



Class of 65 Newsletter Edition 40-August 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

I'm pleased to say that we have a nice variety of information this month thanks to a number of you that have responded to my pleas. That said, I have found that people don't embarrass easily. Despite direct pleas to several individuals who shall remain nameless (at least for now) there has been a distinct lack of response from them. Perhaps a more consequence threatening approach is necessary.

Bill Leach agreed to let me print his biography from a recent e-veritas. As a fellow logistician and former roommate of his I can say that Bill's success in the army is a matter of pride and satisfaction to me.

Waine McQuinn has shared some information on his many travels. I hope others might choose to do the same for future editions. Such reminiscences might provide some incentive for those of us less travelled to get off our butts and try something different.

Andy Nellestyn has provided us with an update on the documentary, *The Veterans*, that he previewed in Edition 25, and finally, **Rick Archer** has taken us on a trip that he and Marilyn took to Russia as part of his dealings with that country after the end of the Cold War.

First of all, however, **Jim Carruthers** provided a couple of photos taken at the 2011 Ottawa Branch RMC Club Golf Tournament held back in July at the Irish Hills Golf Course. Regrettably, I missed this exhibition of stellar golf and gamesmanship for the second year and my place on the Class of 65 Navy team had to be taken by a pilot of all things!!



Tout le '65 gang except Adams, Forbes and Diamond who had left in disgrace!



The '65 Naval Threesome plus Emond

6454 LGen (Ret'd) William (Bill) Leach served more than 40 years in the Canadian



Army and the Canadian Forces (Regular). In September, 2000, he retired from his last positions of Chief of the Land Staff and Commander Land Force Command, in the rank of Lieutenant-General. He graduated from The Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, in 1965 with a degree in Economics and Commerce. Subsequently, Bill graduated from the Canadian Land Forces Command and Staff College (PSC) and numerous

other Canadian and allied schools, courses and seminars. During his career, he held appointments at all levels. In the field of logistics, he held positions in supply, finance and operational support. He served with the British Army in Germany and in United Nations missions. During the 1990/91 Gulf War, he was the Director of Logistics Plans and Operations on the National Joint Staff. He served in both Air and Land Force Command Headquarters. At the national level, he was in the Finance Group and he was Associate Assistant Deputy Minister (Materiel) in the Materiel Group. In his last position as the Canadian Army Commander, he was a member of Armed Forces Council and Defence Management Committee; as such, he dealt with Department of National Defence and Government of Canada policies, processes and operations.

He is a recipient of the Canadian Order of Military Merit (Commander) and the US Legion of Merit (Commander). Following his retirement in late 2000, he spent 10 years in the private sector; first with Honeywell International as Vice President Operations, Honeywell Canada Logistics Services; and, more recently with Mincom, Australia's largest software company. He left Mincom in December 2010 to devote more time to his volunteer interests. Bill is now the President of the Friends of the Canadian War Museum; until recently he was a member of the Board of Directors of the Perley and Rideau Veterans' Health Centre; he is on the Executive Committee of the Military Families Fund (MFF); he is the Honorary Colonel of the Ottawa Service Battalion; he is the Chairman of the Defence and Security Committee of the Royal Canadian Legion and he is on the board of the University of Ottawa Institute of Health Research.

In late June of this year the MND appointed him the Colonel Commandant of the Logistics Branch of the Canadian Forces.

Bill was born in Sarnia, Ontario, the son of a career Army officer. He considers Ottawa his home. He has two daughters and a son, two grandchildren and three huge dogs (the smallest one is a Newfoundland). Bill lives in Kars on the south side of Ottawa, trying to master the art of rural life. He is in the midst of four generations of family, from parents through siblings and children to grandchildren. His golf game is improving very, very slowly. *Source:* <http://www.imhr.ca/about/board-directors-leach-e.cfm>

Post-Graduation Travels
By 6660 Wayne McQuinn

A few weeks ago I discussed with Mike Braham the idea of getting classmates to

identify some of the places in the world they had travelled/vacationed in the past 4-5 years and who would be willing to answer questions about those destinations for other classmates who were planning future travels.



We have seen numerous pictures of colleagues while travelling. At Jim Carruther's picnic last month, it seemed everyone was talking about their last cruise or where they were going on their next spend their winters.

Mike and I agreed that there would be no particular format. We also agreed we were not looking for a detailed travelogue of any trip. Where available, one could provide a link to anything they had produced about their travels that might be elsewhere on the Internet.

We think we should try to keep things relatively recent as things in the travel industry can change rapidly. We also realize that there are excellent independent travel advisory sites on the Internet. Nevertheless, we think there will be a greater comfort factor in discussing things with a classmate.

You will have to realize that people travel in different styles. What might be a 'Must See' for some, may be of minor interest for others. The RMC Club hosts/organizes wonderful 4-5 star excursions to exotic places of the world. I believe the next one is to India. On the other hand, others like my wife and I, tend to do things more economically, using the Internet for detailed planning and staying in modest accommodation. We have not yet, and probably will not get down to, the 'biking and tenting' stage like friends of ours do every summer in Europe.

I agreed to start things off so here we go.

Trip/Cruise/ Destination	Timing/ Duration	General Summary	Highlights/*Must See ** Worth the Trip
Sarasota, Florida	4-6 months yearly	Have owned condo on Siesta Key for 20 yrs	Sarasota is known for its cultural presence and its fine white sand

Cruise - NCL Jewel Western Caribbean	7 days, Feb 2011	From Miami, stopped at Roatan, Belize, Costa Maya and Key West before returning to Miami	*For snorkelers, we have an excellent private company excursion in Roatan
Cruise - NCL Jade Western Mediterranean	7 days, Oct 2010	From Barcelona, stopped at Monaco, Florence/Pisa, Rome, Naples(Pompeii), Mallorca and returned to Barcelona	Barcelona, Florence, **Rome, *Pompeii plus the cruise itself
Southwest France	5 days, Sept 2010	Drove from and returned to Barcelona	**Peyrepertuse, **Carcassonne, Cape d'Adge, Couliere
Cruise - Emerald Princess Eastern Caribbean	7 days,	From Ft. Lauderdale, stopped at Princess Key, St. Martin, St. Thomas, Grand Turk, returned to Ft. Lauderdale	The cruise itself, St. Martin
Las Vegas, Grand Canyon	4 days, Oct 2008	Flew into Vegas, stayed two days, drove to Grand Canyon for one night, visited Bryce Canyon and flew out of Vegas	** Grand Canyon Bolder Dam
New Zealand	14 days, Jan 2007	Landed in Auckland, drove North and South Islands, flew to Sydney from Christchurch, stayed in hostels	**Rotorua, The Farewell Spit, *west coast of South Island, *Pancake Rocks, Queenstown, *Milford Sound, Dunedin, Christchurch
Australia - East Coast Sydney - Townsville	Feb-Apr, 2007	Travelled by bus and plane, stayed in hostels and studio apartments	**Sydney, Nelson Bay, *Byron Bay, Airlie Beach, *Townsville

			(had two disappointing visits to the Great Barrier Reef)
--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------

We would be happy to talk/email with anyone about these places. We have lots of photos for most of them.

THE VETERANS: DISCOVERING CANADA'S PAST THROUGH THOSE WHO WERE THERE

By 6560 Andrew Nellestyn, Co-producer 'The Veterans'



Some three years ago Daniel R. Rodrigue, a documentarist and author, took a bold and ambitious step. He decided to produce a documentary series on Canada's veterans and serving men and women in the CF which would be of unique historical importance and which would feature not only the sacrifices made by these gallant men and women but would cast this in the mold of the CF's contributions to nation building and world security. The documentary would be called **The Veterans**. A production team was formed and what was first assessed as a one-year project became a gargantuan effort which would take three years to complete. And all on a voluntary, not-for-profit basis.

The Veterans illustrates the impact of Canada's participation in foreign conflicts and crises on Canada, Canadians and the Canadian Forces (CF). The documentary is also a production in which veterans and serving men and women of the CF talk of their experiences in their own words and convey the legacy for which they wish to be remembered. It consists of 52 episodes each of 40 minutes in length.

The documentary has two streams:

1. **The history and evolution of the CF** from WWII through to and including Korea, peacekeeping, the Cold War, the Balkans, Iraq and Afghanistan. It deals with all aspects of operations in these theatres: defence, security, economic development, governance, humanitarianism, etc. It examines the impact of the changing nature of war on doctrine, operations, education, training and equipment. Every branch of the three services (Navy, Army and

Air Force) is featured by this operational, support (health services, chaplaincy, logistics, maintenance, etc.). The contributions of such organizations as the Salvation Army, St John Ambulance, the Red Cross, CFPSA/CFPSP and Tim Horton's as well as NGOs are illustrated. The impact of defence Science and Technology and the formation of the defence industrial base are also discussed. Counterterrorism and counterinsurgency and whole-of-government strategies and activities, in other words, the evolving and changing nature of warfare are expounded upon. DFAIT, CIDA, CSC and other departments of government are included wrt their contribution to Team Canada Afghanistan and the ISAF whole-of-government mission.

2. **The history and evolution, that is, the coming of age of Canada from WWI through to and including Afghanistan** are examined. WWI was chosen as the start point. WWI heralds Canada's coming of age as it marks the first time Canada exercised full sovereignty: the command of the Canadian Expeditionary Force by General Currie and his reporting channel to Ottawa vice the British Foreign Office in London. WWI also began the transformation of Canada to an industrial nation. The documentary touches on the impact on Canadian society, changing lifestyles and values, governance and Canada's increasing and influential role on the world stage such as economics, finance, trade, diplomacy, participation in international institutions, membership in the Heads-of-Governments club, the IMF, World Bank, WTO, human rights, etc.

The documentary has been widely and most favourably commented upon and supported by the media. Participants in *The Veterans* are drawn from all walks and levels of society and include many leading men and women in the private sector, academia, government and the military. Equally important is the participation of Non-Commissioned Members (serving, retired and veterans). The episodes are introduced by Senator Pamela Wallin.

The documentary features MGen (Ret) Mackenzie, WO Willy MacDonald (PPCLI), General (Ret) Hillier, MCpl Erik Poelzer (EME), Capt Ray Wiss MD, the MND, the CDS, LCol Sebastian Boucher CO NSE Roto 10 Afghanistan, CWO Gilles Godbout RSM NSE, Col Bob Elvish (EME), Maj Devon Matsalla (EME), BGen Dean Milner Commander TFK, LCol Mike St-Louis CO TFK BG, General (Retd) Paul Manson, VADM (Retd) Ralph Hennessey, Ambassador Tim Martin DFAIT Kandahar Provincial Reconstruction Team and a host of other retired and serving military personnel. The RCR, R22iemeR and the PPCLI deployments to Afghanistan are featured.

Colonel (Retd) Andrew Nellestyn filmed on location and interviewed CF personnel during Roto 10 which was based on the 1st Battalion R22iemeR Battle Group and drawn principally from CFB Valcartier.

A selection of pre-released episodes can be seen on www.pwu.ca by clicking on the Veterans logo. The contributions of the Reserves and the importance thereof in missions such as the Balkans and Afghanistan are also featured. HColonel Blake Goldring expounds on the challenges faced by the Reserves and offers options as to how best to maintain this important element of the combat arms order of battle. Episode 19 featuring the MND and CDS sets the theme and tone for the series. Episode 24 Capt Ray Wiss MD, author of *FOB DOC* and *A Line in the Sand*, is a most informative and gripping account of the Afghan theatre. It is noted that the episode numbering on the PWU website will be re-ordered for the final release.

The documentary's principal financial supporter is the Power Workers Union (PWU) of Ontario. Other contributors, both financial and in-kind, include corporate Canada, individual Canadians, universities, policy institutes, professional organizations, departments of the Federal Government, veterans, serving men and women of the CF, Navy, Army and Air Force Associations and private foundations.

The documentary will be officially released in November 2011. It is intended that The Veterans be officially released/premiered (on an episode excerpt basis) at the Canadian War Museum in Ottawa during the CWM's Remembrance Day Week 2011 activities.

This is a unique historically significant documentary in that, unlike other documentaries about veterans which consist principally of talking heads with little national and global context, The Veterans examines all the dynamics related to Canada's participation in foreign conflicts and crises which impacted, and continue to do so, on Canada, Canadians and the CF. It is these factors which set The Veterans apart from other documentaries about those men and women who served and are serving in Canada's military.

The documentary will be gifted to the people of Canada and be available free of charge. It will be accessible on the Internet and will be shown by various television broadcasters. Interviews were conducted in both official languages.

The target audience is today's and tomorrow's young men and women, tomorrow's leaders, so that they may know not only of the sacrifices made by those who served Canada during war but also how veterans shaped and build a proud nation. The focus

for young Canadians will be on civics, citizenship, nation building and leadership.

The Veterans production team also created a documentary on **Currie Hall** for the RMC Foundation narrated by John Cowan. Additionally, John narrates a documentary on WWI which was filmed at the CWM.

The Russians are Coming...

By 6585 Richard Archer



In 1996, for both me and my wife Marilyn, a number of life forces came together and intermingled. That year both our daughters graduated from Carleton University, one with a master's degree, the other with an undergraduate degree. And even though I was already in the 36th year of my naval career (I had joined the Venture program just after my 17th birthday), I was offered a golden handshake under the Force Reduction Program to leave the service "early" - monetarily beneficial and fine by me.

At the time, I was on arguably my last posting anyway, with one year to go as a staff officer on the International Military Staff (the military staff reporting to the Chairman of the Military Committee) at NATO HQ, Brussels. Among other jobs, I was the IMS representative to the NATO Naval Armaments Group (NNAG) and its various naval information exchange groups under the Alliance's Conference of National Armaments Directors (the Canadian rep on CNAD is ADM(Mat)). With the process for my release already started, I was approached out of the blue by retired Italian Navy Captain Arcangelo Simi, who led the Naval Armaments Section in the International Staff (the civilian staff reporting to the Secretary General). The Naval Section ran NNAG. He wanted me to apply for a staff position in the section that was just becoming vacant. Apparently, my IMS boss's boss, an Italian air force general having the wonderful name of Ferrari, had put in a good word for me. The upshot was that in the autumn of 1996 I won the international competition for the position, and started work in January 1997. Basically the job description was to facilitate naval armaments collaboration amongst NATO nations.

The Naval Section wasn't big. Under Capt Simi we were two staff officers and a Scottish lady, Sybil Beaton, as secretary. My staff colleague was a retired German Navy commander by the name of Edi Dransfeld. Between us we divided up the naval world. While Dransfeld looked after the international groups addressing above-water, anti-submarine, maritime air and electronic warfare, I had under my wing

everything else. This included Naval Group 3 on Mine Warfare, Naval Group 5 on Tactical Control and Data Handling, Naval Group 6 on Ship Design, Special Working Group 10 on Electromagnetic Compatibility, Special Working Group 12 on Maritime Environmental Protection, Project Group 38 on Submarine Rescue, and three sub-groups addressing the particulars of naval, air force and army Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Warfare.

The main Naval Groups also had a number of sub-groups that met separately to address narrower areas of endeavour. One such sub-group under NG/6, for example, led the world in the software characterization of the interaction between a ship in a seaway and an aircraft or UAV trying to land on the pitching deck. They found a way, called a "run-time integrator", to amalgamate the differing software programs each nation had for characterizing the sea states, their ship classes and various air vehicles. I heard that the Joint Strike Fighter project adopted the sub-group's software integration tool in its own development program.

All such NNAG groups had originally been called "information exchange", but when I joined the section NNAG was well on the way toward each group doing something substantive and collaborative beyond mere info sharing, to push the boundaries of technologies. The names had been changed to "Naval Group", and Naval Group 3, for example, was vigorously pushing the envelope in the use of automated underwater vehicles in mine warfare. (I hear that the NNAG bodies are now called "Maritime Capability Groups").



NATO Headquarters

A major factor at the time was NATO's move to make friends with other nations in Europe, not only neutral nations but particularly those that had been in the Soviet sphere. The program was called Partnership for Peace (PFP). While Dransfeld and

his groups resisted PFP participation in their meetings and work until several years later, I embarked on a concerted effort to invite PFP representatives to all "my" meetings. This was even the case for Naval Group 5 on Tactical Control and Data Handling, where the Swedes and Finns became major contributors to the advancement of ideas and technology. I also welcomed Australia into a few groups.

About this time we also started getting feelers from the Russian Federation. They had heard about NNAG's Project Group 38 on Submarine Rescue, which was moving smartly towards the international development of replacement submersible rescue vehicles, the ones that a rescue mother ship would launch to a submarine in distress to recover the crew. The PG/38 intent was also to set up a multinational coordination centre, including such nations as the Australians, Japanese and South Koreans, for handling world-wide submarine distress incidents. Yet another initiative was to compile a list of both military and civilian ships around the world that could act as a "vessel of opportunity" for mother ship duties close to the scene of the submarine distress. The actual rescue vessels would be flown in.

PG/38 was chaired by the RN's submarine rescue project director, a commander. A meeting with a Russian delegation was arranged, and in due course the delegation arrived led by two senior admirals. This was only a preliminary feeling-out meeting, but at the end of the day the RN commander put together a brief summary of what had been agreed. He signed it with a flourish and then passed it to the senior Russian, who had to admit, "I am not authorized to sign this document".

Do you remember being told in your junior officer training that a big difference between western and Soviet navies was in their rules of engagement? While western commanders could do anything justified as long as they weren't specifically forbidden to do so, the Soviets commanders *couldn't* do anything unless they had received related instructions from higher authority. Well it seemed that this practice was still in place, and throughout my interaction with the Russians it remained a consideration. Such were the delays in getting back to me for preparations for meetings that I came to believe the Russian delegation had to first bounce the issue off senior authorities in Moscow, especially during the sour relations arising from the Kosovo bombing episode. I had the conceit that I was keeping Vladimir Putin up late at night.

In any case, I had regular Russian participation in NG/6 on Ship Design (even through the 1999 Kosovo bombing campaign, when NATO-Russia relations were nominally severed) and they appreciated me arranging separate Russian language interpretation at all meetings. They came from the Russian state enterprise for

submarine design in Saint Petersburg. Over the course of a couple of meetings it gradually became clear the Russians were in the process of designing a new submarine rescue mothership, and were looking to western navies for assistance and possible collaboration. NG/6 was chaired by a USN captain, who worked at their major surface ship design research institute, the Naval Surface Warfare Center's Carderock Division, under the USN Sea Systems Command. Initially he wasn't used to dealing with submarine-related issues, and of course, NG/6 being the largest group in NNAG, submarine rescue motherships was only one of a multitude of avenues of endeavour for the group.

But it all came to a head on August 12th 2000, when the Russian submarine *Kursk* sank with all hands in the Barents Sea. The RN commander who was chair of PG/38 led a British expedition to help. The RN chartered a suitable Norwegian vessel in a northern Norwegian port and then flew the RN's rescue vehicle, the LR5, and its ancillary equipment there. They got to the scene of the *Kursk* sinking but arrived too late.



Kursk (Oscar II Class Nuclear Submarine)

In the NNAG groups it was customary for individual nations to periodically host meetings on home turf. The French invited NG/6 to Toulon for a visit to their research facilities, for example. In November 2001 the Russian NG/6 delegation invited the group to Saint Petersburg. At this time, a lead staff officer in the IMS was another RN commander and submariner, a Scot named John Stanley-White, who participated in most NNAG meetings, like NG/6.

The Archers and Stanley-Whites teamed up, and I could write a whole separate article on the Saint Petersburg adventure. We arrived on a Saturday and stayed at the submarine research institute's own *Hotel Neptun* (then managed by Best Western). The meeting was on Monday and Tuesday and on Sunday the four of us did a whirlwind tour of all the sights, including a rapid passage of the Hermitage Museum (hey there's a Van Gogh, hey there's a Da Vinci, hey there's a Rubens, and so on) but we marveled at the decor and architecture as much as the art displays. I know this sounds crass, but that one day of opportunity we also wanted to visit the Peter and Paul Fortress and the Naval Museum, among other sights. We even had high tea from a samovar in the Astoria Hotel, the one that Adolf Hitler declared would be his HQ when the time came to victoriously enter Leningrad.

Marilyn was later treated to a guided tour by one of the Russian wives. One stop was at the Saint Nicholas Cathedral, which is the naval garrison church in the city. They went in and discovered that a commemoration service for the lost sailors of the *Kursk* had been held the day before.



St Nicholas Cathedral, St Petersburg

The actual NG/6 meetings in St Petersburg went as expected and we moved the files along satisfactorily. A highlight was a limitless vodka-fuelled lunch, full of bonhomie and a multiplicity of toasts on every subject.

In 2002 NATO and the Russian Federation signed a cooperation agreement and formed the NATO-Russia Council, separate from PfP (which the Russians didn't wish to be associated with). Their intent was to have equal, bilateral status with NATO as an entity, and I guess at the higher level meetings this was the case. But of course in meetings at the NNAG level, Russia would just be another nation, with a voice and a vote equivalent to that of Belgium or Poland. It took them a while to get used to this. And they often looked taken aback by how "junior" many of the movers and shakers on the NATO staff were, and how much power and authority they had...like me.

Initially, the Russian authorities appointed an air force colonel to be the liaison officer with NATO. We all knew that he was from the military intelligence branch, GRU, but that was okay. When NATO brought in a few Russian speakers to help

handle the Russia file, they tended to be spooks as well.

A problem was that the Russian colonel had to operate out of an office in the Russian embassy downtown, and initially at least he wasn't cleared to get past the security checkpoints in the NATO building. So I had to set up meetings in the NATO cafeteria. Later he was replaced by a naval captain, also GRU, whose last posting had been to Tunisia. So his French was better than his English, and our discussions often occurred in the former.

Between Stanley-White and I, we knew that we needed a stronger understanding and mandate concerning cooperation in submarine rescue, and so together and in consultation with the Russians we drew up what came to be called the NATO-Russia Framework Agreement on Submarine Crew Escape and Rescue. This document was officially agreed by the NATO-Russia Council in May 2003.

In this regard, we encouraged the Russians to participate actively in the NATO Submarine Escape and Rescue Working Group (NSERWG) in the NATO Standardization Agency. The NSERWG met twice yearly to pursue widely accepted standards in such things as escape hatch docking rings. But despite our recommendations, the Russians stayed away from that group.

As NG/6 meetings progressed, the Russian NG/6 delegation, now led by a couple of navy captains, whom I grew to know well, were getting more and more involved in the many other avenues of NG/6 endeavour, but submarine rescue was not a subject that the NATO and PFP naval architects around the table had thought much about. Even so, I kept the subject of submarine rescue motherships on the agenda, and everyone learned a lot about the subject. I confess I was anxious to make the Russian participation in NG/6 useful to them, and I chatted up the US chair of the group to see how we could accommodate some substantive work. I also arranged for the NNAG chair, a Danish admiral, to brief CNAD on the subject.

To NG/6 I proposed that the group engage the NATO Industrial Advisory Group (NIAG), who had an office across the hall from me. NIAG was a loose connection of major defence industry companies whose mandate was to advise the Assistant Secretary General for Defence Investment (our division honcho, chair of CNAD and Simi's boss's boss) on the industrial implications of the division's initiatives. NIAG also had a budget to do studies, and did quite a few while I was there, many for my groups.

I asked for five minutes at the next NSERWG meeting, to bring the submarine

rescue standardization authority up to speed, as well as to get a more-or-less green light to proceed. I ended up putting in an hour and a half at the meeting. The chair, an RN naval captain this time, complained that NG/6 was treading on NSERWG's turf...and why weren't the Russians coming to *their* meeting? My argument was that as far as NSWERG was concerned, the Russians *weren't* coming, and that the NATO naval architect community was proposing to do some work to *complement* that of NSERWG...and the WG should look upon NG/6 as a very useful naval architecture resource. I received a grudging go ahead. But I didn't tell them that even if the NSERWG had balked, I would still have proceeded with the NG/6 study....

I briefed NIAG on the idea that they should study the specifications for the interfaces between the mothership and the submersible rescue vessels to determine where some standardization could occur. The specifications for foreign systems would be known and accommodated to the extent possible in emerging mothership designs. The ultimate object would be to be able to fit any nation's rescue vessel on any other nation's mother ship. I also made the point to NIAG that at least one of the cooperating shipbuilding concerns in the study should be from Russia, a new idea for NIAG. After some negotiations and convincing, NIAG agreed to pursue such a study with Russian industrial participation for NG/6.

All this was of course going on while I was doing similar things for my other groups - a busy time making sure that all groups were undertaking substantive work and that NNAG was getting its money's worth. But in addition, the Naval Section, indeed all of the Defence Investment Division, was in turmoil. In 2001 the Clinton-appointed ASG for Defence Investment had been replaced soon after 911 by someone more to the liking of George Bush. The new ASG had his marching orders, and they were to get the NATO armaments community away from business-as-usual and support the war on terrorism. This was fine except NATO soon became a two-speed alliance. While one nation, the US, was at war and went full speed ahead on anti-terrorism, all the other nations were more inclined to pursue that business-as-usual, which included due emphasis on other lines of endeavour.

This was most evident in CNAD, where the ASG got the nations around the table to agree to the emphasis on anti-terrorism, but this did not have much if any impact on groups like NNAG. There was, of course, a huge disconnect between CNAD and its nominal groups like NNAG, in that in their national capitals CNAD members were the *materiel* folks like ADM(Mat), while the NNAG and similar groups were the *requirements* folks, who didn't have any national chain of command to authorities like ADM(Mat). When I queried group members, they hadn't even heard of the

CNAD initiative.

This came to a head when the ASG made a move to refocus the CNAD onto "more important" activities such as IED detection and destruction. He cast around for a CNAD activity to cancel and came up with submarine rescue, which he characterized as passé business-as-usual. That is, he wanted to disband PG/38, which was then in the last stages of the development of its tri-national collaborative project to replace existing submersible rescue vehicles with a common design.

As soon as I heard about the ASG's move, I surreptitiously telephoned the PG/38 chair and the lead OPIs in the other two nations. The end result was that the ASG's initiative was decisively killed in the next CNAD meeting. Phew!

But that wasn't all. The ASG was bent on reforming the Division to make it joint and more responsive to emerging requirements, particularly the war on terror. He wanted to replace dinosaurs like Simi, Dransfeld and myself with much younger (and presumably more malleable) staff. Simi was let go, but Dransfeld and I stayed on in the expectation that we were in any case close to reaching CRA at age 65. For me that was actually four years hence...but I'd had enough. I submitted my resignation in 2004.

It wasn't that much later when at home in Ottawa I received a phone call from the US Chair of NG/6 - the NIAG study had been a success.

Closing Notes

That's it for another month, however, before closing, I wonder if any of you have any thoughts on the recent announcement to reintroduce "Royal" back into the Navy and Air Force titles. For our Class, of course, it means an almost complete full-circle to the pre-unification decision of 1968 and might, therefore signal some sort of vindication for the angst many of us felt for that decision.

However, such a feeling might not be shared by those who joined the Forces after 1968 and have known nothing other than a unified Canadian Forces.

I imagine the decision will involve some not inconsiderable expenses to make all of the associated uniform, equipment, etc changes.

What do you think? Was a change necessary? Will it be good for the Forces?