



Class of 65 Newsletter

Edition 39-July 2011



Disclaimer: This Newsletter is produced for members of the RMC Class of 1965 and is based solely on inputs from members of the Class of 65. It is not an official publication of the Royal Military College nor does it purport to represent the views or opinions of all members of the Class of 65. Articles will be entered in the official language in which they are received. Regrettably the Editorial staff still lacks the linguistic skills to produce a bilingual version.

Editor's Corner

The following is a brief summary of the response to the survey I sent out on the future of the newsletter. However, before doing that, I would like to clarify the reason for the survey. First of all, I want to make it quite clear that I enjoy producing it and am quite happy to continue doing so. It has proven to be a valuable personal vehicle for me to re-acquaint myself with classmates and class business after a long period of absenteeism.

That said I was becoming a bit concerned that either interest in the newsletter had waned or that a monthly version was proving to be overkill. These concerns were prompted by a marked reduction in the number of inputs.

I am pleased to say that my fears seem groundless if the responses I have received are a true indicator.

To date, forty-six class members have provided written replies and their response has been resounding support for continuation of the newsletter. The majority have recognised the difficulty in gathering together sufficient material for a monthly edition and most have suggested either a quarterly version or publication when sufficient input dictates. With regard the latter option, a number of respondents felt that it is important to maintain some kind of schedule to prevent a slow slide into extinction.

I also received a number of promises for input. It seems that some folks were concerned that they might not have had much to say; or, that their lives might have seemed mundane in comparison with other class members. I

was also reminded by a couple of respondents with experience at this kind of thing, that I need to be more proactive in searching for inputs and not simply wait until they flow in.

With those broad guidelines, the following is the tack I intend to take unless I receive strong objection from any quarter.

Publication of the Newsletter will continue on a not-more frequently than monthly and not-less frequently basis than tri-mensual depending on the availability of inputs.

I encourage all classmates to contribute to a bank of inputs that can be as short as a single paragraph and should not be longer than three pages. No topic is too trivial - the objective of this newsletter is to provide a forum in which we can share information about ourselves to fill in the gaps between major reunions. What have you done since graduation? Did you have a favourite/least favourite job? Have you done anything of special interest? Do you have a family?

As someone pointed out, not all inputs need be retrospective. There is nothing to stop individuals from expressing forward-looking opinions about issues of general interest.

I apologise to our Francophone colleagues for the predominantly unilingual nature of the Newsletter to date. Chalk that up to my own inability to adequately edit French prose. I would love to see more items in French and would appreciate a volunteer who might undertake to edit such inputs for me to ensure a reasonable degree of correctness.

All this is well and good, however as noted above, to ensure input, I will have to be more proactive so I will be undertaking a program of random challenges to victims prior to each edition seeking some input from you. The only way to avoid the embarrassment of being asked to reveal all your secrets is to beat me to the punch.

One last note on submissions - it is always appreciated if you include a recent

photo of yourself. Family photos are also welcomed since they help out at reunions when we struggle to remember spouse's names.

Thanks again to all those who responded. It was very gratifying to receive such warm support and to learn that the Newsletter is something that is providing some enjoyment.

Ottawa Lunch

Jim and Gail Carruthers hosted the monthly Ottawa Class lunch at their estate on Constance Bay. As an added attraction spouses were invited to ensure that the event did not degenerate into a morass of shop talk and maundering reminiscences.

The great weather, anticipation of free food and drink, and the prospect of some good company brought out a very welcome group of classmates and spouses from the Montreal area seen below arriving *en masse!*



The gang enjoyed themselves and are seen below wading out to Jim's 16' boat for a tour of the Ottawa River. That's Jim centre background trying to figure out how they are all going to fit!



In addition to Jim and Gail, those in attendance were: **Rick & Marilyn Archer; Vil Auns; Jean-Louis & Margie Bolduc; Mike and Jan Braham; Phil Bury; Jim & Jane Cale; Ken & Dianne Clarkson; Terry & Lynn Colfer; Peter & Nancy Cooke; Gaetan Dextras; Gord & Irene Diamond; Charlie & Lucie Emond; Pierre Falardeau; Roger & Lina Gaudreau; John Hilton; Mike & Nancy Houghton; Pete & Peggy Houliston; Jim & Mary Humphrey; Peter & Sally Jackson; Roman Jakubow; Gerry & Angela Jensen; Marc & Louise Jette; Laurent Lord; Cord & Nicole Lukey; Michel & Joan Matte; Waine & Nellie McQuinn; Larry & Ruth Mills; Andy Nellestyn; Ed Sanford; and, Georges & Yolande Wilson.**

The large gathering took full advantage of the Carruther's beautiful waterfront property to get reacquainted, exchange salty dips, sip a few brews, inhale some barbecued treats and enjoy each other's company on a steamy hot day.

After the annual reunions at RMC and CMR this probably counted as one of the largest single gatherings of the Class of 65. Thanks to those who made long treks from Montreal and other out of town locales to attend and a special thanks to Jim and Gail for their usual high standard of warm hospitality.

The following are a few random photos of the event taken by yours truly.



Input Made Simple

By 6396 Rod MacKinnon



Rod provided the following simplified Newsletter format for engineers and air force officers that some of you might wish to adopt to meet your newly assigned commitment to sharing info.

3 things about me

Three names I go by: Rod, Dad, Bump

Three places I've lived: Groton, Conn., Kingston, Ont. Calgary, AB.

Three places I've worked: Halifax, N.S., Montreal, Que., Vancouver, B.C.

Three things I love to watch: War Movies, Golf Tournaments, Good Plays

Three places I have been: Scotland, Mexico, Hawaii

Three things I love to eat: Fresh Corn, Strawberries, Pork Chops

Three things I love to drink: Orange Juice, Coffee, Cold Beer

Three people I think will respond: Bill S., Denny B., Jerry K.

Three people who email me regularly: Bruce K., Bob R. Hugh S.

Vil Auns Retirement

Jim Carruthers passed along the following note from a former naval colleague, "As most of you know, Vil will be "slipping the cable", "swallowing the anchor" ... after 51 years of working in and with the Canadian Navy. To celebrate the fact that the old bugger is finally moving on and turning in his tech manuals we will gather at the Royal Oak 329 March Road commencing 11:30 on Friday June 3rd. "



Vil is seen here in mid-eloquence.

Congratulations Vil, from all of your classmates on a long and honourable career with the navy. Welcome to retirement! Now the fun begins!

The Wilsons at sea

6345 Georges Wilson sent the following pictures of a sailing holiday that he and Yolande enjoyed near Bordeaux in June.



Looks like fun, even though it appears that they haven't noticed that the tide is out!

Nicknames

By 6567 Gary Running

A while back I was in Ottawa for a week or so and decided to drop in and see the "new" War Museum. My intention was to spend a few hours but I was so fascinated with it that in the end

I spent 2 days and still didn't see everything I wanted to. I came out feeling a little bemused, (on a personal level one doesn't think of things they have

seen, done or lived through as being the stuff of museums), and also I got to thinking about nicknames. About how some people have nicknames that seem to stay with them for life and others may never have a nickname, or have one that they grow out of, or are used only in certain places or contexts.

For example when I was a kid in the late forties and early fifties we lived in a small town in the Ottawa Valley. My dad was one of the 3 town doctors. In small Ontario towns in those days, young boys, particularly oldest sons, didn't seem to be know by their own names, but rather by their dad's name. Thus I was known as Doc. When we moved away the nickname disappeared, but when I from time to time come across contemporaries from those days, I am still called Doc.



That's Gary on the far left!

In our class of '65 there are lots of examples of nicknames- Fats Carruthers, LT Taylor, Boog Powell, Fras(z?) Holman, Ugly Jim Hampton, Suds Sutherland, and the list goes on.

In any event, while wending my way through the displays in the museum I suddenly got stopped in my tracks. There way down low in a glass display case was the complete instrument panel from a Harvard. I couldn't believe it. I had to get down on my knees on the floor so I could see it close up. Everything was there exactly as I remembered it. On the extreme left side of the panel was the magneto switch. A four position switch (left, right, both, off).

For aspiring Air Force pilots, the summers between academic years at RMC in the early 60's were great. You got to leave rigors of military college life behind and fly airplanes for the summer. Not onlythat but your monthly salary (about \$67.00 as I recall?) more than doubled with the addition of \$75.00 flying pay.

In the summer of 1963 a number of us from RMC were sent to Moose Jaw where we met up with class mates from RR and CMR to form one of the many training flights. Other flights were made up from ROTP Civvy U and direct

entry short-term Commission types. The latter stayed at Moose Jaw until all their Harvard training was completed. We on the other hand did about 25 hours of the program, and then came back the following summer to do another 25 or so hours.

The Harvard, to someone whose only previous flying experience was 25 hours in a single engine (4 cylinder in line inverted) Chipmunk, was awesome. It was big and noisy and had a single large radial engine that could put out a lot of torque. This torque was significant because the Harvard had a tricycle undercarriage with the 2 main wheels under wing, and a small tail wheel. To take off in a Harvard you taxied to the end of the runway, did your engine run up to ensure everything was working. You then positioned yourself pointing down the runway, stood as hard as you could on the brakes, gave the engine full power, released the brakes and headed down the runway, keeping it close to the centre line using rudder. When you got close to take-off speed, you pushed forward gently on the stick (control column) to raise the tail off the ground. Once gaining lift-off speed you pulled back on the stick, and you were airborne.

The tricky part was when you pushed gently forward on the stick to get the tail wheel off the ground. At that point, with all the torque up front, the gyroscopic effect made the plane want to veer to the right. So when you pushed forward gently on the stick, you had to stomp hard on the left rudder to keep on the runway, otherwise you would do a "ground loop" i.e. heading off onto the grassy infield at far too high a speed and possibly wiping out one or both of the main wheel undercarriages.



To illustrate this point I have attached a photo of a Harvard that was ground looped and did not survive intact. The three young folks on the left wing are Garry Mulder (who was a year ahead of us at college, but on our flying training flight), Frasn Holman, and Ugly Jim Hampton.

During that summer a number of Harvards

were ground looped, so much so that there were a number of planes sitting in the airplane cemetery where the photo was taken. The CO was not happy with the attrition rate of his aircraft.

Previously I mentioned the 4 position magneto switch on the left side of the instrument panel. After getting the Harvard started, and before moving the aircraft you conducted a post start-up check. One of the items in the check, at a low RPM was to move the mag switch to both right and left. This proved that left and right mags were functional. Then you moved the switch briefly to the off position and the engine would start to die. Quickly while the prop was still rotating you put the switch back to both and, if all was well, the engine would fire right up again.

Now you were good to go, you could taxi down to the end of the runway where you did a run up check before you positioned yourself for takeoff. This check was done at close to full power, and this time when rechecking the mags, you only went both, left, right, both, NOT to the off position as far too much fuel was pumping through the system, and the exhaust manifold was very hot.

On one of my training flights during the mag portion of the run up check, I put the mag switch in the off position by mistake. That was bad enough but to compound the error instead of pulling the throttle back, I left it at close to full RPM and turned the mags back on. The resulting explosion in the exhaust manifold was spectacular. My flying instructor calmly suggested that we taxi back to the line so that the maintenance techs could determine the health of the exhaust manifold. That was the end of my flying for that day.

A couple of weeks later there was a brief ceremony in the snake pit wherein I was presented with a plaque made from a mag switch taken from one of the many ground-looped Harvards. Thereafter, among my flight mates and others in the know, I was never referred to by any name other than Mags.

In addition to light moments that summer also had tragedy. One of the ROTP Civvy U students had a relative with a farm nearby, and while doing low

level stunts over his uncle's farm, crashed and killed himself.

At the end of the day, the CO thought the summer flying program for Military College/ROPT types was something that should be revisited. I believe our courses that summer were cut a little short. In fact that was the last year for summer flying training. After that year, flying training didn't start until after graduation.

The F35: One Man's Opinion

By 6480 Tom Drolet

Recently Tom sent me a copy of the article reproduced below from The Economist. He followed up my "So what?" with the following thought provoking opinion piece that may elicit some comment from his former light-blue brethren.

The last thing needed in a College newsletter is a political comment by an old, retired, long forgotten cadet who was prone to losing his pillbox on major parades. So, in line with that caveat, my purpose here is not to be political (though I have to, of course, acknowledge the role of our political bosses that are charged with supporting or denying major purchase programs), but to make a part strategic, part technical and part economic value statement.



Though I now live in the USA (Florida and North Carolina), I try, with some difficulty, to follow major issues related to my CMR/RMC heritage and their CAF parent. On the topic covered below on the Joint Strike Fighter, I have been less than enthused about Canada jumping on the F 35 program for a long time - and I want to say that now. I still don't understand why many of my old time colleagues in the CF are still pushing to buy sixty or so single-engine F35s, with their limitations in range and weapons capacity, when what we need is a capable longer range interceptor for air defence missions in this vast land of ours with its relatively few suitable airfields - particularly in the North and on the coasts. We don't need a stealthy limited range strike

fighter! Of course, some of our fast-jet friends are thrilled to have the opportunity to fly the same sexy equipment as our American and other NATO friends, and our Conservative politicians seem more committed to that program than some of their US counterparts even though it has been obvious for some time that the costs are soaring into the stratosphere.

Many believe that our role in the future for the CF Air Fighter arm is to participate in Libyan-like altercations (I'll be darned if I know what to really call that particular craziness). In my opinion our prime role is to be on guard for Canada--with an eye (not our whole body) on needs for participation in the world's inevitable future skirmishes and limited wars. I do not think that it would be prudent yet to eliminate the need for a new generation of manned fighters in favour of unmanned interceptors, but we should start looking at some sort of mix of those for the future. In the interim it would be more appropriate to do a realistic assessment of our defence needs, particularly at home, and recognize that we don't need to have an expensive, limited range strike fighter, particularly in the rough economic times which I see for not just the near term... but the middle term (that I define as for the next 10-20 years).

The future of the Joint Strike Fighter

Coming up short

America should cut back orders for its late and expensive new fighter—and spend the cash on more useful kit

Jul 14th 2011 | from the print edition of the Economist



IT SEEMED like a great idea at the time. When Lockheed Martin won the contract in 2001 to develop what became known as the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the aim was to produce a relatively cheap tactical aircraft with radar-beating stealth capability that would replace at least four other types in service. The biggest military programme in history would not only provide the backbone of America's fighter fleet for the next 50 years but would also bring in sales from the United States' closest allies. At least 3,000 F-35s would be ordered from the outset (over 2,400 by America alone). The result would be huge efficiency savings, initially from the scale of production and subsequently from the Southwest Airlines model of running just one basic type of aircraft across 90% of the fleet. Deliveries of operational aircraft were meant to begin in 2010.

Things look less rosy a decade on. The F-35 is now unlikely to enter service before 2016; programme costs have risen to more than \$380 billion; the average price of each plane has nearly doubled; and the Pentagon now thinks the F-35 will be a third more expensive to run than "legacy" aircraft, with lifetime costs of \$1 trillion. Senator John McCain calls the project "a train wreck". Even supporters, such as Robert Gates, the former defence secretary who was forced to restructure the programme last year, reckon numbers may have to be cut.

What should be done? The radical answer would be to abandon the entire F-35 programme. But it is too late for that: it would mean America relying on updated versions of aircraft based on 40-year-old designs. However, the size of the planned order for what is almost certain to be America's last manned strike fighter makes little sense and should be cut.

One immediate priority should be cancelling the jump-jet variant of the F-35 for the Marines. It has been the main cause of the technical and weight problems that have bedevilled the programme. Having been put on two-year "probation" by Mr Gates in January, this version should be put out of its misery.

Over sea and air—but with a relatively short range

With the air force and navy versions of the F-35, the debate is more nuanced. Although a far more capable aircraft than those it is replacing,

it may not be useful enough for long enough to justify the size of the planned order. Analysts question whether it is as stealthy as claimed and its ability to penetrate the best future air-defence systems. And to be as stealthy as it is, the F-35 can carry only two air-to-air missiles. The head of the air dominance branch of the Air Combat Command says he “wakes up in a cold sweat” thinking about it.

The F-35’s range of around 600 miles (1,000km) is another problem. The potential adversary that will dominate American military planning in the decades ahead is China. Even now, China is acquiring weapons, such as accurate anti-ship ballistic missiles, that will push American carriers out into the western Pacific, well beyond the range of seaborne F-35s. For all its sophistication, against a “near peer” opponent the F-35 may not be able to do the job for which it has been intended nearly as well as the next generation of pilotless armed drones and hypersonic cruise missiles. Indeed, it could be obsolescent only a few years after it enters service. At a time of shrinking defence budgets, the F-35’s huge cost and the affection of service chiefs for fast jets flown by brave chaps should not be allowed to crowd out the development of more capable weapon systems. Cut back the F-35s and spend the money there.

Closing Notes

It’s amazing what a bit of judicious whining will produce. I think this edition has a perfect blend and balance of material - past, present and future. I am completely regenerated to get back into your faces for a few more years and look forward to the flood of interesting material that I know is being feverishly prepared.

Don’t worry - if you can’t think of anything, I will be on your case with a suggestion.

Until next time.

Mike