian and foreign Qualified Flying Instructors (QFIs) provide the flying training, with the industry team providing the classroom instruction and aircraft maintenance of the leased T-6 Harvard II and BAE Systems Hawk II aircraft.

---

[168] Department of National Defence, "NATO Flying Training in Canada – Innovation in Military Flying Training," Backgrounder, May 2001; available from http://www.nftc.net/nftc/en/print/print.jsp?urlPrint=backgrounder.html?lang=en; internet, accessed 11 January 2008.

Though originally intended as a NATO joint jet pilot training plan,[169] the NFTC has expanded to include instructor pilots and students from Canada, Denmark, the United Kingdom, the Republic of Singapore, Germany, Italy, Hungary and the United Arab Emirates.

A 2007 study by the federal government's Minister for Western Economic Diversification Canada reported that as anticipated, the NFTC has not only been successful in reducing the overall cost of Canadian Forces pilot training, but has also resulted in substantial economic and political gains. Most notably, in its first six years of operation, "the NFTC has sold $1.13 billion worth of training to other nations… and [it is also expected to generate] up to $1 billion in direct industrial benefits for Canada, including over 5,600 person-years of employment in high technology and knowledge-based Canadian industries"[170] during the twenty year lifespan of the contract. In addition to the effects already noted, Canada's decision to enter into the NFTC agreement has also signalled its continued commitment to the North Atlantic Alliance by its operation of yet another aircrew training scheme.

CONCLUSION

In June 1956, as Canadian parliamentarians considered the option of terminating the NATO ATP, Lester B. Pearson characterized the training scheme as "the most constructive

---

[169] Department of National Defence, "NATO Flying Training in Canada," Backgrounder, 23 April 1997; available from http://www.dnd.ca/site/newsroom/view_news_e.asp?id=960; internet; accessed 12 February 2008.

[170] Western Economic Diversion Canada, "An Assessment of Economic Benefits Resulting from the Operation of the NATO Flying Training in Canada (NFTC) Program at Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan," *Economic Research and Market Studies* (Saskatoon), 09 August 2007; available from http://www.wd.gc.ca/rpts/research/nato/6_e.asp; internet; accessed 11 January 2008.

[and important] form of Canadian mutual aid contributions to NATO."[171] This description is particularly indicative of the stature which this program had assumed within the Mutual Aid Program, itself envisioned at its inauguration as Canada's foremost contribution to the NATO alliance. In the eight years of its formal existence, the expenditures committed toward the NATO ATP averaged approximately one third of the entire mutual aid budget.[172] Considering that aircrew training was but one element in a list of between five to twelve donation categories on a year to year basis, the amount of money spent is quite impressive.

At first glance, the expenses which were accrued by the Mutual Aid Program may seem inordinately high. It should be recalled, however, that they are relatively insignificant in comparison to the costs associated with Canada's decision to station both Canadian Army and Air Force personnel and units in Europe from the mid-1950s onwards. This eventual commitment of substantial military forces seemed outside of the realm of the possible at the time of NATO's creation in 1949. Thus, when the idea of the NATO ATP was conceived in 1949, it was intended to make up but one part of a larger program which would allow Canada to minimize its commitment to the new transatlantic alliance, while maximizing the benefits of partnership. For the most part, the program would adhere to this principle and prove itself beneficial not only to NATO, but especially to Canada.

From a purely political perspective, the program allowed Canada, as an emerging middle power, to maintain a position of influence among its more powerful allies. In

---

[171] Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Telegram to Canadian High Commissioner in the United Kingdom – Aircrew Training Program* (Ottawa), Telegram DL-888, 14 June 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3197; internet; accessed 11 Feb 2008.

[172] Minister of National Defence, *Memorandum to Cabinet – Canadian Mutual Aid Program* (Ottawa), Document No. 235/59, 7 August 1959; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=10922; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

embarking on a plan that "could assist in the buildup of the strength of the NATO forces at a time when the European economy had not recovered from the effects of World War II and [also] contribute to the development of [Canadian] defence production capacity,"[173] Canada was able to support the Alliance, but more importantly, it positioned itself to cater to its own interests. From the outset, Canadian leaders believed that this demonstration of support would suffice with respect to its obligations to NATO.

The establishment of the NATO ATP also provided substantial economic and military benefits, as well. Without the program, it is unlikely that the RCAF would have been afforded the opportunity, at almost no cost, to operate some of its first Air Division fighter squadrons from RAF bases in England. It is also plausible to posit that the financial benefits which were translated to profits and sustainability in the Canadian aerospace industry, particularly at companies such as Canadair and Avro Canada, could not have been possible without the provision of aircrew training to West Germany and Belgium. All in all, for the amount of effort and money expended, the NATO ATP paid for itself many times over. For fairly little outlay of funds, the Canadian government was able to reap considerable benefits.

"The NATO Aircrew Training Scheme, which was set up to help meet the desperate shortage in Europe of trained aircrew graduated, up to its formal termination in 1958, some 5,500 pilots and navigators from ten member countries."[174] By the time the program ended, it had allowed all of its NATO allies in Europe, except for Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands, to establish their own national training systems that provided them with a

---

[173] *Ibid*.

[174] Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Memorandum to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Canadian NATO Mutual Aid Program* (Ottawa), DEA/50030/L-40, 19 June 1959; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=10918; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

consistent pool of trained aircrew to meet Alliance force goals. The termination of the program permitted Canada to re-focus its efforts as greater fiscal constraints began to emerge, and also to place itelf in a position to continue to both contribute effectively and also derive benefits from its membership in multinational alliances and organizations. Like its predecessors, the NATO ATP set the stage for a follow-on series of agreements and arrangements which enabled to Canadian Forces, even in times of downsizing and budgetary limitations, to continue to play an important role on the international security stage. The influence of the training scheme, and its guiding principles of greatest return for least expense and effort, contiue to be hallmarks of Canadian foreign and defence policy to this day. Lester B. Pearson's assessment of the value of programs of this type are as true today as they were in 1956, thanks in large part to the accomplishments of Canadian personnel and the NATO ATP.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Canada. Acting Under-Secretary of External Affairs. *Extract of Draft of North Atlantic Treaty*. Ottawa: DEA/283(S), 12 November 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10105; internet; accessed on 12 March 2008.

Canada. Assistant Deputy Minister (Policy). *Directorate of the Military Training Assistance Programme – Background and Strategic Relevance.* Ottawa: DND Policy Group, 21 June 2007; available from http://www.forces.gc.ca/admpol/content.asp?id={75991DE6-7D4D-4C4B-988C-0EFE4AB4EE47}; internet; accessed 22 March 2008.

Canada. Canadian Ambassador to United States. *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs.* Washington: Telegram WA-766, 13 March 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9992; internet; accessed 12 March 2008.

Canada. Canadian Ambassador in United States. *Report to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs – Proceedings of Washington Exploratory Talks on Security.* Washington: DEA/283(S), 4 September 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10083; internet, accessed 12 March 2008.

Canada. Canadian Ambassador in West Germany. *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Allocation of Canadian Aircraft to Germany.* Bonn: Telegram 136, 24 June 1955; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=1180; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

Canada. Canadian Ambassador in West Germany. *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Sale of Sabre Jet Aircraft to Germany.* Bonn: Telegram 298, 19 December 1955; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=1190; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

Canada. Canadian Ambassador in West Germany. *Letter to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs – Transfer of Aircraft as Mutual Aid to Germany and Support of Canadian Forces in Germany.* Bonn: DEA/50334-40, 19 July 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3246; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Canada. Canadian Ambassador in West Germany. *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Mutual Aid to Germany.* Bonn: Telegram 214, 20 July 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3247; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Canada. Canadian High Commissioner in United Kingdom. *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs.* London: Telegram 1996, 10 November 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9980; internet; accessed 12 March 2008.

Canada. Canadian High Commissioner in United Kingdom. *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Canadian Contribution Under Article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty.* Lo, Belgium: Telegram 2389, 12 December 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9025; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

Canada. Canadian Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council. *Telegram to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Allocation of Aircraft to Germany.* Paris: Telegram 635, 13 May 1955; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=1179; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

Canada. Chargé d'Affaires, Canadian Embassy in Turkey. *Memorandum – Annual Review and Mutual Aid Turkey.* Ankara: DEA/50030-L-40, 10 October 1955; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=1183; internet; accessed 5 February 2008.

Canada. Department of External Affairs. *Draft Communication from Department of External Affairs to High Commissioner of United Kingdom.* Ottawa: B.C./Vol.113, 8 August 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=7555; internet; accessed 08 February 2008.

Canada. Department of External Affairs. *Letter from Secretary of State for External Affairs to Minister of National Defence.* Ottawa, B.C./Vol.113, 12 August 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=7558; internet; accessed 08 February 2008.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Directorate of History and Heritage. Robert Lewis Raymont Fonds (73/1223).

Canada. Department of National Defence. *NATO Flying Training in Canada.* Ottawa: Backgrounder, 23 April 1997; available from http://www.dnd.ca/site/newsroom/view_news_e.asp?id=960; internet; accessed 12 February 2008.

Canada. Department of National Defence. *NATO Flying Training in Canada – Innovation in Military Flying Training.* Ottawa: Backgrounder, May 2001; available from http://www.nftc.net/nftc/en/print/print.jsp?urlPrint=backgrounder.html?lang=en; internet, accessed 11 January 2008.

Canada. Department of National Defence. *Military Training Assistance Programme: Annual Report 2002 - 2003*. Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 2003.

Canada. Department of National Defence. New Investments in CFB Goose Bay. Ottawa: Backgrounder BG-05.040, 24 November 2005; available from http://www.dnd.ca/site/newsroom/view_news_e.asp?id=1822; internet; accessed 22 March 2008.

Canada. Western Economic Diversion Canada "An Assessment of Economic Benefits Resulting from the Operation of the NATO Flying Training in Canada (NFTC) Program at Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan," *Economic Research and Market Studies*. Saskatoon: 09 August 2007; available from http://www.wd.gc.ca/rpts/research/nato/6_e.asp; internet; accessed 11 January 2008.

Canada. Government of Canada. *Commentary on the Washington Paper of September 9, 1948*. Ottawa: DEA/283(S), 6 December 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10141; internet, accessed 12 March 2008.

Canada. Government of Canada. *Extract from Minutes of Meeting of Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions*. Ottawa: DEA/50030-K-40, 14 May 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3195; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Canada. Minister of Trade and Commerce. *Telegram – Extract from Minutes of Meeting of Cabinet Defence Committee – North Atlantic Treaty Mutual Aid*. Ottawa: Telegram WA-3178, 23 November 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9016; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

Canada. Minister of National Defence. *Extracts from Report on NATO Defence Meetings November 26 to December 14, 1949*. Ottawa: L.S.L.Nol 234, 21 December 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9030; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

Canada. Minister of National Defence, *Letter to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Defence and Mutual Aid Policy* (Ottawa: DEA/10813 40, 12 October 1950); available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7580; internet; accessed 7 April 2008.

Canada. Minister of National Defence. *Memorandum to Cabinet – Canadian Mutual Aid Programme*. Ottawa: Document No. 235/59, 7 August 1959; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=10922; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Canada. North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *Final Communiqué,* North Atlantic Council Press communiqué, 17 September 1949; available from http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c490917a.htm; internet; accessed 16 March 2008.

Canada. Privy Council Office. *Extracts from Minutes of Meetings of Panel on Economic Aspects of Defence Questions*. Ottawa: 15 November 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7587; internet; accessed 11 January 2008.

Canada. Privy Council Office. *Memorandum from Military Secretary, Cabinet Defence Committee to Cabinet – Offer of Training Facilities.* Ottawa: Cabinet Document no. 8-50, 4 May 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7520; internet; accessed 28 January 2008.

Canada. Privy Council Office. *Extract from Minutes of Meeting of Cabinet Defence Committee – Aircrew Training Program.* Ottawa: 19 April 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3191; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Canada. Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Memorandum – Canadian Attitude Towards a North Atlantic Defence Agreement.* Ottawa: DEA/283(S), 26 June 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10041; internet, accessed 12 March 2008.

Canada. Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Telegram to Canadian High Commissioner in United Kingdom – Implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty.* Ottawa: Telegram 977, 27 May 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=8970; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

Canada. Secretary of State for External Affairs, *Letter to Minister of National Defence – Defence and Mutual Aid Policy* (Ottawa: B.C./Vol.113, 12 August 1950); available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7558; internet; accessed 7 April 2008.

Canada. Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Memorandum to Cabinet – Report on the Mutual Aid Offer of 75 F-86 Aircraft to Germany.* Ottawa: Cabinet Document No. D-10-56, 12 June 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3234; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Canada. Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Telegram to Canadian Ambassador in Belgium*. Ottawa: Telegram E-54, 11 January 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3213; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Canada. Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Telegram to Canadian High Commissioner in the United Kingdom – Aircrew Training Program*. Ottawa: Telegram DL-888, 14 June 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3197; internet; accessed 11 Feb 2008.

Canada. Under Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Memorandum to Prime Minister Regarding ABC Talks*. Ottawa: DEA/283(S), 15 March 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9993; internet; accessed on 12 March 2008.

Canada. Under Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Personal Letter to Canadian Ambassador in United States*. Ottawa: 13 April 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=10026; internet; accessed 12 March 2008.

Canada. Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Letter to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Next Meeting of Defence Committee*. Ottawa: DEA/50030-T-40, 29 November 1949; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9019; internet; accessed 8 February 2008.

Canada. Under Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Letter to the High Commissioner of the United Kingdom*. Ottawa: DEA/10813-40, 10 July 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7540; internet; accessed 08 February 2008.

Canada. Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Memorandum to Secretary of State for External Affairs*. Ottawa: DEA/50030-U-40, 18 April 1956; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=3190; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

Canada. Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. *Memorandum to Secretary of State for External Affairs – Canadian NATO Mutual Aid Programme*. Ottawa: DEA/50030/L-40, 19 June 1959; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefId=10918; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

United Kingdom. RAF Chief of the Air Staff, United Kingdom. *Telegram to RCAF CAS Regarding Possibility of Training of RAF Aircrew in Canada.* London: Telegram 299, 27 July 1950; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=7552; internet; accessed 08 February 2008.

United States. Secretary of the Air Force of the United States. *Letter to the Minister of National Defence.* Washington: DND/Vol. 21743, 28 May 1957; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=3218; internet; accessed 11 February 2008.

United Kindgom. Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations. *Telegram to British High Commissioner in Canada.* London: Telegram 220, 10 March 1948; available from http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/department/history/dcer/details-en.asp?intRefid=9983; internet; accessed 12 February 2008.

United Nations. *Exchange of Notes between Canada and Federal Republic of Germany Constituting an Agreement Respecting the Contract for the Purchase of F-86 Aircraft and the Training of German Aircrew in Canada.* Bonn: No. 5633, 17 September 1956.

United Nations. *Exchange of Notes Constituting an Agreement Providing for a Continuation for a Period of Three Years of Canada's NATO Air Training Programme with Respect to Aircrew Trainees.* Copenhagen: No. 4586, 17 April 1957.

Secondary Sources

Babcock, Major Al. *The British Commonwealth Air Training Plan and Limited Liability*. Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 1997.

Barkway, Michael. "Canada's Changing Role in NATO Defence." *International Journal* XIV, no. 2 (Spring 1959), 99 - 110.

Ted Barris, *Behind the Glory – The Plan that Won the Allied Air War* (Toronto: MacMillan Canada, 1992).

Bercuson, David Jay. *True Patriot - The Life of Brooke Claxton, 1898 - 1960*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Bryce, Robert B. *Canada and the Cost of World War II: The International Operations of Canada's Department of Finance 1939 - 1947*. Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 2005.

Canada. RCAF Historical Section. *The Royal Flying Corps in Canada: The Aircrew Training Plan Operated in Canada during 1917 - 1918 by the Royal Flying Corps*. Ottawa: RCAF Historical Section, (December 1961), D Hist 180.013(09).

Canada. Department of External Affairs. "NATO Training by the RCAF." *External Affairs* 3, no. 9 (September 1951), 300 - 301.

Canada. Department of External Affairs. "NATO Air Training Plan." *External Affairs* 10, no. 8 (August 1958), 188 - 189.

Cook, Don. *Forging the Alliance: NATO, 1945 to 1950*. London: Secker and Warburg, Ltd., 1989.

Douglas, W. A. B. *The Creation of a National Air Force - the Official History of the Royal Canadian Air Force, Volume II*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Douglas, W. A. B. and Brereton Greenhous. *Out of the Shadows - Canada in the Second World War*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1995.

Duignan, Peter. *NATO - Its Past, Present and Future*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2000.

Dunmore, Spencer. *Wings for Victory - the Remarkable Story of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan in Canada*. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart Inc., 1994.

Eayrs, James. *In Defence of Canada – Appeasement and Rearmamen.* Vol 2. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Eayrs, James. *In Defence of Canada - Growing Up Allied*. Vol. 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Eayrs, James. *Northern Approaches - Canada and the Search for Peace*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1961.

Ellis, Frank H. *Canada's Flying Heritage*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954.

English, John. "Who Could Ask for Anything More?" in *A History of NATO - the First Fifty Years*, edited by Gustav Schmidt. Vol. 2. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Gellner, John. *Canada in NATO*. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1970.

Goodspeed, Lieutenant-Colonel D. J. *The Armed Forces of Canada 1867 - 1967*. Ottawa: Directorate of History, Canadian Forces Headquarters, 1967.

Government of Newfoundland. *Industry Profile: Low level Flying.* St-John's: Government of Newfoundland, 2001; available from http://www.budget.gov.nl.ca/budget2001/economy/lowLevel.htm; internet; accessed 22 March 2008.

Granatstein J.L. and Desmond Morton. *A Nation Forged in Fire: Canada and the Second World War, 1939 - 1945*. Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, Ltd., 1989.

Granatstein, J. L. *Canada's War: The Politics of the Mackenzie King Government, 1939 - 1945*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Granatstein, J. L. and Peter Neary. *The Good Fight: Canadians and World War II*. Toronto: Copp Clark, Ltd., 1995.

Greenhous, Brereton and Hugh A. Halliday. *Canada's Air Forces 1914-1999*. Montreal: Art Global, 1999.

Halliday, H. A. *Chronology of Canadian Military Aviation*. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975.

Harrison, W. E. C. *Canada in World Affairs, 1949 to 1950*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Hatch, F. J. *Aerodrome of Democracy: The British Commonwealth Air Training Plan, 1939 - 1945*. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre, 1983.

Hatch, Fred J. "The British Commonwealth Air Training Plan." *The Canadian Aviation Historical Society Journal* 19, no. No. 4 (Winter 1981).

Henderson, Sir Nicholas. *The Birth of NATO*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1983.

Ireland, Timothy P. *Creating the Entangling Alliance: The Origins of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Ismay, Lord H. L. *OTAN - Les Cinq Premières Années*. The Netherlands: Bosch-Utrecht, 1954.

Kaplan, Lawrence S. *NATO 1948: The Birth of the Transatlantic Alliance*. Toronto: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2007.

Maloney, Sean M. "General Charles Foulkes: A Primer on How to Be CDS." In *Warrior Chiefs: Perspectives on Senior Canadian Military Leaders*, edited by Stephen Harris and Lieutenant-Colonel Bernd Horn. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2001.

McCracken, George W. "NATO Air Training in Canada." *Current Affairs for the Canadian Forces* 4, no. 1 (1 January 1953), 3 - 29.

Milberry, Larry. *Canada's Air Force at War and Peace*. Vol. III. Toronto: CANAV Books, 2001.

Milberry, Larry. *The Canadair Sabre*. Toronto: CANAV Books, 1986.

Milberry, Larry. *Sixty Years: The RCAF and CF Air Command 1924-1984*. Toronto: CANAV Books, 1984.

Milberry, Larry and Hugh Halliday. *The Royal Canadian Air Force at War, 1939 - 1945*. Toronto: CANAV Books, 1990.

Milloy, John C. *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization 1948 – 1957: Community or Alliance?*. Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press, 2006.

Morton, Desmond. *A Military History of Canada - from Champlain to Kosovo*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, Inc., 1999.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *NATO - Facts and Figures*. Brussels: NATO Information Services, 1969.

Pearson, Lester B. "Canada and the North Atlantic Alliance." *Foreign Affairs* 27, no. 3 (April 1949), 369 - 378.

Pearson, Lester B. "NATO: Retrospect and Prospects." *International Journal* XIV, no. 2 (Spring 1959), 79 - 84.

Pickersgill, J.W. *The Mackenzie King Record, Volume 1 1939 – 1944.* Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1960.

Pickersgill, J. W. *My Years with Louis St-Laurent - A Political Memoir*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Roberts, Leslie.

Tf12 0 0 12 89.9999 41w 12 0 0 12 89.9999 682.38 222 Tf Tf21.66ie.

Smith, Major-General J.D.B. “Canada and NATO,” in *The Empire Club of Canada Speeches 1955-1956,* ed. Dr. C.C. Goldring, 293 – 305. Toronto: The Empire Club Foundation, 1956; available from http://www.empireclubfoundation.com/details.asp?SpeechID=2646&FT=yes; internet; accessed 12 February 2008.

Spencer, Robert. "Triangle into Treaty: Canada and the Origins of NATO." *International Journal* XIV, no. 2 (Spring 1959), 87 - 98.

United States Air Force. *Training in the Royal Canadian Air Force*. Scott AFB, IL: USAF Air Training Command, 1958.

Wakelam, Randall. “Flights of Fancy: RCAF Fighter Procurement 1945-1954,” Master’s thesis, Royal Military College of Canada, 1997.

Wise, S. F. *Canadian Airmen and the First World War: The Official History of the Royal Canadian Air Force, Vol. 1*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.