

2014-01-22

The Canadian Forces and American military influence, 1963-1989

Nelemans, Jamie

<http://knowledgecommons.lakeheadu.ca/handle/2453/535>

Downloaded from Lakehead University, Knowledge Commons

**THE CANADIAN FORCES AND AMERICAN MILITARY INFLUENCE, 1963-
1989**

by

Jamie Nelemans

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

Department of History

Lakehead University

August 2013

Abstract

The 1963 to 1989 period witnessed a rapid change in Canadian defence matters. During this period the Canadian government forced the military away from its traditional ally the United Kingdom and moved it closer to the United States (US). The Canadian governments of Lester B. Pearson, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and Brian Mulroney attempted to create and retain a distinctive military with a truly 'Canadian' organization and with new Canadian military traditions. However, in the process of attempting to create a distinctive 'Canadian' military, all three of these governments moved the Canadian Forces (CF) closer towards the US military. While US defence and government officials welcomed an increased defence cooperation between Ottawa and Washington, they were often not responsible for the burgeoning ties between the US and Canadian armed forces. Moving the CF closer towards their American counterparts enabled Ottawa to keep its defence budget relatively stable without any drastic increases because of the promise of support from the larger US military. More importantly, this movement towards the US enabled all three prime ministers to continuously assure Washington of Canada's abilities to help defend North America and participate in the cooperative NATO defence of Western Europe. Becoming a 'strategic liability' for the US in Western defence would have had grave consequences for Canadian sovereignty. For the Canadian government during this period, the only way to ensure Canada did not become a liability was to have the CF work closely with the US. As a result, Canadian defence policies during the Cold War strove to ensure that Canada was able to participate with the US in the defence of the West.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my utmost thanks and gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Michael Stevenson, for all of his work in helping make my thesis come together. I would also like to thank Professor Victor Smith for all of his help and encouragement with the MA program and my thesis. I would also like to express my thanks to Dr. Ron Harpelle and Dr. Michel Beaulieu for their assistance and encouragement. Finally, I would like to thank the faculty and staff of the Lakehead University Department of History for their role in assisting in the completion of this thesis. Thank you all for the hard work, assistance and encouragement you have provided to me over the past two years of graduate work.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter One	
The Canadian Military and the Unification Debate, 1963-1968	18
Chapter Two	
Pierre Trudeau and the Canadian Forces, 1968-1979	53
Chapter Three	
The Re-Equipping of the Canadian Forces, 1979-1989.....	91
Conclusion	135
Bibliography.....	149

Introduction

With the end of the Second World War, the United States (US) became the dominant superpower of the Western world and worked to create a system to defend itself and its allies from the Soviet Union. Canada had traditionally identified with the interests of the United Kingdom (UK), but the declining power of the British Empire after 1945 led Canada to look elsewhere for military support. During the Cold War, the United States military exerted great influence upon its allies within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). However, no other military felt this pressure greater than the Canadian armed forces.

Prior to 1945, the Canadian military was primarily oriented towards the British Empire and was a small replica of the larger British military. In the nineteenth century, the US was viewed as Canada's primary threat. However, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the Canadian government and population began to work closely with the US in economic and social spheres. With the onset of the Cold War, Canada also began to look towards the Americans for both political and military leadership. During the four decades following the Second World War, the military relationship between the two countries was to be unlike that of any other in the world. As the neighbour to an immense military superpower, the Canadian military saw the waning influence of the British military system give way to that of the powerful US military machine, and the Canadian military was transformed into a defence establishment that looked to the US for its primary support instead of the UK, its traditional ally.

Even though the US armed forces exerted an increasingly powerful influence on the Canadian military, it was Canadian politicians attempting to 'Canadianize' the

military who forced Canada to adapt to US military models, strategies and equipment. This accomplished two important objectives for Ottawa. First, it enabled successive governments to keep their defence budgets relatively small during the Cold War. Second, it ensured that the United States government knew that Canada was able to defend its borders and participate in the defence of the West. While the first item was a bonus, it was the second that was necessary to ensure Canadian sovereignty and gave the Canadian government a perceived voice in Washington.

Beginning with the unification of the Canadian Forces (CF) from 1964 to 1968 through to the end of the 1980s, the Canadian military was transformed into a fighting organization that rapidly shifted from UK to US military models. During these three decades, the CF began to adopt significant elements of US military strategy, equipment, models and traditions in order to work more effectively with their North American neighbour. However, this was a process that had begun with the onset of hostilities between the Axis and Allied powers in 1939 and had slowly evolved during the Second World War and throughout the 1950s. When accepting an award in Kingston, Ontario, in 1938, American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt made a speech that was to change the course of North American security relations for the remainder of the twentieth century. Roosevelt assured Canada “that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened.”¹ Immediately afterwards, Canadian Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King responded and assured Roosevelt that Canada would not allow itself to become a staging area for any potential invasion of the

¹ J.L. Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?* (Toronto: HarperCollins Canada, 2004), 37. The speech by Roosevelt caught King and the Canadian government completely off guard. Roosevelt’s statement is often characterized as the first step in the development of the Canadian-American security relationship.

US.² While both of these statements were made in regard to the deteriorating situation in Europe, they were to lead to a comprehensive agreement that would allow for direct and continued military cooperation well beyond the end of the Second World War. The statements made by both leaders also opened the door for the powerful influence that the United States armed forces would have on Canada's military during the Cold War.

Following the June 1940 defeat of France and the onset of the Battle of Britain, King and Roosevelt met at the town of Ogdensburg, New York, in August 1940 to create an agreement that would formally announce Canadian-American defence cooperation. With the majority of the active Canadian military forces overseas defending the UK, King was eager to meet at Ogdensburg to ensure US assistance if Canada became threatened by the Axis powers. The meeting at Ogdensburg signaled a major shift in Canadian defence policy. For the first time, the Canadian armed forces were looking to a country other than the UK for military assistance. The senior leadership of the American military was not content with simple assistance and instead wished for the creation of a joint Canadian-American military with a single chain-of-command.

Throughout the Ogdensburg Conference, and for the remainder of the Second World War, US military leaders strove to get politicians in Ottawa and Washington to reach a North American defence agreement. Such a development would enable American and Canadian forces to participate together under a single command.³ However, this was immediately rejected by the Canadian military, as it would have given the US operational control of all Canadian forces engaged in the defence of North America.⁴ The attempt by

² Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 37.

³ Brian Cuthbertson, *Canadian Military Independence in the Age of Superpowers* (Don Mills, ON: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1977), 15.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 22.

the US military commanders for a bilateral agreement was to become the main fear of Canadian military and government leaders in regards to the North American security relationship. This coincided with the longstanding Canadian fear of US control of Canadian foreign and domestic policies. After having its military fight under the command of the UK in two world wars, the Canadian government had a strong desire to retain control of its own forces in any future conflict.

King and Roosevelt created several defence structures at Ogdensburg that would become long-standing pillars of the Canada-US defence relationship. Arguably, this meeting created the most important element in North American defence relations during the Cold War, the Permanent Joint Board on Defence (PJBD). The PJBD consisted of Canadian and American members who were instructed to develop plans to coordinate the defence of North America.⁵ Both leaders also took the very important step of deciding that any agreement signed at Ogdensburg would continue after the end of the Second World War. While this meeting is often seen as a sidebar, it was the Ogdensburg Agreement that allowed Canadian-American defence relations to flourish during the Cold War.

From the beginning of negotiations at Ogdensburg in 1940 and continuing into the immediate post-war years, however, a comprehensive bilateral defence agreement was not on the Canadian agenda. Canadian diplomat Escott Reid made this abundantly clear in a 1947 meeting between Canadian and American officials. Reid pointed out that any military cooperation between the two allies was only possible in the framework of a

⁵ Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 39.

larger alliance in which both countries were loyal members.⁶ It was feared that Canadian territory and military units would instantly come under US command if Canada entered into any bilateral military alliance with Washington. By signing a bilateral military agreement with their large neighbour, Canada would instantly become the junior partner, which would effectively leave all Canadian military units under US command and control.⁷ Instead, Ottawa argued that mutual cooperation become the basis for all command decisions in joint Canadian-US military actions.⁸ It was clear to Washington that Canadian fears of losing control of its military forces would not allow for a bilateral treaty to be signed encompassing all aspects of North American security. Despite Canadian fears, the senior military leadership of Canada's military was not an unwilling partner in increased cooperation with the American military juggernaut in both continental and NATO defence.

While Canada's defence links with the US expanded, Ottawa began to move away from its traditional military ties with the UK. Following the material and financial devastation of the 1940s, the British government faced the prospect of granting freedom to many of the remaining British colonies. With more and more colonies being granted or winning their freedom, a strong anti-British and anti-imperial sentiment began to take hold in many of these former colonies. With this ongoing backlash against the British Empire, the Canadian government and military began to realize that a more 'Canadian' military model was needed in the post-imperial world. This need was made abundantly clear to future Prime Minister Lester Pearson during the 1956 Suez Crisis.

⁶ Arthur Andrew, *The Rise and Fall of a Middle Power: Canadian Diplomacy from King to Mulroney* (Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, Publishers, 1993), 28.

⁷ Cuthbertson, *Canadian Military Independence in the Age of Superpowers*, 25.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 15.

Following concerted efforts by Pearson to broker a peace after the invasion of Egyptian territory by French, British and Israeli forces, the Queen's Own Rifles of Canada were sent to help keep the peace around the Suez Canal.⁹ Soon after the Regiment's arrival, the Egyptian government launched a number of complaints to Ottawa regarding the Canadian military's strong British-oriented traditions. These complaints made many Canadian military and Foreign Affairs personnel realize that adhering to a British model and dress code was not attractive in a post-colonial world.¹⁰ This sentiment was magnified by the events that ensued surrounding the arrival of the Royal Canadian Navy's aircraft carrier, *HMCS Magnificent*, at Port Said, Egypt. The carrier arrived flying the traditional White Ensign of the Royal Navy and its Commonwealth allies. As the Egyptians had only recently been engaged in combat operations with the Royal Navy, the ensign was taken as a form of hostility and it was only the interference of United States naval personnel at Port Said that prevented Egyptian forces from firing on the Canadian ship.¹¹ The incidents that the Canadian Army and the RCN experienced in Egypt convinced the leadership of the armed forces that they needed a different military model. Many within the military and the government also recognized that if Canada were to undertake peacekeeping operations, they would frequently occur in nations that were former colonies.

While the Canadian armed forces were facing challenges to their identity in operations overseas, the federal government was in the process of bringing the Canadian air force into a joint North American defence force with the US. In July 1957 Prime

⁹ J.L. Granatstein, *Canada's Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), 347.

¹⁰ Andrew, *The Rise and Fall of a Middle Power*, 28.

¹¹ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 348.

Minister John Diefenbaker agreed to the creation of the North American Air (later Aerospace) Defence Command (NORAD) that would officially integrate US and Canadian air defence forces within North America. Supporters of the agreement argued that this would allow Canada to both better exercise protection of its airspace and also allow Canada to gain a voice in Washington.¹² Meanwhile, detractors of NORAD argued that this was handing over Canadian military forces and sovereignty to the US and that Canada would soon become simply a tool of the US government and military.¹³ Through almost a year of government and public debates, the federal government finally agreed to formally sign the agreement in May 1958. The NORAD agreement was one of the few bilateral treaties signed between the two countries in which Ottawa agreed to an American commander having certain operational command over elements of the Canadian military.

The events of the 1940s and 1950s were to be a stepping-stone for increased cooperation between Ottawa and Washington over the course of the next three decades. Prime Ministers Lester Pearson, Pierre Trudeau and Brian Mulroney all attempted to retain a truly Canadian defence policy and military force. However, in the process of trying to accomplish this goal, the politicians pushed Canadian defense institutions to cooperate closely with their American counterparts. This led to the adoption of US organizational structures and military strategies by the CF for much of the Cold War. For much of the latter half of the twentieth century the CF slowly transformed from long standing British traditions towards a more North American model that drew heavily from the different branches of the United States Armed Forces. This was not a process that

¹² Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 347.

¹³ Andrew, *The Rise and Fall of a Middle Power*, 348.

occurred overnight but instead took many years to develop and continued into the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Canadian-American defence relations are a well-studied topic among military historians. The majority of these scholars acknowledge the defence cooperation that developed between these two countries during the Cold War, but few examine the growing influence that the US military had on the Canadian Forces during this period. Three distinct schools of thought exist concerning the development of North American security relations during the Cold War. The first school emphasizes the role and importance of the Canadian military but contends that bilateral defence relations between the two countries have forced the CF to become utterly dependent on the US armed forces.¹⁴ This argument stems from two important points: the belief that the US can impose its North American security demands upon the CF at will, and the fact that Canadian military forces often operate under American command in Alliance relations. These historians also contend that the Canadian defence establishment has always been tied to a powerful ally and that in the 1960s it simply switched from the UK to the US. Although this is a useful theory when examining North American defence relations during the Cold War, it fails to take into account the critical role that the Canadian government played in pursuing many of the defence agreements. Historians who advocate this theory have published some of the most important works in Canadian-American military relations during the Cold War. Among these are Joel Sokolsky and Joseph Jockel's edited collection of essays analyzing Canada's bilateral military

¹⁴ Justin Massie, "Canada's (In)dependence in the North American Security Community: The Asymmetrical Norm of Common Fate," *American Review of Canadian Studies* 37, no. 4 (2007), 494.

alliances, *Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defence Cooperation*,¹⁵ and Sokolsky's *Defending Canada*.¹⁶ In both of these influential works the authors argue that North American defence between the two countries was characterized by Canada having to use the US military to assist them in almost all aspects of its defence duties. Furthermore, Jockel and Sokolsky contend in both works that the constant reductions in the Canadian defence budget and personnel resulted in Canada having to adhere to many American military strategies and demands during the Cold War.

Proponents of this analytical school have been challenged by a second group of Canadian military scholars arguing that North American defence relations during the Cold War were founded upon common norms and values held by Ottawa and Washington. In essence, this school argues that Canada and the United States have created a "liberal democratic security community, founded upon shared norms of mutual expectations and sovereignty, as well upon values and political norms."¹⁷ Foremost among these scholars are Canadian military historians Bernd Horn and Robert Bothwell. Horn's edited collection of essays, *The Canadian Way of War*,¹⁸ and Bothwell's *Alliance and Illusion*¹⁹ contend that Canada did not become dependent on the US but instead worked closely with the Americans because of a similarity in international objectives. Horn argues that a similar world and regional view held by Canadian and American military personnel were the main reason that Canada worked very closely with the US

¹⁵ Joel J. Sokolsky & Joseph T. Jockel, ed., *Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defence Cooperation: The Road from Ogdensburg* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press, 1992).

¹⁶ Joel J. Sokolsky, *Defending Canada: U.S.-Canadian Defense Policies* (New York: Priority Press Publications, 1989).

¹⁷ Massie, "Canada's (In)dependence," 503.

¹⁸ Colonel Bernd Horn, ed., *The Canadian Way of War: Serving the National Interest* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2006).

¹⁹ Robert Bothwell, *Alliance and Illusion: Canada and the World, 1945-1984* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007).

military.²⁰ Bothwell, meanwhile, argues that Canada's military contribution to alliances was predicated on similar democratic values and norms it holds with the other alliance members.²¹ However, by examining the common values held by the two countries, these scholars do not acknowledge the immense pressure the American government and military placed on their Canadian counterparts to adhere to American military strategies and plans. These scholars also do not often discuss the fact that Canada worked almost exclusively with the US both within and outside of NATO and rarely with the other Western nations that also held similar world-views with Canada.

Finally, a third group of scholars contends that Canadian-American military cooperation did not occur because of similar democratic values or Canada's dependence on the US military; instead, it was a tool used by the Canadian government during the Cold War for other purposes. These authors argue that successive federal governments throughout the Cold War used the immense size of the US military and American security concerns to their advantage by having the US take on a large role in Canadian defence efforts.²² Two important works representative of this school of thought are J.L. Granatstein's *Canada's Army*²³ and John Blaxland's *Strategic Cousins*.²⁴ Granatstein argues that Canada was able to get by in NATO without having to contribute heavily to the overall defence of the Alliance because of its close proximity to the US and its role in assisting the US in North American defence. Blaxland argues that Canada kept its military budget and force numbers low by sending its forces on UN missions to areas that

²⁰ Horn, *The Canadian Way of War*, 288.

²¹ Bothwell, *Alliance and Illusion*, 261.

²² Massie, "Canada's (In)dependence," 503.

²³ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*.

²⁴ John C. Blaxland, *Strategic Cousins: Australian and Canadian Expeditionary Forces and the British and American Empires* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006).

were of strategic importance to the Pentagon and by partnering Canadian units with American forces throughout the world. While this theory is important to the study of North American defence relations during the Cold War, it focuses mainly on Canada's overseas commitments and often glosses over cooperation between the two militaries within North America. It also does not take into account the demands that the US placed on Ottawa to restructure and rebuild its forces during the 1980s.

While all three of these schools of thought encompass the majority of the historiography on Canadian-American defence relations during the Cold War, there are some overarching holes in this historiography. One of these is that many existing works focus solely either on government interactions between Ottawa and Washington or the military cooperation between the Canadian and American militaries. Both of these are the main elements of North American defence cooperation. But since Canada and the US are democracies, the federal government and military of each country should not be treated as separate entities by scholars discussing Canadian-American Cold War defence cooperation. A second gap in the literature results from scholars focusing primarily on defence cooperation between the two allies during the Second World War and at the very end of the Cold War, while paying minimal attention to defence relations developed between 1960 and 1989. Combined, these are two important holes in the historiography of the subject that need to be filled in order to provide a concise overview of the military cooperation between the United States and Canada that developed during the Pearson, Trudeau and Mulroney governments.

This thesis will attempt to address these historical gaps by examining three primary chronological periods. Chapter One will examine the unification of the branches

of the Canadian military between 1964 and 1968. Beginning with the announcement in 1964 to unify the Canadian military, officials began to mothball many of the traditional links between the Canadian and British militaries. As the 1960s progressed and unification became a reality with the formal creation of the Canadian Forces, it was clear that Minister of National Defence Paul Hellyer was more closely aligning the Canadian defence establishment with the US. Both Hellyer and Prime Minister Pearson wanted to develop a distinctly Canadian identity in the country's armed forces. Hellyer was keenly interested in the US military system, in particular the United States Marine Corps (USMC), which he viewed as a key model for the newly unified Canadian Forces. Members of both the Canadian Senate and House of Commons were concerned that Hellyer was attempting to create a 'fifth-service' for the US armed forces. Coincidentally, it was also during the unification debates that cooperation between the two neighbours in military affairs began to become standard operating procedure.

Chapter Two will examine changing defence roles and policies adopted by the Trudeau government in the late 1960s and 1970s. For much of this period, Trudeau turned Canadian defence priorities upside down when he demanded that the CF focus their main effort on the protection of Canadian sovereignty. Despite the need for significant air, naval and land forces to enforce Canadian sovereignty, Trudeau was constantly reducing the relative defence budget and the manpower of the CF and often refused to provide the CF with the equipment they needed. Reallocation of Canadian units from Europe to North American defence and vast reductions in capabilities, manpower, and equipment led to the CF looking towards the US for assistance in completing many of their military objectives assigned by the Trudeau government.

Finally, Chapter Three will look at the ‘rebuilding’ of the CF during the 1980s by Prime Ministers Trudeau and Mulroney and how the US military was integrated into this process by Canadian government and defence officials. Both prime ministers worked closely with the United States Department of Defense (DoD) and President Ronald Reagan in order to help reshape NATO strategy and continental defence arrangements in order to meet the growing Soviet conventional threat. It was also during the 1980s that the Pentagon took on an increased role to help get the CF more manpower and better equipment. This was a period in which both external and internal pressures on the Canadian military led to increased cooperation and acceptance of American military trends. The US began to exert pressure on Ottawa, realizing that a larger and better-equipped CF would only help defend American interests and free up US military assets for other operations.

Between 1964 and 1989 Ottawa and Washington developed a highly intricate military relationship that was to see the militaries of both countries begin to work together closely. It was during this period that the military of the US replaced that of the UK as the Canadian Forces primary alliance partner. Despite the importance that successive Canadian governments put on the development of a purely Canadian defence strategy, these same politicians inadvertently moved the CF closer to their American counterparts. Realizing the potential benefits to Canadian security and the economy, politicians in Ottawa looked to move the military closer to the US. This is an important era in Canadian military history, as it was during this period of continuously high international tensions that Canada and the US began to develop an integrated continental defence structure. Eventually this cooperation in North America would expand to both

countries' military forces partaking in international alliances and commitments, which would result in Canadian and American forces working and supporting each other throughout the world. Through the examination of primary documents such as the papers of Defence Ministers Paul Hellyer and Barney Danson and House of Commons and Senate documents, this study will seek to show how Canadian politicians, not American government or military officials, moved the CF towards the US over a twenty-five year period at the height of the Cold War. In moving the CF towards their superpower neighbour, the governments of Pearson, Trudeau and Mulroney recognized the security and economic benefits that a closer military relationship with the US could bring to Canada.

Chapter One **The Canadian Military and the Unification Debate, 1963-1968**

On 25 April 1967, the Canadian Parliament passed the Canadian Forces Reorganization Act. This was followed with the official names of the Canadian Army, Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF), and Royal Canadian Navy (RCN) being dropped and renamed as the Canadian Forces on 1 February 1968. While this greatly shocked many Canadians, it was the result of a process that had begun as early as 1964 with a desire by newly elected Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson to move the Canadian military away from its British roots and traditions and create a distinctly Canadian defence establishment. In the search for a purely Canadian military identity, Ottawa looked towards the United States with their large and global armed forces for assistance in developing a Canadian approach to reorganizing its armed forces.

The movement towards the US military under the leadership of Prime Minister Pearson and Defence Minister Paul Hellyer occurred in three distinct phases between 1964 and 1967. First, the Pearson government gave Hellyer free reign to remove British traditions from the Canadian military. The debacle of the Suez Canal crisis in 1956 was still fresh in the minds of Pearson and Hellyer, and they both believed that to ensure this would not happen in the future the Canadian military would have to be reshaped and given a new set of distinctly 'Canadian' traditions. Hellyer was given the go-ahead to begin this process in 1964 and was effectively finished eliminating many British traditions and customs by 1966. Second, Hellyer took a serious look at reorganizing the Canadian military along the lines of the United States Marine Corps (USMC). This was tantalizing to Hellyer, as not only would it help show Washington that Canada took its

defence seriously, but it also would allow him to create a tri-service, highly mobile force. These discussions came at a rapid pace beginning soon after the release of the 1964 White Paper on Defence and captivated the public along with military and government officials. However, these discussions had effectively ended by late 1965 because of the widespread opposition to the plan from both the public and the military. Finally, the Canadian military began to realize the future of NATO relations and started to move towards their US counterparts for assistance in altering certain segments of Hellyer's unification strategies. These discussions began in the summer of 1965 after it was clear to the military that the Pearson government was going to ensure that unification became a reality. While these discussions continued into 1968 they trailed off significantly when Hellyer left the Ministry of National Defence in the fall of 1967.

Ultimately these three distinct phases were the beginning of the 'Canadianization' project of the CF that would last the remainder of the Cold War. In its attempt to find and develop a distinct Canadian military identity, the leading officials of the Pearson Cabinet, including the Prime Minister himself, began the push of the CF towards their US counterparts. Hellyer and Pearson both realized that creating a tri-service force with a new identity would allow them to reduce flourishing Canadian defence budgets by eliminating any excess funding that went to the military because of service rivalry and competition for funds. Politicians throughout Ottawa also encouraged Pearson and his Cabinet to go ahead with their plans, as it would show the US that Canada cared about its military defence and was prepared to adapt to the US superpower and away from the UK.

The Move Away from British Military Traditions (1964-1966)

While many members of the armed forces and the government were shocked at Canada's movement away from UK military models and traditions and its rapid push towards the US, this was a process that had begun as early as 1956. Following the Suez Crisis and the problems that the Canadian Army and the RCN faced in their peacekeeping operations as a result of their dependence on British traditions and models, the government and military began to slowly sever their military ties with London. With its official membership in NATO in 1949 and NORAD in 1958, the Canadian military role models began to gradually shift towards the US.²⁵

When the Canadian government agreed to station land and air units in Western Europe after the creation of NATO, it planned to have them placed with American units; however, this was unacceptable to London, as it would lead to Commonwealth military units under US, not UK command.²⁶ After much debate, US General Dwight Eisenhower was able to get an agreement from Ottawa, London and Washington in late 1951 in which all Canadian land units in Europe would be placed with the British Army of the Rhine (BAOR).²⁷ Meanwhile, all RCAF units would be placed with United States Air Force (USAF) units on the continent. The Canadian naval contributions would answer to a United States Navy (USN) commander based in Norfolk, Virginia. This left a bitter taste in the mouths of many senior Canadian commanders and the upper echelons of the government and reinforced the belief that Canada needed to move its defence establishment away from its traditional UK benefactor. They feared that if they did not move the defence establishment away from the UK, then the Canadian military would

²⁵ Andrew, *The Rise and Fall of a Middle Power*, 136. Even though NATO was not a bilateral alliance between the two North American neighbours, Canada routinely found itself having to participate more and more with the American forces in NATO than with any other nation in the Alliance.

²⁶ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 336.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 336.

answer to London and not Ottawa. Although this arrangement had Canadian units in separate theatres and would prevent a unified Canadian military force in the event of a war, it also reflected a growing trend in the Canadian military establishment.

After his election victory in 1963, Pearson was faced with a Canadian military that was being pulled in two different directions. The RCN was attempting to ensure its British traditions and alliance with the Royal Navy (RN), while the RCAF was trying to move the military away from its traditional roles and traditions and towards a new main alliance partner in the US armed forces. General Jean Victor Allard observed the differences when he became Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS) in 1966: “I had found a highly Americanized Air Force, a very British Navy, and an Army that, particularly since the Korean War, stood between those two extremes and, therefore, was the most Canadian of our three arms.”²⁸ These competing realities were pulling the Canadian military in three different directions and the new Liberal government believed that if they did not get a handle on the situation the military would be more responsive to Washington and London than to Ottawa.

The need for a Canadian defence policy and reorientation of the military was further emphasized by the difficulties the 4th Canadian Mechanized Brigade Group (4CMBG) was having in the BAOR as a result of Ottawa trying to appease both the UK and the US. Soon after its arrival in Europe during 1953, the 4CMBG came under the command of the British generals who led the BAOR. Quickly, British military leaders

²⁸ Jean Victor Allard, *The Memoirs of Jean V. Allard* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1988) 229. Branches of the Canadian Armed Forces also had their own staff system and were rapidly becoming very different from each other and all looking in different directions for the future.

made the 4CMBG one of the main forward defence units in their sector.²⁹ While the RCAF and RCN developed increasing ties with their US counterparts, the Army was solely focused on maintaining interoperability with the British Army because of its commitment to the British sector of Europe.³⁰ However, its ability to seamlessly operate with the BAOR was severely degraded during the 1960s with the introduction of newer equipment, which was often bought from the US and not the UK. American M113 armoured personnel carriers (APC), M109 self-propelled artillery and US-style anti-aircraft and anti-tank weapons were brought to the 4th Brigade. The result was that the Army, and particularly the 4CMBG, developed a doctrine in the early 1960s derived from a mixture of both UK and US sources.³¹ The new American equipment and doctrines complicated the logistical support and command structure for the brigade as they now depended on British logistics units to supply non-British items to the brigade.³² It was clear that the Government was going to have to choose one direction for the Army, as it could not continue to be pulled in two different directions.

While the Canadian Army was trying to continue its interoperability with their British counterparts, the government was moving it closer towards the US Army for logistical purposes. With the introduction of more and more American equipment, the Canadian brigade finally made arrangements in 1964 with the US Central Army Group (CENTAG) for the provision of spare parts and supplies.³³ The Canadian government and

²⁹ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 340. The 4CIBG was highly valued by the BAOR as it provided one-sixth of its strength and was highly trained and well equipped for its role.

³⁰ Howard G. Coombs and Richard Goette, "Supporting the Pax Americana: Canada's Military and the Cold War" in *The Canadian Way of War: Serving the National Interest*, ed. Colonel Bernd Horn (Toronto: Dundurn Press Limited, 2006) 277.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 278.

³² Cuthbertson, *Canadian Military Independence*, 212.

³³ Sean M. Maloney, *War Without Battles: Canada's NATO Brigade in Germany 1951-1993* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Trade, 1997) 241.

senior military leaders had opened the door for American influence on the Army, which was being forced to move away from its traditional ties with the UK.

The RCN and the Army were traditionally close to the British forces and were often placed under the operational command of British commanders during a military crisis. The Liberal government of Pearson sought to remove the British control of not only the Armed Forces but over all government organizations. Upon taking office in 1963, the Pearson government came to the conclusion that the RCN was very expensive and was ‘too British’ to promote Canadian national interests.³⁴ Furthermore, much of the senior cadre of leadership of the RCN was British trained, although most of the enlisted men and junior officers felt little allegiance towards the RN.³⁵ Similar to the Navy, the Army’s officer corps also held a close allegiance with their British counterparts. It was found that in 1966 seventy-three percent of Canadian officers and sixty-three percent of enlisted personnel were of British descent.³⁶ Much of the senior cadre of leadership in all three branches of the Canadian military were British-trained and, therefore, felt a strong allegiance with their British counterparts.³⁷ Because of these close affiliations, Hellyer was determined to unify the forces and eliminate as many of the British affiliations as possible within the military. Indeed, one of his main objectives on reforming the military institution was to redirect the loyalties of the officers away from their traditional services and towards the new force.³⁸ As British traditions, models and allegiances were slowly removed from the military establishment, many of the officers and enlisted men began to look for another ally to assist them in their military operations. In their efforts to unify the

³⁴ Marc Milner, *Canada’s Navy: The First Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010) 242.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 242.

³⁶ Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 112.

³⁷ Milner, *Canada’s Navy*, 242.

³⁸ Major-General Daniel Gosselin, “Hellyer’s Ghosts: Part Two,” *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 3, 11.

military and move it away from its British roots, both Hellyer and Pearson brought the armed forces under the large shadow of the US military.

Early in 1964 Hellyer announced in Parliament that he had created a new defence policy that would ‘Canadianize’ the armed forces. His policy was soon laid out in the 1964 White Paper on Defence, which revealed that the RCAF, RCN, and Army would lose all of their British style names in order to represent a modern military that would be able to support each other on land, air and sea under one commander. Hellyer argued that Unification was necessary, as it would enhance the civilian government control of the military, which would force the CF to look towards Ottawa for direction and not towards Canada’s allies.³⁹ With the British demand that all Commonwealth forces be under its command in Europe fresh in his mind, Hellyer believed that the military was focused solely on NATO duties and responded to allied commanders and not to the elected Canadian government.⁴⁰ In particular, Hellyer and the remainder of Pearson’s Cabinet were determined to change the age-old tradition of Canadian military units being responsive solely to the British high command in times of war.

The central idea of the 1964 White Paper was to develop a defence institution based on Canadian needs and national interests and not those of their allies. However, many of the senior leadership of the armed forces and members of the Official Opposition argued that Hellyer’s Unification was bringing the military more closely together with their southern neighbours. Former Minister of National Defence Douglas Harkness argued in Parliament in 1965 that the only thing that reorganization had done “has been to allow the army to ride on the United States supply line rather than on the

³⁹ Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 73.

⁴⁰ Colonel Bernd Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium: The History of the Royal Canadian Regiment, 1953-2008* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2011), 68.

British, as has been the case heretofore.”⁴¹ By eliminating many of the British traditions in the armed forces, Hellyer had opened the door to the expanding American influence in Canadian society.

During a Parliamentary debate on 6 July 1964, Progressive Conservative MP Walter G. Dinsdale contended that the proposed Bill C-90, “An Act to Amend the National Defence Act”, would force the CDS to merely accept the strategic policy previously agreed to between the Canadian and American governments.⁴² Furthermore, other members of the Official Opposition looked at Unification as a method by the Liberal government to simply switch the armed forces’ allegiance to the Pentagon and away from Whitehall. It was becoming clear to many in both Parliament and the military that Hellyer was determined to eliminate as much ‘Britishness’ from the military as possible, including full regiments. Finally, members of Parliament began to echo the opinions of Canadian military leaders who argued that keeping Canadian forces closely aligned with both the UK and US armed forces would prevent any one of those nations from becoming the predominant strategic controller of Canadian military units in wartime. In Hellyer’s haste to move the Canadian military towards independence from both the UK and US, he succeeded in accidentally moving it towards the shadow of the much larger American military.

Similar to members of the Official Opposition, there was also anger directed towards Hellyer from within the military. One of the primary opponents of unification and the growing ‘Americanization’ of the military by the Government was Admiral Jeffrey

⁴¹ Douglas Harkness, File 4, “DND Background Information, 1956-1962”, Volume 68, Paul Hellyer Papers, MG 32 B-33, [hereafter PHP], Library and Archives Canada [hereafter LAC], p. 5260.

⁴² Statement of W.G. Dinsdale, 6 July 1964, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1964, Vol. V: June 19-July 16, pp. 4487-5600, *Hon. W.G. Dinsdale, July 6, 1964*, 5122.

Brock of the RCN. Brock argued that Hellyer's intention of giving Canada a distinctive military force only succeeded in further helping to Americanize the armed forces by eliminating many of their Canadian-British traditions.⁴³ Brock maintained that there was a "rather cynical belief in Western military circles that, in our enthusiasm to 'shed the British yoke' we have donned the harness of another team that runs faster... and wants to go further than we had bargained for."⁴⁴ While Brock, as the Maritime Commander Atlantic, had an up-close view of Hellyer's Unification and the military's move towards closer cooperation with the US, his view of Unification was shared by many of the senior cadre of leadership within the RCN and the Army. Among the senior members of the Canadian military, particularly the RCN, who were critical of unification were Admiral Bill Landymore (Brock's replacement as Maritime Commander Atlantic), recently promoted Vice-Admiral Ken Dyer and Commodore A.B. Harris, himself a former member of the Royal Navy. Similar to Brock, all three of these high-ranking officers were soon either forced to resign or retired from active service. A total of twenty-eight officers of general or admiral rank and seventy-nine senior officers (colonels, commodores and wing commanders) left the military from 1964 to 1966.⁴⁵

As the Canadian units in Europe were being forced to develop a close relationship with their US counterparts to ensure their own survival, Hellyer and the rest of Pearson's Cabinet were in the process of rapidly trying to stamp out the remaining 'Britishness' from the Army. In a 1965 meeting between the Minister and the senior officers of the Army, it was made clear that Hellyer wanted the old traditions to go and be replaced by a

⁴³ Admiral J. Brock, "National Defence- A Policy Position Paper", *File 10 Rear Admiral J. Brock, 1966*, Volume 68, PHP, LAC, page 3.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, page 3.

⁴⁵ Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 242.

set of new ‘Canadian traditions’. Despite this, the Army held their ground to keep some of their more important traditions. One of Hellyer’s main targets was to eliminate the distinctive regimental names that dominated the Army’s history. He made it clear to the senior officers that he intended to strike these names from the order-of-battle and have them replaced with new names that would help create a series of new Canadian military traditions.⁴⁶ The Army, however, was vehemently opposed to this idea and began to mount a significant resistance to the ideas of the Pearson government. Finally, in early 1966, the spirited resistance of the Army, and the national Tri-Service Identities Organization (TRIO) began to sway the Pearson administration towards the Army and the traditional regimental names were retained.⁴⁷

The backlash against the removal of these traditions was only heightened when Hellyer announced to Parliament in the summer of 1965 that the Department of National Defence would look at eliminating some of Canada’s most traditional regiments from the order-of-battle. Hellyer announced that four regiments would be eliminated by 1968: the Canadian Guards, the Fort Garry Horse, the Black Watch and the Queen’s Own Rifles.⁴⁸ The regimental Lieutenant Colonel of the Canadian Guards, Colonel Strome Galloway, made his frustrations evident in his memoirs. Galloway argued that Hellyer’s Unification was simply a “gimmick to ‘Americanize’ the Canadian forces and eliminate, as far as possible, the British traditions of the past.”⁴⁹ It was clear that Hellyer was determined to press forward with his plan, even if this meant that he had to remove four of Canada’s most famous regiments from the Order-of-Battle.

⁴⁶ Granatstein, *Canada’s Army*, 355.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 357.

⁴⁸ Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium*, 72.

⁴⁹ Strome Galloway, *The General Who Never Was* (Belleville, ON: Mika Publishing Company, 1981), 277.

Furthermore, the Minister demanded that the Royal Canadian Regiment (RCR), Canada's most senior infantry regiment, amalgamate with the Canadian Guards Regiment with a distinctly Canadian name.⁵⁰ However, this proposed amalgamation was rapidly dropped, as both Hellyer and Pearson believed there would be a backlash against the RCR's removal from the Canadian public.⁵¹ Brock, and other senior members of the armed forces, firmly believed that this was a mistake as the Canadian forces were patterned after those of the Commonwealth and without this organization they would be placed under increasing pressure to fully integrate with US forces.⁵²

In response to both his critics within the armed forces and Parliament, Hellyer argued that the military had always set its own policies, not the government. Therefore, he believed that the military was more responsive to its allies in London than to Ottawa.⁵³ One way to change this was to force the military to respond to the government and move it towards the US as its primary ally in order to eliminate all holdovers of the British system throughout the armed forces. He argued in both the public and private spheres that British traditions in the military (particularly the Navy) were obsolete and that they should cooperate more closely with the US armed forces, which represented a more modern military system.⁵⁴ However, in order to proceed with unification he firmly believed that he not only had to remove the traditions themselves but also those senior commanders who were firm supporters of them.

⁵⁰ Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium*, 72.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁵² Admiral J. Brock, "National Defence- A Policy Position Paper," *File 10 Rear Admiral J. Brock, 1966*, Volume 68, PHP, LAC, page 4.

⁵³ Paul Hellyer, *Damn the Torpedoes: My Fight to Unify Canada's Armed Forces* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc., 1990), 45.

⁵⁴ Hellyer, *Damn the Torpedoes*, 57. Hellyer faced his most criticism from the Navy as he was very vocal about removing RN traditions and urged them to cooperate more closely with the USN, which he believed was the model that Maritime Command should follow.

In early 1964 Hellyer made it clear that he was determined to move the military in a new direction, and towards a new primary ally, by prematurely retiring Rear-Admiral Brock in the summer of 1964 and replacing him with commanders who would not engage in public debates regarding Government policies. However, Brock's replacement, Admiral William Landymore, also did not agree with Hellyer's proposals and proved to be an outspoken critic within the military until he was also prematurely retired by Hellyer in 1968. Indeed, Hellyer made it clear in his memoirs that he had forced Brock and Landymore to retire as their "devotion to the outmoded class distinctions inherited from the Royal Navy was inappropriate to the modern Canadian navy..."⁵⁵ With the loss of many of its senior officers, Hellyer was soon able to bring the Navy to its knees by eliminating some of its most cherished traditions.

The Navy became the main critics of unification and the removal of British traditions from the military. The RCN's uniforms, flags, and customs were all modeled after the RN and were all being targeted for removal by Hellyer.⁵⁶ The first to go was the traditional White Ensign in February 1965, which had been the only flag flown by RCN vessels, being replaced by the new Canadian flag.⁵⁷ With the end of the White Ensign, many in the RCN saw it as the formal severing of ties between the RCN and RN. This was followed by an announcement from the Minister in June 1965 to the senior officers of the military, indicating that a single-service uniform would replace the distinctive service uniforms of all the military units by 1 July 1967.⁵⁸ This was a large blow to the Navy as not only were they to lose their traditional name but also their distinctive

⁵⁵ Ibid., 92.

⁵⁶ Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 242.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 249.

⁵⁸ Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 250.

uniforms, which was one of the few British traditions left in the RCN. It was clear that the Navy was not prepared to assist Hellyer in Unification and, therefore, he looked to the biggest proponents of unification, the RCAF, for the first Chief of Defence Staff.

In 1964 Air Chief Marshal Frank Robert Miller was promoted as the first CDS. Hellyer firmly believed that as the RCAF supported unification Miller would provide him with a strong counterpoint to the Navy and Army commanders speaking out against his proposals.⁵⁹ However, Miller chose to focus on his duties as CDS and not become involved in the ongoing debate between the military officers and Hellyer and chose to retire in 1966 when it was clear that Hellyer was going to force him to support his plans in this debate. This was followed by the appointment of General Jean-Victor Allard as the new CDS in 1966, an act that saw Hellyer bypass other high-ranking officials. The Vice-Chief of the Defence Staff was Lieutenant-General (Army) Robert Moncel, and he was expected to succeed Miller as the second CDS.⁶⁰ However, after Moncel had made it clear that he had objections to Unification, Hellyer bypassed Moncel and promoted Allard.⁶¹ It was believed that Allard became the new CDS because he did not have a strong devotion to British-style traditions, which was important to Hellyer after the embarrassment of Canadian forces in the 1956 Suez Crisis.⁶² Allard shared Hellyer's view concerning total control of the military by the government. In his memoirs, Allard points out that with its airmen in the American sector and its soldiers in the British sector,

⁵⁹ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 355.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 356.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 356.

⁶² Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 77. Allard himself was more focused on ensuring that the Canadian military would be able to operate seamlessly in Alliance duties, primarily with the United States.

it would have been almost impossible for the CDS and government to maintain complete control of the administration and employment of Canadian units.⁶³

Soon after taking command as the new CDS, Allard began to work closely with his US counterparts in developing strategic military policy for NATO and NORAD. In particular, he believed there were two important thresholds for the two countries to cross: standardization of equipment and the development of shared and common military objectives. As the CDS, Allard argued that the CF had an important role in the standardization of equipment and communications between Canada, the US, the UK, and Australia, the nations he believed formed the backbone of the Western world.⁶⁴ Allard also firmly believed that for these four countries to form a strong military alliance, they all must strive to eliminate “particular characteristics in favour of total conformity with shared objectives.”⁶⁵ While these were the opinions of the new CDS, they were very similar with the opinions of the new cadre of military leadership who had been promoted by Hellyer himself. In a Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence (SCEAND) meeting in February 1967, retired General Charles Foulkes reinforced Allard and Hellyer’s views. At this meeting, he told the committee that in future operations Canada would be forced to operate with larger allies and that all branches of the armed forces would have to be prepared to fit in with air groups, army divisions, and naval battle groups.⁶⁶

Hellyer and the push for a Tri-Service Force (1964-1965)

⁶³ Allard, *The Memoirs of Jean V. Allard*, 252.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 230.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 252.

⁶⁶ General Charles Foulkes (Ret’d), Testimony before SCEAND, 16-17 February, 1967, No. 21, *Respecting: Bill C-243, An Act to Amend the National Defence Act and other Acts in consequence thereof*, (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 1967), p. 1233.

Despite these opinions from former and current high-ranking military leaders, Hellyer was determined to move forward in the Unification process. As its land forces were committed to working with the UK and its air and naval forces operating almost exclusively with the US, it was abundantly clear that the new CF leadership was going to have to find a system that would allow all branches of the military to work together. To facilitate this the government would need to choose a primary alliance partner to work with, as it could not afford to have two unified forces working separately with both the UK and the US. The Pearson government's choice would be clear from the very beginning, as Cabinet argued for the transformation of the armed forces into a new formation that would closely resemble the United States Marine Corps.

Both Pearson and Hellyer's main goal surrounding Unification was to enhance the civilian control of the armed forces and to reduce the inter-service rivalry within the military. Hellyer argued that this inter-service rivalry was costing the Defence Department millions of dollars every year and by ending it the savings could be used to purchase new equipment for all branches of the military.⁶⁷ However, they had to find a new unified organization that would both enhance civilian control but also keep the CF visible in the eyes of the country's largest allies, particularly the US. A new military system was soon brought to the attention of Pearson and Hellyer, courtesy of retired General Guy Simonds.

At a 1964 Parliamentary committee, Simonds argued that a tri-service force prepared to handle small brush-fire wars and whose organization would be very similar to the USMC, which is a highly mobile force, would be best for a country with the

⁶⁷ Hellyer, *Damn the Torpedoes*, 34.

population and financial limitations like Canada.⁶⁸ This concept was pushed further along in 1965 by the Army Tactics and Organization Board (ATOB), which concluded that a USMC-like concept would allow for two important types of formations the CF needed: rapidly deployable light forces for NATO and UN operations, and heavy armoured and mechanized units for service in Europe.⁶⁹ While Simonds did not have direct discussions with Hellyer regarding his idea, retired General Charles Foulkes brought it to the attention of the Minister.⁷⁰ With this new idea in hand Hellyer began to look seriously at reorganization of the military.

Hellyer's proposed Marine Corps organizational scheme for the reorganized armed forces became the focal point for the fight against unification in both the military and government spheres. However, whether the Minister was serious about the idea or not, it was clear to all involved that he was determined to move the military in another direction towards closer cooperation with Canada's southern neighbour. Before this objective could be achieved, Hellyer and Pearson would have to ensure that the military responded to a civilian developed and controlled defence department. The establishment of a new military organization would also need a new integrated command structure, which was very appealing to the Liberal Government.

In order to fully transform the CF and move it towards closer cooperation with the US military, Hellyer realized that he would have to increase the civilian leadership of the armed forces. He firmly believed that Canadian military leaders used the Minister of

⁶⁸ Statement of Andrew Brewin, 8 May 1964, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1965, Vol. III: April 17-May 19, pp. 2279-3384, *Hon. Andrew Brewin, May 8, 1965*, 3076.

⁶⁹ Sean M. Maloney, "Global Mobile II: The Development of Forces Mobile Command, 1965-1972," *Canadian Military Journal*, 9.

⁷⁰ Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 243.

National Defence as a puppet to help them achieve their military goals.⁷¹ His counterpart in the United States, Robert McNamara, had recently overhauled the Pentagon to ensure that the civilian government directed defence policy and not the military, which Hellyer openly admired.⁷² Having stand-by units for brush-fire conflicts became an essential aspect of Hellyer's 1964 White Paper on Defence, as he recognized the importance of keeping both the US and Soviet militaries away from each other in these small conflicts. Both Pearson and Hellyer believed that the large conventional and nuclear forces arrayed against each other in Europe were enough to deter either side from attacking the other in Europe. However, it was the opinion of the Pearson government that a worldwide conflict could escalate from any potential brush-fire conflict in the world if American and Soviet military forces were fighting on different sides.⁷³ In the new Defence White Paper, Hellyer identified one of the top priorities of the future reorganized force was to be peacekeeping. Peacekeeping had become an important element of Pearson's defence policy. Pearson and his government firmly believed that Canada and other middle powers must use their military forces to defuse these brush-fire conflicts in the Third World in order to prevent a superpower confrontation.⁷⁴ Even before the 1964 Defence White Paper, it was evident that the Canadian military and senior leadership was moving towards this new American strategic trend. This became more of a reality to Hellyer as both the US and Soviet militaries were preparing and planning for brush-fire conflicts.

⁷¹ Tom Axworthy, *Soldiers Without Enemies: A Political Analysis of Canadian Defence Policy, 1945-1975* (Kingston, ON: Queen's University, December 1978), 362.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 362.

⁷³ Lieutenant-Colonel John Conrad, *Scarce Heard Amid the Guns: An Inside Look at Canadian Peacekeeping* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2011), 57.

⁷⁴ Andrew Cohen, *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World?* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2003), 70.

Beginning in the early 1960s the Pentagon and Joint Chiefs of Staff began investigating ways to create a more flexible, mobile and responsive armed forces that could counter any threat in the world immediately. The Pentagon began to stress three distinct capabilities: greater strategic mobility, expansion of Special Forces units, and a greater air and sea transport capability.⁷⁵ Meanwhile, the Canadian Army had focused its abilities on two realities: air mobility for Arctic defence along with nuclear firepower and heavily mechanized forces for Europe.⁷⁶ However, soon after Hellyer became the new Minister of National Defence, a third reality began to slowly creep into Canadian Army strategic thinking. The new focus was very similar to that which was adopted by the US in 1959, the idea of ‘stand-by battalions’ for operations in short, small brush-fire conflicts.⁷⁷ If he was to have any chance of success in reorganizing the Canadian military, Hellyer knew that he would have to look towards the efforts being made in the US Department of Defense.

During the 1964 debate on Unification in Parliament, Hellyer argued that in order to achieve the necessary reorganization a civilian leadership in the department, similar to that of the US DoD, would be needed: “To achieve this it is essential that there be a strong civil staff in the department outside the military chain of command for analyzing and reviewing military requirements...”⁷⁸ Hellyer and Pearson firmly believed that Canada’s primary military priority was the protection of the US nuclear deterrent and military power, which not only ensured the safety of the US but also of Canada. With this objective in mind, Hellyer declared that it was important for the Canadian armed forces

⁷⁵ Maloney, “Global Mobile II,” 14.

⁷⁶ Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium*, 46.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 46.

⁷⁸ Statement of Paul Hellyer, 8 May 1964, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1964, Vol. III: April 17-May 19, *Hon. Paul Hellyer, May 8, 1964*, 3068.

to concentrate on building up its conventional forces, which included a strategic air and sealift capability in order to provide the land forces with maximum flexibility and mobility.⁷⁹

As directed by the Minister of National Defence, current and former senior leaders and military planners looked towards the new American strategic planning on small, mobile forces for Third World conflicts. Former Chief of the General Staff General Foulkes identified the Canadian desire to follow this new American strategic trend. In his analysis of the new defence policy he argued that there would be a movement away from preparing to fight a major war and instead trending towards more flexible and mobile roles with the goal of preventing major conflicts breaking out anywhere in the world.⁸⁰

Furthermore, in the spring of 1964 Foulkes argued that the new organizational scheme would focus the Canadian Armed Forces on two distinct tasks in support of its major American ally. These would be the maintenance of a mobile ready reserve force available to immediately meet any NATO or UN task and anti-submarine warfare in support of the USN in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans.⁸¹ By focusing on these two major military tasks, Hellyer was able to enforce two major goals of the Liberal government: support of the American military power and the enforcement of civilian control of the Canadian military. In his attempt to rapidly shift the armed forces towards the US

⁷⁹ Major Ray Stouffer, "Cold War Air Power Choices for the RCAF: Paul Hellyer and the Selection of the CF-5 Freedom Fighter," *Canadian Military Journal* 7, no. 3 (Autumn 2006), 64.

⁸⁰ Statement of Andrew Brewin, 29 October 1963, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1963, Vol. V: October 28-November 28, pp. 4071-5240, *Hon. Andrew Brewin, October 29, 1963*, 4140. This statement from Brewin was a restatement of a meeting between Foulkes and the National Defence Parliamentary Committee earlier in the year.

⁸¹ Statement of Andrew Brewin, 8 May 1964, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1964, Vol. III: April 17-May 19, *Hon. Andrew Brewin, May 8, 1964*, 3076. Once again Brewin was restating Foulkes from an earlier meeting between Foulkes and the Special Committee on Defence.

military as its main allied partner, Hellyer failed to realize that the Pentagon greatly desired the CF to maintain most of its previous capabilities. His new marine-corps organization would result in the CF losing parts of its ASW and air defence capabilities, which Washington viewed as an important aspect of the defence of North America.

Upon the announcement in 1964 in the House of Commons that the Canadian military would be going under an extensive reorganization, it was immediately clear that Hellyer wanted to have the new CF be similar to the USMC. In Hellyer's opinion this idea would help to 'Canadianize' the armed forces and provide it with a modern tri-service organization. However, what Hellyer did not realize was that using an American military organization as the structure for this tri-service force was no more Canadian than the previous British-oriented Canadian military structure. The Ministry of National Defence had made it clear that they were going to create a Mobile Command that would operate anywhere in the world and would be transported and supported by Canadian air and naval forces. However, the proposed transformation of the military into a USMC-like formation would result in the air and naval commands being reduced to a supporting role for the land forces and was not well received in these formations. The result was that both the navy and air commands moved closer towards their US counterparts in order to help them prevent the creation of a Canadian USMC organization.

While Hellyer insisted that he was not interested in turning the Canadian forces into a modified USMC, he was very intrigued with the prospect of the increased mobility that this system could have for the land forces. According to many members of the Pearson government, it was brush-fire wars in the Third World that were more of a danger to creating an east-west conflict than an all-out war in Europe and rapidly

deployable military forces were needed to combat these conflicts.⁸² Once again General Simonds was at the forefront when he stated to a Parliamentary committee that a “conventionally armed tri-service, highly mobile force adapted to deal with brush-fire wars” was the type of military organization Canada needed.⁸³ However, what many overlooked was that his statement was very similar to the new strategic military doctrine being implemented by the Pentagon in the US Armed Forces at the same time.⁸⁴ Hellyer quietly agreed with this new direction and began to argue for a reshaped Canadian military that would echo the changes being made in the US.

The components of the USMC made it a very unique and powerful force in western military circles. The basic components of a marine expeditionary unit, which would be the basic component Hellyer would need for operations, consisted of air, naval and land units. Its basic component was an infantry battalion supported by small amounts of armour and artillery.⁸⁵ It would be supported in the air by its own transport and attack helicopters and multi-role fixed wing aircraft, which were operated by large amphibious assault ships.⁸⁶ Even though it was highly mobile, it could not operate by itself on sustained operations and was not a truly integrated force. Simonds himself pointed out to elected officials, after being called to provide evidence at a SCEAND meeting, that the USMC was a larger part of American military strategy which would go in quickly and secure the situation and then be replaced.⁸⁷ If Mobile Command were to be reorganized on a USMC system, there would be nothing left to back it up in these brush-fire wars.

⁸² Axworthy, *Soldiers Without Enemies*, 361.

⁸³ Colonel Bernd Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium*, 68.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁸⁵ Major Lee John Hammond, “Joint Amphibious Capabilities- Past Lessons, Future Options” *The Canadian Army Journal* 8, no. 3 (Fall 2005), 18.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁸⁷ Sean M. Maloney, “Global Mobile II,” 18.

Hellyer, however, was more interested in the mobility and rapid deployment capabilities of the USMC than its organization and was determined to create a highly mobile Canadian military that would be able to support the US and other NATO allies wherever needed.

Since his announcement in 1964 of the government's intention to unify the armed forces, it was clear that Hellyer was attempting to move the military towards creating a closer operational capability with the US. He followed this announcement with an intense push to have the military adopt a new organizational model based upon that of the USMC. In order to transform the Canadian military similar to that of a marine corps, Hellyer identified in the 1964 White Paper that the new Air and Maritime Commands would have to change their primary goal to that of transporting Mobile Command around the globe.⁸⁸ Soon after the release of the White Paper, he tasked the navy to produce a fleet plan that would support his USMC concept.⁸⁹ For both Air and Maritime Commands to adapt to this new concept, they would be forced to cut back on two of Canada's most important alliance commitments, ASW capabilities and air defence of North America.

ASW and air defence were two important military priorities that caused many in the armed forces and Parliament to question Hellyer's goals. In a *Time Magazine* article in May 1964, these fears regarding the future of Canadian ASW and air defence capabilities came to the forefront of the public, and indeed the Pentagon. While the article identified that it was Hellyer's desire to reinforce the Army by having its three Canada-

⁸⁸ Honourable Paul Hellyer and Honourable Lucien Cardin, *White Paper on Defence* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, March 1964), 15.

⁸⁹ Major-General Daniel Gosselin, "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is Forty Years Old- Part One," *Canadian Military Journal* 9 no.2, (2009), 10. Also, to fit into his new integrated concept for the military, Hellyer created Mobile Command in 1965 which became Canada's first joint land-air command.

based brigades brought up to operational strength, it also identified many troubling trends in the new Defence White Paper. One of these was that Hellyer had proposed to replace all the RCAF's CF-101B interceptors with a tactical ground-support aircraft, while the remainder of the RCAF would be transformed into a Transport Command.⁹⁰ Furthermore, the Navy would receive troop transport ships similar to the USMC Iwo Jima Class.⁹¹ This was further emphasized when Hellyer stated in a 1966 Parliamentary debate that the primary ingredients of this new force were "quick reaction time, the ability to go where required with dispatch, and to perform its tasks with maximum effectiveness."⁹² The article made clear that while Hellyer would be forced to sacrifice some important military commitments in order to achieve his two main goals, saving money and integrating the armed forces.

Despite Hellyer's desire to acquire this new equipment for his proposed tri-service force, the equipment was simply too expensive for Canada's defence budget to bear. To purchase a fleet of 250 F-4 Phantoms, which Hellyer had proposed to become the new tactical strike aircraft of the air force, would cost in the range of \$600 million-\$1 billion (US), while the purchase of a single Iwo Jima class amphibious assault ship would require the Navy's budget to sharply rise from the \$277 million it received in 1964.⁹³ With the large costs of these potential new equipment purchases and the desire by much of Pearson's Cabinet, notably Secretary of State for External Affairs Paul Martin Sr., to create a distinctly Canadian military, the idea of adopting a USMC organization for the

⁹⁰ Unknown Author, "Canada: Defence for a Decade Ahead," File 100.8 "White Paper: Defence Policy", Volume 31, Lester B. Pearson Fonds, MG 26 N3, LAC, unknown page number.

⁹¹ Ibid., unknown page number.

⁹² Statement of Minister Paul Hellyer, 17 February 1966, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1966, Vol. II: February 14- March 4, pp. 1131-2257, *Hon. Minister Paul Hellyer, February 17, 1966*, 1417.

⁹³ Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 244.

CF was scrapped by Hellyer by late 1965. By 1966 Hellyer had removed all thoughts of a USMC style reorganization, stating in his memoirs that he totally rejected a 1966 CBC report, which stated the name of the future unified force would be called the Royal Canadian Marine Corps.⁹⁴

Military Pressure to Alter Unification Strategies (1965-1967)

While the USMC model for the CF was debated in Parliament and Defence headquarters, it showed a rapidly developing relationship between the two armed forces in order to enable the CF to combat the increasing demands placed on it by Hellyer. This relationship is signified by the increasing concerns of Washington and the Pentagon in Hellyer's reorganization of the military and their solidarity with the different branches of the military, which enabled the CF to maintain many of its previous operational objectives.

Hellyer's announcement of a newly unified armed forces that would be based around Mobile Command with a strategic air and naval transport capability caused immense anger and trouble within the Air and Maritime Commands. Air Command wanted to ensure that its main goal was air defence with tactical interceptor aircraft, while Maritime Command resisted any attempt by Hellyer to remove its main capability of anti-submarine warfare. In order to ensure that these capabilities would remain a crucial objective of any unified Canadian military, both commands began to look towards the US armed forces for support in combating Hellyer's reforms. This support was not long in coming and helped both commands to retain their important capabilities. However, it also signified the first time that the CF looked towards the US for military assistance.

⁹⁴ Hellyer, *Damn the Torpedoes*, 148.

It was clear that Hellyer was trying to push the military towards an increased relationship with their American counterparts. What he could not have foreseen was how this continental defence relationship could help the military stunt his future plans for the Canadian military. Throughout his tenure as Minister of National Defence, Hellyer argued that Canadian defence was tied in with that of the United States in a collective North American partnership.⁹⁵ As a result, the different branches of the CF began to closely cooperate with their American allies. Air Command and Maritime Command were rapidly eyeing the USN and USAF as important allies in their fight with Hellyer over equipment, strategies and international objectives.

In 1964 Prime Minister Pearson agreed to a number of American proposals that would lead to direct interaction between the two militaries. First, Pearson agreed to a controversial USAF dispersal plan that was pushed on him by the RCAF. This plan would see the USAF deploy between four and eight interceptor aircraft at a number of Canadian military installations on a permanent, rotational basis.⁹⁶ Not only would this plan improve NORAD's defensive posture but it would also force the Canadian government to retain its own interceptor capability.⁹⁷ This was important, as it would ensure the US that the RCAF was also participating in NORAD and capable of defending Canadian airspace. Furthermore, Pearson's agreement to this American proposal prevented Hellyer from completely eliminating the air defence capability of the air force. This was followed on 7 October 1964 by Pearson's announcement that the two countries had come to an agreement that would allow the USAF to store nuclear air-to-air weapons

⁹⁵ Hellyer and Cardin, *White Paper on Defence*, 14.

⁹⁶ Unknown Author, File 26, "DND- Canadian/U.S. Ministerial Committee on Joint Defence- Brief for Canadian Delegation", Volume 68, PHP, MG 32 B-33, LAC, page 1.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, page 2.

at bases in Newfoundland and Labrador.⁹⁸ Once again, Pearson and Hellyer were shown the importance of maintaining a credible Canadian air defence capability by the importance the USAF was placing on it. These two agreements also showed that the RCAF's desire to work with the USAF in North American air defence, as the RCAF needed the support of the much larger USAF to properly defend Canadian airspace.

With the creation of NORAD, American and Canadian fighter squadrons had been working closely together with the common goal of protecting the US nuclear and conventional military deterrent. When the White Paper on Defence was released in 1964 and Hellyer proposed to remove the interceptors from the air force's inventory and replace them with ground support and transport aircraft, the air force leadership used the NORAD agreement as the basis of their defence against Hellyer's proposal. Retired RCAF Major-General Leonard Johnson showed how close the two air forces were when he stated that, "The U.S. Air Force was a big and powerful cousin with whom we identified."⁹⁹ Furthermore, the USAF wanted the new Air Command to maintain, and indeed strengthen, its air defence capability, as this would enable the USAF to focus its resources and efforts on other parts of the globe.

During a Parliamentary debate regarding unification in February 1966, Minister Hellyer made evident the role that the USAF wanted Air Command to play in US-Canadian defence relations. Hellyer argued the importance of Canada's purchase of the new US C-130 transport aircraft as the USAF had offered to refuel the aircraft when they were deployed in exchange for Air Command taking on a larger role in transporting US

⁹⁸ Axworthy, *Soldiers Without Enemies*, 366.

⁹⁹ Granatstein, "The American Influence on the Canadian Military, 1939-1963," *Canadian Military History* 2, (1993), 70.

personnel and equipment.¹⁰⁰ This was followed in a fall 1966 meeting of Parliament, when Progressive Conservative MP Jack Bigg identified that it was important for Air Command to work closely with the USAF. Bigg argued that while the USAF allows for Canadian personnel to assist them at SAC headquarters in the defence of North America, Hellyer was pushing the air force towards complete independence and not towards assisting the USAF in the common defence of both nations.¹⁰¹

The developing relationship between the two North American armed forces was not limited to the air forces. Unlike the air force, which had been gradually moving towards the US since the end of the Second World War, the Canadian Army also began to slowly move towards the United States. When the Liberal Government was elected in 1963 the Canadian Army found that its rich British history and traditions were coming under fire by the ambitious new Minister of National Defence. While the Army had been slowly pushed towards closer cooperation with their US counterparts through the gradual adoption of American equipment, strategies and training regimes, they managed to maintain their British traditions. With the release of the White Paper and sensing the direction that the CF was being pushed, the Army began to look toward the US as their main alliance partner. Retired Lieutenant-General Howard Graham, former Chief of the General Staff, saw the writing on the wall in 1965 and believed that the Army's main concern was the defence of North America, which would demand much closer liaison with the American Army.¹⁰² Admiral Brock echoed this stance and other members of the Canadian military leadership who all believed that the Government's new focus on North

¹⁰⁰ Statement of Minister Paul Hellyer, 21 February 1966, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1966, Vol. II: February 14- March 4, *Hon. Paul Hellyer, February 21, 1966*, 1566.

¹⁰¹ Statement of F.J. Bigg, 14 November 1966, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1966, Vol. IX: October 19- November 16, *Hon. F.J. Bigg, November 14, 1966*, 9879.

¹⁰² Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 349.

American security would lead to increased cooperation with the Pentagon. Brock himself stated that the “territorial integrity of North America can only be guaranteed if Canada can depend on the powerful forces of the United States...and the United States can depend on whole hearted Canadian support of all U.S. military measures...”¹⁰³ The Canadian Army was indeed moving closer to the United States in not only the defence of North America but also in the adoption and development of close, unofficial ties between the two.

Despite Hellyer’s desire to transform the Army into a light and highly mobile force, the officers and enlisted personnel of the Army wanted to maintain many of their existing capabilities. As Hellyer was rapidly attempting to ‘Canadianize’ the armed forces, the Army was accidentally moved towards greater cooperation with the US. As a result of Hellyer’s proposals, the Canadian Army began to look towards the US Army for assistance in maintaining its capabilities, which they believed were necessary for both the defence of North America and Western Europe. Hellyer made it clear that the Army must be prepared to assist the civil power, fight small brush-fire conflicts, participate in UN operations and prepare to fight the Soviets in Europe.¹⁰⁴ However, the Army would be hard-pressed to provide forces for all of these objectives. In his memoirs, General Allard recognized that the Americans greatly helped the Canadian Army reorganize itself into a more mobile force with Unification. US Army personnel helped train their Canadian counterparts on the M113 APC, the M109 self-propelled howitzer and the numerous anti-aircraft and anti-tank systems purchased from the US by Ottawa.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, Allard

¹⁰³ Admiral J. Brock, “National Defence- A Policy Position Paper,” File 10 “Rear Admiral J. Brock, 1966”, Volume 68, PHP, LAC, page 4 of document.

¹⁰⁴ Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium*, 69.

¹⁰⁵ Allard, *The Memoirs of Jean V. Allard*, 222.

stated that the US Army greatly assisted the Canadian Militia in the rearmament of all their armour, artillery and infantry regiments and also helped assist them in the training of this new equipment.¹⁰⁶ According to Allard, Brigadier J.W. Bennett, the Canadian representative to the US Army, was instrumental to the relationship between the Canadian and American armies. Brigadier Bennett consulted between Allard and the US Army high command to ensure that both armies remained on the same wavelength.¹⁰⁷ Soon after Allard's promotion to CDS cooperation between Mobile Command and the American Army began to develop through official training exercises.

Although the odds of a successful Soviet land invasion of North America in the late 1960s were very slim, the potential threat pushed Mobile Command and the US Army together. The emergence of the Soviet threat and the creation of NATO brought the two armies into a close alliance for the first time in peacetime.¹⁰⁸ The Army began to send its forces to the US for specific training operations. Soon after unification was announced, the Army began to send personnel to American training centres to be trained as helicopter pilots and learn ground support tactics.¹⁰⁹ The Royal Canadian Regiment found itself being sent to the US for training with American Army Rangers on how to fight on a nuclear battlefield.¹¹⁰ Hellyer himself had an important part to play in this increased cooperation. The Minister identified to Parliament in December 1966 that the creation of mobile divisions with helicopter transport by the US was a new way for

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 223.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 230.

¹⁰⁸ C.C. Cook, File 104, "Defence- Permanent Joint Board", Volume 31, Lester B. Pearson Fonds, MG 26 N 3, LAC, page 7.

¹⁰⁹ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 349.

¹¹⁰ Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium*, 55.

mobile army units to be structured and one in which he fully supported.¹¹¹ If the Army were to be reorganized along these lines then they would have to train in these types of amphibious and mobile operations. As a result, numerous infantry, armour and artillery regiments were sent to participate with light US infantry divisions, as well as the USMC in both North America and Western Europe.¹¹²

All of this led to the creation of formal annual defence exercises between the two armed forces. Beginning in 1965 the Canadian Army began formal cooperation with their American counterparts through annual Canada/United States (CANUS) operations and training exercises. The object of many of these operations was to create an environment that would allow the smaller Canadian forces to operate within the framework of a much larger American military force, either in a UN mission or to combat Soviet forces in Western Europe.¹¹³ The cooperation and contacts developed through these exercises was astounding, even to Hellyer, who soon saw the development of a fruitful and intertwined North American defence relationship within the two militaries. It was at these exercises that cooperation between the two allies really began to take hold in both militaries. It also caused intense debate within the Government and among the public about the close relations that were being rapidly expanded between both armed forces. It also led to a reversal of some of Hellyer's reforms and a rethinking of Canada's future security environment.

In 1964 Hellyer had identified in his Defence White Paper that he wanted the military to focus more on peacekeeping activities and Third World conflicts. This was

¹¹¹ Statement of Minister Paul Hellyer, 7 December 1966, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1966, Vol. X: November 17-December 13, *Hon. Paul Hellyer, December 7, 1966*, 10831.

¹¹² Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium*, 57.

¹¹³ Lewis Hertzman et al, *Alliances and Illusions: Canada and the NATO-NORAD Question* (Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig Ltd., Publishers, 1969), 316.

followed by his attempt to recreate the armed forces as a light mobile force that could be used to help combat so-called brush-fire wars. Even though he was attempting to move the military closer towards the US, he had also identified that North American defence would be the second or third main priority for the armed forces. In his attempt to move the defence department and the armed forces towards the US, he found himself changing Canadian defence policies to recognize the new realities concerning Canada's military status.

In a memorandum to the Defence Department in 1967 Hellyer identified Canada's new position in regards to its cooperation with the US military. He stated that the government believed that it was necessary to continue with the close military association that had developed with the United States since the end of the Second World War.¹¹⁴ He then argued that "Most of the bilateral agreements and arrangements by which Canada has accepted obligations in the field of cooperative defence have been concluded between Canada and the United States."¹¹⁵ While his statements caused much internal discussion within the Government, Hellyer was simply reacting to the close defence ties that had been created between the two countries since his appointment to the Minister of National Defence.

Hellyer's views on participation with the US were not only his own but were echoed by many elected Members of Parliament in debates that would last until the elevation of Pierre Elliott Trudeau to the position of Prime Minister in 1968. In an interview with General Simonds at a spring 1967 SCEAND meeting, Progressive Conservative MP Donald MacInnis echoed the opinions of Minister Hellyer concerning

¹¹⁴ Canada, Ministry of National Defence, "DND Agreements and Arrangements Covering Canada's Participation in Cooperative Defence", Volume 67, PHP, MG-32 B-33, LAC, p. 5

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 5.

the future relationship between the Canadian and American militaries. MacInnis argued that if Canada was going to cooperate with the US military in the defence of North America and the West, then Canadian units should be assigned to US units in order to “assimilate our forces and our efforts with theirs.”¹¹⁶ Furthermore, Progressive Conservative MP Heber Smith pointed out that Canada had two essential truths to its national defence in the post-war world. “The first,” Heber noted, “is that the defence of our country will always depend on others, primarily the United States. The second is that the defence of our principles must also depend on others.”¹¹⁷ Both of these ‘truths’, he believed, rested on the fact that the US and Canada must be willing to support their primary ally when necessary. However, he also cautioned that Canada could not just hand over its defence to the Americans but it must contribute to its own defence at the best of its ability with the fact in mind that Canada would be dependent on others to assist in her defence.¹¹⁸

On 18 September 1967, Leo Cadieux as the Minister of National Defence replaced Paul Hellyer. With the removal of Hellyer from the Defence portfolio, the military settled down and began to focus on developing their future capabilities. While these opinions and arguments were heavily debated in the House of Commons, the predominant views from these sessions were beginning to be pushed upon the armed forces, which would see even greater cooperation with the US armed forces in the coming decades.

¹¹⁶ Statement of Donald MacInnis, 16 March 1967, SCEAND, Session, 1967, No. 34: March 16, 1967, *Hon. Donald MacInnis, March 16, 1967*, 2205.

¹¹⁷ Statement of Hebert E. Smith, 30 January 1967, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1967, Vol. XIII: January 25- February 21, *Hon Hebert E. Smith, January 30, 1967*, 12483.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 12483.

Conclusion

The 1963 federal election signaled a drastic shift in the Canadian armed forces. With the election of Lester B. Pearson as the new Prime Minister and his subsequent appointment of Paul Hellyer as the Minister of National Defence, the Canadian military found itself being pushed in a new direction, towards the US and away from their traditional British military allies. As the 1960s came to a close it was clear that Hellyer's rush to unify the armed forces and create a distinctly Canadian military had instead forced the new Canadian Forces into closer cooperation with the United States military. Hellyer's views on participation with the US were echoed by many elected Members of the Official Opposition in Parliamentary debates that would last until the election of Pierre Elliott Trudeau as Prime Minister.

In the attempt to eliminate as many of the British military traditions as possible, the Pearson Government failed to provide the CF with adequate Canadian military traditions. Soon this resulted in the adoption of American military traditions by the Canadian military chain of command. The elimination of the British traditions was soon followed by Hellyer's announcement that the three branches of the Canadian military were to be reorganized into a unified force, which was to be a distinctly Canadian experiment. However, Hellyer wanted to reorganize the newly unified force into a force similar to the USMC. In the end this proposal was widely rejected by Canadian politicians, the public, and the military officials who all did not want the CF to become a small part of the larger American military.

Finally, the RCN, RCAF and Army all began to work more closely with their American counterparts, as they feared that Unification would eliminate many of their

combat capabilities. The senior cadre of Canadian military leadership worked with the Americans to ensure that the US provided the CF with a decent counterbalance to Canadian politicians in Ottawa, which would enable the CF to retain a significant voice in Ottawa. With the election of Pierre Elliott Trudeau in 1968, the CF found that all the roles and preparations it had made for unification were outdated and not functional with the new Prime Minister. All the cooperation that the CF had developed with the US would have to be fully utilized and expanded during the next decade, which was to signal tough times for the CF.

Since the appointment of Paul Hellyer as the Minister of National Defence in 1964, the Canadian armed forces underwent numerous drastic changes. In a relatively short five-year period Hellyer and the remainder of Pearson's federal Cabinet rapidly changed the CF identity from that of one closely aligned to the UK and Commonwealth, to one slowly being pushed towards the shadow of the United States military. However, this was not brought about by members of either the US or Canadian armed forces but by the federal government of Liberal Prime Minister Lester Pearson. Pearson and his Cabinet had begun to push the Canadian military towards adopting the models, strategies, and equipment of the US military. They did this in order for Canada to both gain a larger voice in Washington and to move the military away from the UK, which had been an election goal of the Pearson administration for all sectors of the Canadian federal government. While the Liberal government of Pearson did not envision that the Canadian military would be pushed towards closer cooperation with the US because of their actions, this inevitably became the case as the Canadian military had always worked within larger alliances and had always had a primary alliance partner to assist. By

implementing these changes in the Canadian Armed Forces the Pearson administration was able to reduce both the size and costs of the defence department. Secondly, Pearson's Cabinet believed that by beginning a change from traditional UK military models to a newer North American model would ensure Washington that Ottawa was taking the defence of the continent and the West seriously into the coming decades.

Chapter Two **Pierre Trudeau and the Canadian Forces, 1968-1979**

Unification was made official in early 1967, and the different branches of the Armed Forces were molded together into the Canadian Forces. Soon after, however, Prime Minister Pearson announced his retirement from politics, which forced the Liberal Party to begin looking for his replacement. On 20 April 1968, this search came to an end when Pierre Elliott Trudeau was announced as the new leader of the Party and, therefore, as the new Canadian Prime Minister. While the Trudeau administration began to influence the new CF in some fashion almost immediately, it began to put its full stamp on the military when it had a firm grasp in Ottawa beginning in 1970. The Canadian Forces of the 1970s under the leadership of Trudeau was marked by the development of increasingly closer ties with the American military, due in large part to the constantly changing defence policies of the Prime Minister and his Cabinet.

Under the leadership of Paul Hellyer and Lester Pearson, the CF had been transformed into a military organization that was to signify the next evolution of Western military organization. It had also found itself torn away from its traditional ties with the United Kingdom and pushed towards an increasing relationship with the United States. While the CF was still reeling from its rapid transformation, Trudeau proceeded to turn Canadian defence priorities upside down, which only increased confusion within the military. Trudeau's security and defence policies during the 1970s forced the CF to look towards the US military for assistance in some of its new priorities and to help combat the rapid deterioration of the armed forces under the Trudeau Government.

Upon taking office in 1968 Trudeau soon found that he would not be able to pull the CF away from the United States and instead found himself striving to increase

cooperation between the two armed forces in the defence of North America. Beginning in 1971, when it saw its primary goal of preparing for war against the Warsaw Pact downgraded in favour of protecting sovereignty, the CF created increasingly cooperative strategies with the US military in order to give the military a voice in the Trudeau Government. This cooperation was significantly strengthened during the early 1970s through the similar world-views and the difficulties that both armed forces were having in communicating with their respective governments.¹¹⁹ Maritime Command found itself continuing to work closely with the USN in ASW Operations, while both Mobile and Air Commands worked with their American counterparts to prepare for war against the Warsaw Pact and the defence of North American territory.¹²⁰ Officers within both Air and Mobile Commands developed increasing ties with the USAF and US Army because of the looming cutbacks that they were sure would soon follow the release of the 1971 Defence White Paper. It was soon discovered that this ongoing cooperation between the two armed forces would provide Trudeau with a significant obstacle while he attempted to focus Canadian defence resources solely on sovereignty protection.

In late 1969 the Trudeau Government announced a new set of objectives for the CF during the coming decade. The government formally declared that the military's main purpose was to be the protection of Canadian sovereignty, not preparation for war in Europe and assistance to NATO. By demanding that the CF focus on sovereignty protection, Trudeau was inadvertently pushing the CF closer to the United States. If the CF was focused on sovereignty, the Trudeau Cabinet believed it could reduce the costs and manpower of the military and redirect these resources to other government

¹¹⁹ Coombs & Goette, "Supporting the Pax Americana," *Canadian Way of War*, 288.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 288.

objectives. However, as Canada is such a large country, it could not hope to protect all of its airspace and waterways with a decreased budget and manpower without the assistance of the US military, which also happened to be the largest threat to Canadian sovereignty.

Sovereignty protection was only one part of a larger defence policy that Trudeau's Cabinet had envisioned for the CF. One of the most fundamental defence objectives that the Trudeau Government held throughout the 1970s was the belief that the cornerstone of Western defence was the large US nuclear and conventional military force. Therefore, throughout the 1970s Trudeau and his Cabinet argued that another important goal for the CF was to help protect these US forces from any Soviet incursion into North American airspace and waterways. Through increased cooperation in NORAD and between Maritime Command and the USN, the CF would be able to better protect North America from any hostile incursion. Furthermore, Trudeau himself firmly believed that any conflict between NATO and the Warsaw Pact would quickly escalate to nuclear warfare and that conventional forces were not important, as they would not make a big difference in a nuclear conflict. As a result of the switch to sovereignty protection and the Government's desire to assist the US in the protection of their nuclear deterrent, the CF were placed under even greater strains and were forced to work even more closely with the US military than they had under Hellyer. Forces in both North America and Europe had to develop joint capabilities with their American counterparts to achieve both of Trudeau's military objectives with smaller relative budgets and reduced manpower at their disposal. Reallocation of forces to North American defence and vast reductions in capabilities, manpower and equipment led the CF to look towards the US for assistance in completing many of the objectives assigned by Trudeau.

In a situation similar to what occurred under the leadership of Paul Hellyer and Lester Pearson, the new Liberal Government in Ottawa was inadvertently pushing the CF into greater cooperation with the US military. Once again, this was not brought about by US military and government officials, although they did express satisfaction in these moves, but by the elected Canadian officials in Ottawa from whom the CF took its orders. While at first the Trudeau Government was more concerned with protecting Canadian sovereign airspace and waterways from US military incursions they soon began to realize that the small CF could not hope to protect all of Canada's sovereignty without support from the much larger US armed forces. As a result, Trudeau and his Cabinet began to look at ways to bring the CF into even greater cooperation with their southern neighbours in order for the Trudeau Government to gain a seat at the NATO head table with the US.

The 1971 Defence White Paper and Canadian Defence Policy in the 1970s

Since the end of the Second World War and the creation of NATO in 1949, the Canadian military had focused its primary efforts on preparing for a conventional and/or nuclear war in Europe. This had remained the CF's main objective for much of the early Cold War, including the tumultuous Hellyer Unification years. However, in early 1970 the new Trudeau Government quickly made this goal a secondary one to that of sovereignty protection. The Trudeau Cabinet's implementation of sovereignty protection was part of their firm belief that the defence of North America and that of Western Europe through NATO were arbitrarily separated from each other.¹²¹ According to J.L. Granatstein, sovereignty is exercised by acting in the national interest, and by meeting

¹²¹ Nicholas Tracy, "NATO in Canadian Defence Policy," *Canadian Defence Quarterly*, Special Edition no. 1 (1988), 72.

treaty obligations that previous Canadian governments had entered into.¹²² The Trudeau Cabinet completely revamped Canadian defence policy in order to give Canada greater control of its armed forces, much like what Hellyer and Pearson sought to do. However, similar to his predecessor, by revamping the CF and its defence priorities, Trudeau was moving the military into even closer cooperation with the US armed forces. The furious debate that raged within Trudeau's Cabinet in the lead up to the release of the 1971 White Paper showed the change in Canada's military objectives that Trudeau and Donald Macdonald, his defence minister, demanded.

The politicians within Trudeau's Cabinet between 1968-1971 were often far removed from the internationalism that had driven the government policies of the previous Liberal government under Lester Pearson. On 24 September 1970, Trudeau reshuffled his Cabinet and made Donald Macdonald the new Minister of National Defence.¹²³ Historian Douglas Bland argues that the new Defence Minister sought to "change, redirect, or eliminate altogether Canada's ongoing international military commitments."¹²⁴ Both Trudeau and Macdonald fought to convince skeptical members of the Trudeau government that Canada's defence policies needed to be redirected back towards North America and away from Europe and United Nations missions. Two of the foremost opponents of Trudeau's proposed defence policies were Mitchell Sharp and Charles Drury, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the President of the Treasury Board, respectively.

¹²² Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 61.

¹²³ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 361.

¹²⁴ Douglas Bland, *Canada's National Defence: Volume I, Defence Policy* (Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, 1997), 111.

Throughout the Cabinet discussions prior to the release of the White Paper, Macdonald sought to keep the focus on economic issues, mainly the need for additional funds to allow the government to pay for new social welfare systems being implemented throughout Canada. By keeping the focus on the economic issues, Macdonald was able to undertake the decision made by Trudeau to reduce Canadian overseas military personnel by half.¹²⁵ However, it was not only the overseas military that was reduced, but also the entire military as a whole suffered from stagnating defence budgets for most of the 1970s. The following chart illustrates the defence budget from 1967-68 through to the end of the 1970s

National Defence Expenditures, Fiscal Years 1968-1980¹²⁶

Year	Total Dollars (in millions)	% of GDP	% of Total Government Expenses
1967-68	\$1,842	2.60%	15.40%
1968-69	\$1,875	2.50%	14.40%
1969-70	\$1,892	2.30%	12.90%
1970-71	\$1,932	2.10%	11.80%
1971-72	\$2,019	2.10%	10.70%
1972-73	\$2,096	1.90%	9.70%
1973-74	\$2,377	1.80%	9.40%
1974-75	\$2,722	1.80%	8.50%
1975-76	\$3,163	1.80%	8.20%
1976-77	\$3,564	1.80%	8.40%
1977-78	\$3,981	1.80%	8.60%
1978-79	\$4,315	1.80%	8.40%
1979-80	\$4,588	1.60%	8.30%

As a result of the stagnating defence budget the CF were forced to vastly reduce the number of trained personnel. In 1966 the CF consisted of 107,467 personnel, but this had

¹²⁵ Bland, *Canada's National Defence*, 113.

¹²⁶ Government of Canada, *Fiscal Reference Tables*, in the Department of Finance Archived Reference Tables, <http://www.fin.gc.ca/fit-trf/2011/fit-trf-1102-eng.asp#tb18> (accessed March 18, 2013).

fallen to 79,738 personnel by 1976.¹²⁷ With a plan to both reduce the relative percentage of funds available to the Ministry of Defence and the manpower of the military, the resulting debates that preceded the release of the 1971 White Paper revolved around two important elements: a) the future role of the Canadian Forces in Europe, and b) Canada's role in North American defence.

Since Trudeau's election to the Liberal Party leadership and Prime Minister in 1968, it became clear to all Canadians that he was going to turn his focus towards social welfare benefits for the Canadian people. This was in stark contrast to the internationalism that the previous Liberal government under Pearson had espoused. Within this larger goal of Trudeau's was a need to bring the Canadian military under the strict control of the government. As a result, one of the primary objectives of the 1971 White Paper was to 'free' the Minister of National Defence from dependence on military advice and provide a new process for determining what defence requirements were important.¹²⁸ According to Douglas Bland, Macdonald found the military assessments of their operational requirements unacceptable and was determined to have these assessments changed from the control of the military to that of civil servants.¹²⁹ By accomplishing these two simple objectives, Macdonald and Trudeau were attempting to gain control of defence spending, which would enable them to keep the defence budget stagnant and, therefore, enable any saved funds from Defence to be redirected towards the government's social welfare plans. As a result, the debates around the White Paper

¹²⁷ Unknown Author, "On Guard For Thee? Canada's Shrinking Military", *CBC News*, June 28, 2005, under "Canada's Military," http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/cdnmilitary/shrinking_military_table.html (accessed on March 18, 2013).

¹²⁸ Bland, *Canada's National Defence: Volume I*, 115.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 116.

revolved around Canada's two main, and most expensive, military goals: participation in NORAD and NATO.

One of the important themes of the new White Paper and the debates leading up to its release was the emphasis placed on a rebuilt Europe by Trudeau. At a Cabinet meeting on 30 March 1969, Trudeau argued with the then Minister of National Defence, Leo Cadieux, that a Canadian military presence was no longer needed in Europe, as Western European countries had successfully undergone a dramatic economic and military recovery.¹³⁰ Indeed, in September 1970 Macdonald argued to Cabinet that as Europe was now prosperous, it no longer needed Canadian assistance to help defend it.¹³¹ However, what Macdonald and much of the Cabinet failed to realize was that the CF were built primarily around their responsibilities towards NATO. In 1971 the military viewed the commitments to NATO and NORAD as the justification for modern military equipment.¹³² Taking away this NATO objective would have a profound impact upon the morale, identity and shape of the Canadian Forces.

During Cabinet meetings leading up to the release of the White Paper, the role and shape of the Canadian military contribution to Europe was heavily discussed. By July 1971 Trudeau and Macdonald were prepared to make significant changes to both 4CMBG and the Canadian air component stationed in Europe. Macdonald stated that the new White Paper would make it clear that 4CMBG would be changed from a heavily mechanized force to a light, air-portable brigade that would be ideally suited for

¹³⁰ Cabinet Conclusions, *The Defence Policy Review and the Report of the Special Task Force on Europe* (1969/03/30), RG2, Privy Council Office, Series A-5-a, Volume 6340, LAC, page 4.

¹³¹ Bland, *Canada's National Defence: Volume I*, 113.

¹³² John Hasek, *The Disarming of Canada* (Toronto: Key Porter Books, 1987), 157.

reconnaissance operations for US forces in CENTAG.¹³³ In order to accomplish this goal, 4CMBG would be reduced by fifty percent and its main battle tanks would be replaced by light armoured vehicles suited more to reconnaissance than defending against heavily mechanized forces.¹³⁴ Not only would the land component need to be changed, but also the government would have to make significant changes to the air component to ensure that it fit a similar model.

Trudeau wanted a similar role for the Canadian air component in Europe. He instructed Macdonald to reduce the air component to two squadrons of reconnaissance aircraft, which would require the removal of all of the Canadian CF-104 Starfighter interceptors from Europe.¹³⁵ Furthermore, these two squadrons would be limited to ground-support missions for 4CMBG and would not participate in any strike missions with other NATO aircraft against Warsaw Pact forces.¹³⁶ Both of these reductions were intended to remove a significant amount of the combat capabilities of the Canadian Forces Europe (CFE) to ensure that the CF were in tune with the Trudeau Cabinet's defence policy, which was to be a strictly defensive one with no first-strike capabilities. This overarching defence policy also had a large impact on the other major theme of the White Paper, the defence of North America.

Throughout 1970 Trudeau's Cabinet argued over the defence of North America. Macdonald and Trudeau contended that defence expenditures should be focused on areas where there were real threats to Canadian sovereignty, and they suggested that to do this

¹³³ Cabinet Conclusions, *White Paper on Defence* (July 22, 1971), RG2, Privy Council Office, Series A-5-a, Volume 6340, LAC, page 4.

¹³⁴ Maloney, *War Without Battles*, 276.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹³⁶ Cabinet Conclusions, *Canadian NATO Force Proposals* (August 13, 1969), RG2, Privy Council Office, Series A-5-a, Volume 6340, page 9.

Canada did not need anti-bomber interceptors or defence systems to accomplish this sovereignty protection.¹³⁷ However, this view was not shared by all within Trudeau's Cabinet and was vocally opposed by the President of the Treasury Board, Charles Drury. At these debates Drury argued that these same interceptors did indeed protect Canadian sovereignty. He stated that if Canada did not contribute these interceptors to NORAD "than it was possible that the United States would take over military control of that activity, at the expense of Canadian sovereignty."¹³⁸ Eventually, by the final White Paper debates in July 1971, Drury's argument won over Trudeau and the Cabinet, who acquiesced to retain interceptors to ensure that the US would not take control of the air defence of the entire continent.

However, while Trudeau and Macdonald were concerned about US violations of Canadian sovereignty, they also recognized Canada's role in defending the US nuclear retaliatory forces. At a June 1970 Cabinet meeting, Macdonald made it clear that Canada had a responsibility to assist the US in protecting its nuclear forces. He further suggested at this meeting that the strategic concept for Canadian defence in the 1970s had to be examined to ensure that the CF could provide the best possible contributions to alerting and protecting the US nuclear forces.¹³⁹ However, Trudeau cautioned Macdonald that Canadian co-operation in the 1970s should only be conducted as a "contribution to the defensive second strike strategy" and not if there was any indication of the US implementing a first-strike option.¹⁴⁰ With the Cabinet in agreement on the initiatives to

¹³⁷ Cabinet Conclusions, *North American Defence Policy in the 70s* (June 18, 1970), RG2, Privy Council Office, Series A-5-a, Volume 6359, page 4.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁴⁰ Cabinet Conclusions, *North American Defence Policy in the 70s* (July 22, 1970), RG2, Privy Council Office, Series A-5-a, Volume 6359, LAC, page 4.

be undertaken regarding the defence of North America and the reductions to be made to CFE, Macdonald was instructed to immediately prepare the 1971 White Paper for release to Parliament and the public. This document was to be a defining element of Canada's defence relations with the US throughout the decade.

The 1971 Defence White Paper, *Defence in the 70s*, signaled the direction that the Liberal Government was going to take with the CF throughout the remainder of the decade. Defence Minister Macdonald listed the four main objectives that the CF was to be geared towards. The two most important needed to involve direct cooperation and consultation with the US military to be successful: a) the sovereignty and surveillance of Canada's territory and coastline, and b) the defence of North America in conjunction with the United States.¹⁴¹ Meanwhile NATO and UN operations were downgraded to secondary goals in the new White Paper. In order to conduct their new sovereignty protection role, the CF were to work closely with their US counterparts, as the defence of North America was important to both countries.

Since the beginning of the Cold War the US had become of the largest violators of Canadian sovereignty. Through the SAC Overflight Agreement and NORAD, USAF aircraft were legally enabled to patrol parts of Canadian airspace, mainly in southern Ontario and British Columbia, in any period of heightened international tensions.¹⁴² However, USN attack submarines and surface warships often patrolled Canada's claimed Arctic waters without the authority of the Canadian government. As a result, Trudeau's sovereignty protection role for the CF was designed, primarily, to show Washington that

¹⁴¹ Minister of National Defence Donald S. Macdonald, *Defence in the 70s: White Paper on Defence* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1971), 16.

¹⁴² Statement of Hugh Alan Anderson, 9 May 1975, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1975, Vol. VI: May 5- June 6, *Hon. Alan Anderson, May 9, 1975*; 6481.

the CF was capable in assisting the US in the defence of the continent¹⁴³ and that it was in Canada's best interests to "defend itself from unwanted help from its southern neighbor."¹⁴⁴ In order to prevent this unwanted help, Trudeau realized that the CF would have to work closely with the United States to help ensure that US security concerns in North America were in sync with Canadian military priorities.¹⁴⁵

Unbeknownst to many in the public in the early 1970s was that Canada could not simply defend its own sovereignty, as Canadian and American military objectives and treaties had made the defence of both countries interwoven and not separated by national boundaries. The CF was no longer responsible for just the defence of Canada but had become part of an intertwined defence structure designed to defend all of North America. This had been made clear as early as 1967 by Canadian Rear-Admiral William Landymore. At a Standing Committee on National Defence meeting, Admiral Landymore discussed in great length the problems that future Canadian governments would have in protecting Canadian sovereignty from their larger southern neighbour. Despite this meeting occurring well before Pierre Trudeau's rise to Prime Minister, Landymore's argument effectively portrayed how the defence of North America was conducted during most of the 1970's.

Landymore argued that the defence of the continent was an interwoven defence network created by both countries so that Canada and the United States would be able to easily assist each other in the event of a major military conflict.¹⁴⁶ Admiral Landymore

¹⁴³ Colin S. Gray, *Canadian Defence Priorities: A Question of Relevance* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Company Limited, 1972), 154.

¹⁴⁴ Blaxland, *Strategic Cousins*, 216.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 216.

¹⁴⁶ Rear-Admiral William Landymore, *Standing Committee on National Defence: Minutes of Procedures and Evidence*, No.20 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, Wednesday, February 15, 1967), 1130.

made it clear to the elected representatives that the US took responsibility for the defence of parts of Canada, while the CF took responsibility for defending segments of the US.¹⁴⁷ The interwoven defence of the continent forced Trudeau to ensure that the CF cooperated closely with their US counterparts. While he wanted the military to focus on sovereignty protection, he also had to ensure that his Government lived up to the many defence agreements designed between the two allies to defend North America.

While Canada and the United States had created a number of treaties and defence plans to determine how the continent could best be defended, the most critical to both American security and Canadian sovereignty concerns during the 1970s was the Basic Security Plan (BSP). The BSP became an extremely important agreement as it began to impact almost all of the Trudeau Cabinet's defence objectives involving Canadian and North American security, including ensuring Canadian sovereignty from the growing US military power. The BSP was created in 1946 and had been reshaped throughout the 1950s and 1960s to help meet emerging military threats to North America. However, the BSP presented a major problem to Trudeau's sovereignty protection role, as the agreement formally recognized that the defence of North America was effectively intertwined and was not easily separated.¹⁴⁸ Unlike previous and future military agreements between the two countries, the BSP provided the senior military leadership of both countries with the opportunity and ability to develop frameworks and procedures for operational coordination and cooperation without the intervention of civil servants.¹⁴⁹ Similar to his predecessors, it was becoming clear to Trudeau that the only way to satisfy

¹⁴⁷ Landymore, *Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence*, 1130.

¹⁴⁸ Philippe Lagasse, "Northern Command and the Evolution of Canada-U.S. Defence Relations," *Canadian Military Journal* 4, no.1 (Spring 2003),

¹⁴⁹ Coombs & Goette, "Supporting the Pax Americana," in *The Canadian Way of War*, 279.

the security needs of the United States and ensure his political objective of Canadian sovereignty was to push the CF into much closer cooperation with the much larger US military.

While many in both Parliament and the general public believed that Trudeau was determined to remove the Canadian military from its commitments with their US ally, he was in fact increasing this cooperation by having the Canadian Armed Forces becoming more focused on North American defence. This began to force the CF to spend more of their time working with the US than with their European allies in NATO. Air defence had effectively been governed by a series of agreements with the US over the previous thirty years, while naval policy was based on contributing to American naval supremacy and a similarity of maritime interests held by both Ottawa and Washington.¹⁵⁰

The 1971 White Paper clearly showed that Trudeau was not prepared to completely withdraw the CF from any of their commitments with the US. In regards to the land defence of North America, the document stated that “In the event of a requirement to defend the land mass of North America, a mutual support arrangement exists with the United States.”¹⁵¹ With this statement the government had effectively tied the defence of Canadian territory to the US military. To focus such a large effort on one goal, the Trudeau Cabinet would be forced to either increase relative military spending or withdraw from other military commitments. With this in mind many military officials began to question Trudeau’s policies, believing that he intended to withdraw forces from Europe in order to address the glaring military dominance that the US held in North America. While this imbalance did not concern leaders in the Canadian military, who

¹⁵⁰ Cuthbertson, *Canadian Military Independence*, Preface.

¹⁵¹ Macdonald, *Defence in the '70s*, 24.

argued that the US military truly respected Canadian attitudes and sovereignty, it was a significant concern in Parliament and among the general populace of Canada.

Reduced NATO Commitments and Americanization of Canadian Forces in Europe

Trudeau had made it abundantly clear in his 1968 election campaign that he believed that the military was being used wastefully in Western Europe. He argued that these units could instead be used to defend Canadian territory and help provide internal security rather than being sent on missions across the globe.¹⁵² With the new shakeup in defence priorities, Trudeau began to attempt to withdraw the CF units that were on NATO duty defending Western Europe. Since he had been elected, he had sought to end the Canadian land force commitment to NATO. However, it soon became clear that neither the US nor their European allies would allow him to withdraw Canada's military commitment to Europe. To get around this European concern, Trudeau had decided in 1969 that in order to significantly reduce the permanent Canadian presence in Europe, he would commit a Canadian Air/Sea Transportable Brigade (CAST) that would be shipped to Northern Europe if East-West hostilities escalated.¹⁵³ Much to the annoyance of the senior Canadian and American military leaders, this force would be permanently stationed in Canada and not Europe.

By the beginning of 1972 all of Canada's land forces in Europe had been transferred from the BAOR to the US Central Army Group (CENTAG). While the CAST Brigade had been accepted as early as 1968, it was not until after the 1971 White Paper that the federal government began to tinker with the idea that the CAST commitment could be used as a strategy to replace Canada's permanent air and land forces in Europe.

¹⁵² Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*, 120.

¹⁵³ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 362.

This came as a shock to both American and Canadian military officials, as they had focused much of their efforts on defending West Germany within CENTAG. It came as a special shock to US military officials, who had helped National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ) create the CAST group and get it accepted within NATO in order to get an increased Canadian military presence in Europe.¹⁵⁴ Even though the Americans welcomed this increased assistance in defending Northern Europe, particularly Norway, they did not want this to come at the expense of Canada's permanent forces in West Germany. It was becoming clear to the Pentagon that the CF would be unable to support both European commitments with a declining relative defence budget and a shrinking regular force. However, this was not even discussed by Trudeau and his Cabinet in the years before and after the release of the 1971 White Paper. Trudeau, and many within his Cabinet were determined to reduce the forces assigned to CENTAG and central Europe, in order to reduce defence commitments and free more funds for social welfare programs.

Having two commitments in different regions of Europe would have caused a lot of strain on the Canadian Forces and eventually force them to rely on their allies for assistance in transport and supply. However, while this would eventually lead to the degrading of Canada's military sovereignty within NATO, it was not even considered by Trudeau and his defence officials.¹⁵⁵ This was further complicated by the dismal shape of Maritime Command's escort fleet and the fact that no Alliance warships were assigned to escort the CAST group to Norway in the event of war, according to NATO war plans.¹⁵⁶ To the Americans, it appeared that Trudeau was going to depend on the vast capabilities

¹⁵⁴ Sean M. Maloney, "Purple Haze: Joint Planning in the Canadian Forces from Mobile Command to J-Staff, 1975-1991 (Part 1), *Canadian Military Journal* 5, no.4 (Winter 2002-2003), 62.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 62.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 63.

of the USN and USAF to help transport the CAST group and reinforcements to the 4CMBG in Germany in the event of war. However, it soon became clear to Trudeau that Washington and Canada's European allies considered the 4CMBG presence in West Germany as extremely important to NATO. He was faced with growing opposition from the US and European armed forces to ensure that Canada retained its military forces in Germany.

The increasing cooperation between the Canadian and American armed forces as a result of Trudeau's commitment to protecting the US nuclear arsenal was not limited to Maritime Command and North American units. Canadian Forces Europe (CFE) was being forced into increasingly bilateral cooperation with US forces they were working with. NATO had been an important element of Canadian defence policy since its creation, as it enabled Canada to be part of a large military alliance without having to enter into an unequal bilateral military alliance with the United States. The defence of Western Europe extended the American defence perimeter beyond North America and enabled Canadian governments to transform their defence relationship from an unequal partnership into a multi-tiered one based on mutual dependence.¹⁵⁷ While the US government was attempting to overcome the fallout from the Vietnam conflict, the US military was in disarray, and many European defence officials feared a significant drawback of American forces in Europe.

The release of the 1971 White Paper raised many fears from the members of NATO that Trudeau and Macdonald would work to withdraw all Canadian Forces units from Europe by the end of the decade. The main fear among NATO leaders was that if the 4CMBG was withdrawn from Europe, then it would soon be followed by significant

¹⁵⁷ Tracy, "NATO in Canadian Defence Policy," 74.

elements of the US forces in Europe. This stemmed from a belief within NATO, and certain elements of the US Armed Forces, that as the other North American nation that had forces in Europe that the 4CMBG and the Air Group provided a political significance to the US.¹⁵⁸ It is this significance that many NATO officials believed helped to maintain the American military commitment to Europe.¹⁵⁹ However, despite this large fear among members of the European NATO community, it was largely unwarranted as the US was committed to the forward defence of North America in Europe. The US Secretary of Defence, James Schlesinger, stated in 1974 to Trudeau that if both the US and Canada focused solely on North American defence then soon there would only be North America left to defend.¹⁶⁰ Furthermore, this development of interoperability and cooperation did not only extend to the Canadian and American military forces in Europe but also to those forces within North America.

With the movement of the 4CMBG from the British sector to the American Central Army Group in the summer of 1971, the Brigade had begun to work very closely with their American counterparts in CENTAG. Although the Brigade Group was not very large (it had been reduced to less than three thousand personnel since the release of the White Paper), it provided a key reserve force for the VIII (US) Corps as well as the II (German) Corps.¹⁶¹ As a result of this shift, Mobile Command began to work very closely with the US Army in early 1972 in order to develop a significant interoperability capability with the US.¹⁶² This was done so that the 4CMBG and its attached units from

¹⁵⁸ Tracy, "NATO in Canadian Defence Policy," 75.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 75.

¹⁶⁰ D.W. Middlemiss and J.J. Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence: Decisions and Determinants* (Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Canada Inc., 1989), 39.

¹⁶¹ Horn, *From Cold War to New Millennium*, 110. Although it was designated as a reserve for either corps the Brigade worked almost exclusively with the VIII (US) Corps during the 1970s.

¹⁶² Blaxland, *Strategic Cousins*, 163.

Canada would be able to seamlessly work with the US Army in Europe in the event of war. Communications, tactics and supply were extremely important to the 4CMBG and resulted in it working tirelessly with their American counterparts to make this transition as easy as possible during any conflict.¹⁶³

For most of the remaining years of the 1970s, 4CMBG and the Air Command squadrons stationed in Europe worked tirelessly to develop this interoperability, as they needed to work closely with the much larger US forces in order to survive in the event of a major European conflict. Despite the request by the Canadian CDS, General Jacques Dextraze, in 1974 for a replacement for the ageing Centurion battle tank, Macdonald and Trudeau planned to purchase a light armoured vehicle to replace the tank.¹⁶⁴ However, if 4CMBG were to become a successful reconnaissance unit, it would need main battle tanks to defend itself from the heavily armoured formations of the Warsaw Pact stationed in East Germany. As a result of their increasingly ageing equipment, the Canadian Forces in Germany were rapidly integrating with their US allies because the Trudeau Government was not providing these units with the necessary equipment, funds and manpower to successfully fight a prolonged conflict with the Warsaw Pact.

With the Canadian air and land forces in Europe now all working under the direct command of larger US formations and Trudeau's defence focus on North America, it had become essential that Canadian Forces Europe begin to develop a strong working relationship with the American forces. In response to the increasingly shrinking manpower and ageing equipment, Mobile Command issued an ultimatum to the Government in early 1974. The leaders of Mobile Command stated that a useful

¹⁶³ Sean M. Maloney, *War Without Battles: Canada's NATO Brigade in Germany 1951-1993* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Education, 1997), 294.

¹⁶⁴ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 375.

Canadian land force element could not continue in Europe beyond 1976 unless one of two important elements occurred: a) a new main battle tank was purchased to replace the Centurion, or b) the force was transformed to become highly specialized in anti-tank and air defence roles and designed to become integrated into larger American or West German formations.¹⁶⁵ When Mobile Command received no response from the Government, it began to use NATO's annual REFORGER exercises to develop joint Canadian-American standard operating procedures between 4CMBG and the VIII (US) Corps commander, General George Blanchard.¹⁶⁶ These procedures were designed to help integrate 4CMBG and its reinforcements from Canada into either the V (US) Corps or VIII (US) Corps in the near future.

In 1976 4CMBG began to take on a more important role in the VIII (US) Corps and full-scale training between the Canadian and American forces began. In 1975 the US had withdrawn two brigades of the 1st Infantry Division from Europe, which resulted in General Blanchard developing plans to use 4CMBG as the second brigade for the division until the other two brigades were returned to Europe.¹⁶⁷ As a result, between 1976 and 1979 4CMBG was focused on 'plugging-in' to the US logistical system and developing common fire support procedures with the US Army in Europe.¹⁶⁸ This was accompanied by a 1977 proposal by the US Armed Forces to integrate all Canadian military units in Europe into the American military logistics system. The proposed CA/US ILOC Agreement was agreed to by the Trudeau Government in 1979 and

¹⁶⁵ Maloney, *War Without Battles*, 279.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 293.

¹⁶⁷ Hasek, *Disarming of Canada*, 160.

¹⁶⁸ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 293.

effectively enabled CFE to use all American transport, supply and maintenance facilities, while also integrating all Canadian military needs into the vast US logistical system.¹⁶⁹

Furthermore, by 1979 the Minister of National Defence, Barney Danson, witnessed first-hand the interoperability between the Canadian and American forces in Europe. At a 1979 NATO Summit in Washington, D.C., the US delegation was attempting to reconfigure the amount of conventional forces within Europe and those immediately available for reinforcement from Canada, the UK and the US. Danson fully agreed with the US proposal, but he was surprised when throughout the report the US considered all Canadian European forces as part of its own European forces and took full responsibility in aiding the air and sea transport of Canadian reinforcements to CENTAG and Northern Europe.¹⁷⁰ In addition, the US representatives stated that they would strive to develop national mobilization plans between Canada and the US to maximize transport, training and equipment available in North America and encouraged the European NATO members to do the same.¹⁷¹ While Danson, who was different from Trudeau's previous Defence Ministers in that he was a strong supporter of the military, agreed that this was necessary both he and Trudeau were caught off guard. However, this NATO proposal showed how close the Canadian and American forces in Europe had become, as the Americans identified 4CMBG and the air component as homogenous units within the VII Corps. By having CFE integrate with the US logistics system and frontline military units, it enabled Trudeau and his Cabinet to focus on North America by not having to send additional Canadian military units to active service in Western Europe.

¹⁶⁹ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 294.

¹⁷⁰ Barney Danson, "NATO- Long Term Defence Program", Volume 74, Barney Danson Fonds [hereafter BDF], R13905-1415-O-E, LAC, Annex B, page 4.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, Annex C, page 2.

Much like their counterparts in Maritime Command, Trudeau's Cabinet had pushed 4CMBG and CFE towards developing a close interaction with US forces through his constant manpower and budget cuts and his demands to focus on North American defence. This cooperation extended to the point that Canadian and American forces were rapidly developing capabilities, procedures and strategies to have Canadian military units become part of larger US forces, under American commanders, during times of crisis. While the forces in Europe were committed to developing increasingly integrated capabilities with the Americans, Trudeau had begun to redirect his defence efforts to the protection of the US nuclear deterrent. Unsurprisingly to the two main CDS in the 1970s, General Dextraze and Admiral Robert Falls, along with Danson, who became Trudeau's longest serving Minister of Defence, Trudeau was constantly trying to find a way to focus Canadian defence efforts on North America and away from its international commitments.

Defence of the American Nuclear Deterrent in North America

Between 1970 and 1975 the Trudeau Government was almost entirely focused on the protection of Canadian sovereignty by the CF through the reshaping of Air and Maritime Commands to protect Canadian territory. Along with this, manpower available to Mobile Command was reduced and new equipment for its forces in Europe and designated for Europe was not purchased. Furthermore, 4CMBG manpower was reduced by fifty percent, with many of these personnel being taken off of the defence payroll. However, when it became clear that he would not be able to remove the Brigade from Europe and that the only way to protect Canadian sovereignty was to work closely with the US military, Trudeau once again switched his military objectives. While Trudeau had

stated his desire for the Canadian Forces to defend Canada without any significant American military presence since his election victory in 1968, the reality was that Canada could not defend its vast land, air and waterways without US assistance. Historian John Gellner stated the fact that fully one half of the Canadian defence effort “was made necessary by our geographical position as the strategic fore field of the United States.”¹⁷² Canada could either assist the US in the security of its nuclear forces or let the US military do it in Canadian airspace, waterways and on Canadian territory.¹⁷³ The result was that with the beginning of a thawing relationship between the two superpowers and an end to détente, Trudeau could either assist the US or let the US defend Canada, which would have had grave impacts on Trudeau’s sovereignty protection goals.

Despite his desire to limit the number of American forces involved in the defence of Canada, Trudeau and his Cabinet declared to NDHQ and the military in a National Defence document, entitled *Defence 1976*, that their main goal was in assisting the Americans in the protection of their nuclear deterrent.¹⁷⁴ Once again the military’s goals were switched around and they – particularly Air and Maritime Command – were encouraged by the Government to work much more closely with their US counterparts to better protect North America. One of Trudeau’s Ministers of National Defence, James Richardson, illustrated the importance that the Trudeau Government placed on Air Command in a 1974 speech. Richardson stated that other than sovereignty, Canada’s most important goal was the defence of North America and “if it were not for Air

¹⁷² Gray, *Canadian Defence Priorities*, 16.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹⁷⁴ Government of Canada, *Defence 1976* (Hull, Quebec: Department of National Defence, Printing and Publishing Supply and Services Canada, 1976), 8.

Defence Command...we would have to call on the Americans for assistance.”¹⁷⁵ While Mobile Command was primarily focused on its efforts in helping to defend Europe, with American forces, Air and Maritime Command now found themselves working with US forces throughout North America.

In 1975 CDS General Jacques Dextraze approached Trudeau in order to have a new tank purchased for the CF to replace the ageing Centurion. Instead of a new tank, the Government purchased 491 armoured reconnaissance vehicles for the military.¹⁷⁶ Dextraze, however, was determined to get a new tank for Mobile Command and eventually succeeded when he approached West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, who offered Trudeau economic tradeoffs in return for Canada’s purchase of the German-built Leopard tank.¹⁷⁷ After Barney Danson became the new Minister of Defence in 1977, he proceeded to work tirelessly to provide the military with what it needed. Danson immediately sought to revamp the reserve forces of the CF as well as to try and convince Trudeau of the urgent need to purchase a new interceptor aircraft for Air Command and the urgent need of new frigates for Maritime Command.¹⁷⁸ With a constantly shrinking relative defence budget and trained personnel, the CF was being forced by Trudeau to cooperate closely with the US in order to carry out their primary objectives.

Since the 1971 Defence White Paper, the Trudeau Government had placed an increasing priority on North American defence. Consequently, Canadian and American military officers and government defence officials had begun to work very closely together. The decision by Trudeau to focus the CF efforts on North American defence

¹⁷⁵ House of Commons Debates, “October 15, 1974” in *1st Session, 30th Parliament, Volume 1: September 30–November 5, 1974*, (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 1974), 426.

¹⁷⁶ Granatstein, *Canada’s Army*, 375.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 375.

¹⁷⁸ Barney Danson, “Revitalizing Canada’s Reserves”, Volume 72, BDF, R13905 O-X-E, LAC, page 8.

allowed these ties to develop even further. With their new orders focusing them on North America, Air and Maritime Commands had developed a close working relationship with the USAF and USN. Since the end of the Second World War, Canada had signed over one hundred defence agreements or memorandums of understanding with the United States.¹⁷⁹ Two of the most important agreements were directly related to both Canadian sovereignty and the defence of the US nuclear forces, which Minister of Defence Danson declared were the CF's more important objectives in 1978.¹⁸⁰ The first agreement was the Air Defence of the North American Continent (ADNAC), which was designed to create a defence-in-depth using all available Canadian and American air defence units. The second was the Commander, Anti-Submarine Warfare Forces, Atlantic (COMASWFORLANT)- Canadian Commander, Maritime Atlantic (CANCOMARLANT), which was to coordinate the use of North American air, surface and submarine forces in the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans.¹⁸¹ Although both of these agreements had been signed soon after the creation of the Basic Security Plan in the 1950s, the Government and NDHQ gave them a higher priority as a result of Trudeau's desire to focus Canadian defence efforts on North America.

Prime Minister Trudeau and members of his Cabinet constantly reiterated that the two primary goals of the CF during the 1970s were the protection of Canadian sovereignty and the defence of North America. However, while he believed that these two goals were extremely important he refused to provide the CF with the necessary

¹⁷⁹ Department of National Defence, *DND Agreements and Arrangements Covering Canada's Participation in Cooperative Defence* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967). Found in MG 32 B-33 Volume 67, Library and Archives Canada (Ottawa), 5.

¹⁸⁰ Barney Danson, "Remarks by Honourable Barney Danson Minister of National Defence, 'Defence Spending: How to get the most benefit from a Burden'", Volume 72, BDF, R13905 O-X-E, LAC, page 2.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 56.

equipment, manpower, and funds to properly carry out these roles. In order to successfully accomplish these two goals, Canadian military officials were forced to work almost exclusively with the US. The cutbacks initiated by the Trudeau Government, along with the force reductions in Europe, had forced the CF to work much more closely with the US security umbrella, both conventional and nuclear forces, in order to preserve any semblance of Canadian continental defence.¹⁸²

Since 1974 the US had chosen to focus on the forward defence of North America by helping to defend Western Europe.¹⁸³ However, the Pentagon had identified a growing threat to their nuclear forces – the presence of nuclear equipped Soviet submarines off of the Canadian and American coasts. Upon taking office in 1974 US President Gerald Ford began to pressure Trudeau to move Maritime Command towards closer participation with the USN to combat this emerging threat. In order to ensure the US that he was intent on helping to protect the nuclear deterrent, Trudeau made a drastic shift in Canadian maritime defence policy in early 1975. With Trudeau's shift to North American defence and sovereignty protection in the early 1970's, Maritime Command began to greatly suffer from his cutbacks. Since Ottawa created a permanent naval force in 1910, it had always worked in larger RN and USN task forces and battle groups. The Canadian naval element had always focused on providing their larger allies with escort vessels that excelled in ASW, minesweeping and convoy protection duties. However, by the time Trudeau dedicated the Atlantic fleet to the defence of the US nuclear deterrent in 1975, it was unable to provide any real contribution to larger USN task forces and carrier battle groups. By 1975 MARCOM's vessels and equipment had become so outdated and

¹⁸² Blaxland, *Strategic Cousins*, 153. The Trudeau Government itself recognized that the survival of Canada in any major crisis rested with the survival of the American nuclear strike forces.

¹⁸³ Tracy, "NATO in Canadian Defence Policy," 74.

obsolete that it became dependent on USN minesweeping and air defence assets for assistance in almost all of its operations.¹⁸⁴

The dire strait of Maritime Command was confirmed by a meeting that Atlantic Fleet commander Admiral Douglas Boyle had with Conservative MPs in Halifax in the spring of 1975. At a meeting at CFB Halifax, Boyle stated that there was an increase in Soviet naval activity off of the East Coast but that he was unable to send his ships out to counter this threat because of a lack of fuel.¹⁸⁵ This was followed by a 1977 public statement by popular author Brian Cuthbertson in which he stated that Canada was being forced to rely on the USN for the protection of its waterways.¹⁸⁶ His view became important as the Canadian public now began to pressure the Trudeau Cabinet to provide the CF with the budget, equipment and manpower necessary to accomplish their objectives. Cuthbertson further argued that the degree of independence that Maritime Command could have in North America would be directly related to its capabilities; fewer capabilities meant that Canada would become more dependent on US naval power for assistance.¹⁸⁷ With a constant budget that did not allow for major equipment purchases or upgrades, it was clear that Maritime Command was losing its ability to work with larger American naval groups. As the Trudeau Government was not willing to increase the share of the federal budget dedicated to defence, it was resulting in MARCOM losing its critical ASW, air-defence and minesweeping capabilities that enabled it to provide a significant contribution to USN forces. The end result was that

¹⁸⁴ Marc Milner, "A Canadian Perspective on Canadian and American Naval Relations Since 1945" in *Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defense Cooperation: The Road from Ogdensburg*, Joel J. Sokolsky & Joseph T. Jockel et al (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 165.

¹⁸⁵ Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 274.

¹⁸⁶ Cuthbertson, *Canadian Military Independence in the Age of Superpowers*, 157.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 196.

without a significant Canadian naval contribution, the defence of North America's waterways would be solely up to the USN. Trudeau had placed an emphasis on the defence of Canada and the US nuclear deterrent but was not prepared to provide MARCOM with the equipment, budget and manpower to even remotely achieve these objectives.

Since the signing of the NATO agreement in 1949, the vast majority of Canada's East Coast Fleet had been dedicated to NATO's SACLANT, which was headquartered in Norfolk, Virginia, and led by a USN admiral.¹⁸⁸ Despite the importance of this task, Trudeau's Cabinet ordered Maritime Command to restrict its ASW operations to the protection of the US nuclear forces.¹⁸⁹ The result was that by 1976 the Trudeau Government had focused almost all Canadian naval efforts on defending the coasts of North America from Soviet submarines, without having these forces stationed across the Atlantic. However, this decision also forced Maritime Command to adapt to US naval strategies and forced them to prepare to operate seamlessly with American naval battle groups. In *Defence 1977*, the Government stated the main goal of Maritime Command was to conduct surveillance against Soviet ballistic missile submarines, which help prevent a large surprise attack on North American urban centres and military installations.¹⁹⁰ Furthermore, the report stated that "Canadian naval vessels, in conjunction with the USN, detect and monitor hostile maritime operations in waters off the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts."¹⁹¹ Even though the Government had placed a significant

¹⁸⁸ Marc Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 270.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 271.

¹⁹⁰ George R. Lindsey, "Protection of Shipping in the 1980s", *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (Winter 1977-1978), 9.

¹⁹¹ Department of National Defence, *Defence 1977* (Hull, Quebec: Printing and Publishing Supply and Services Canada, 1977), 9.

emphasis on the defence of North America, Maritime Command was in dire need of new equipment and a new class of escort vessels to replace the rapidly outdated and ageing frigates and destroyers that made up the current fleet. By the end of the decade MARCOM was in no position to fulfill all of Trudeau's requests without the assistance of the USN.

Much of the latter half of the decade was spent on exercises involving American and Canadian naval vessels working together in the defence of both NATO and North America. Canadian-American Exercises (CANUSEX) were held regularly and sought to integrate ships, aircraft and submarines of the USN and Maritime Command in all facets of naval warfare.¹⁹² Meanwhile, the Second Destroyer Squadron, operating off of Canada's Pacific Coast, was dedicated to support the USN's Pacific Fleet in the event of a major conflict.¹⁹³ Through these exercises Canadian warships were being effectively integrated into larger USN task forces. In a situation similar to the RCN's efforts with the RN in the Second World War, Canadian naval policy throughout the Cold War was based on the likely challenges to American naval power and creating defences against these challenges.¹⁹⁴ By having it work closely with the USN, Trudeau had intended for Maritime Command to show that it could make a significant contribution to the defence of North America's waterways. The end result, however, showed that the constant budget and manpower cuts were forcing Maritime Command to operate closely with the USN, as they did not have the power to protect Canadian waterways by themselves.

Trudeau and his Cabinet were soon faced with the same problem that had impacted Pearson and Hellyer's reforms in the 1960s. When the Canadian Armed Forces

¹⁹² Ibid., 24.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 27.

¹⁹⁴ Cuthbertson, *Canadian Military Independence*, 133.

became too cooperative with their American counterparts, the general public and politicians began to demand that the federal government divorce itself from the powerful US military system. In a House of Commons session in 1975 many MPs began to question the growing cooperation between the Canadian and American armed forces in the protection of Canadian sovereign airspace and waterways. Many of the elected representatives believed that in his haste to redirect the CF towards North American defence and away from European defence, Trudeau had instead moved the CF very close to the US Armed Forces. It was argued within Parliament that the Trudeau government had focused its air defence on the east and west coasts but left the control of airspace over much of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan to American air defence headquarters and USAF aircraft.¹⁹⁵ It was becoming clear that in his attempt to guarantee Canadian sovereignty the Prime Minister was instead pushing the CF into a closer working relationship with the US, who he deemed as the main defenders of the Western world.

Canada had become an important aspect of US strategic defence plans regarding North American defence. The Pentagon viewed Canada as an important aspect of continental defence as it provided the US Armed Forces with a defence-in-depth capability to help defend their nuclear forces in the American Midwest.¹⁹⁶ Trudeau also believed that Canada had an important role to play in the defence of the US nuclear deterrent. However, with his mind focused on the creation and expansion of social services within Canada, he would not be able to increase the percentage of the federal budget that was reserved for the Ministry of National Defence. By 1975 it had become

¹⁹⁵ Joseph T. Jockel, *Canada in NORAD, 1957-2007: A History* (Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, 2007), 83.

¹⁹⁶ Roger Frank Swanson, "Deterrence, Détente, and Canada?" *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science* 32, no. 2 (1976), 101.

clear to Trudeau and his Cabinet that in order for Canada to remain relevant in the defence of the continent they would either have to adhere to certain American strategic military initiatives or allow the United States to become the sole defender of North America.¹⁹⁷ Defence Minister Danson argued in 1978 that Canada needed to work closely with the US, as a rejuvenated CF would help the US deter any aggression by the Soviet Union.¹⁹⁸ Furthermore, he argued to convince Trudeau and members of his Cabinet that the conventional military forces of North America were there to deter a war not to start one.¹⁹⁹ The second option was not viable to Trudeau, as it would lead to the US having to defend Canada and the violation of Canadian sovereignty, so he chose to move the CF closer towards the Americans by accepting a number of US defence initiatives.

As Trudeau's main defence policies had gravitated towards North America, the major tool for his defence efforts became Air Command. Mobile Command and Maritime Command had been dedicated to the defence of Europe and NATO sea-lanes with their American allies, both of which Trudeau was finding hard to withdraw from. However, with Air Command he had found a force that he would be able to focus almost solely on Canadian defence. Through NORAD and the Air Interceptor Warning Plan, Air Command was primarily focused on its closely integrated capabilities to defend North American airspace with the USAF. Air Command's contribution to NORAD by 1977 took up a large majority of its active air defence forces. By 1977 Canada's contribution to NORAD was four squadrons of CF-101 aircraft, twenty-four surveillance radars, two satellite tracking installations and 10,500 military personnel, the majority of whom were

¹⁹⁷ Cuthbertson, *Canadian Military Independence*, 259.

¹⁹⁸ Barney Danson, "Defence Spending: How to get the most Benefit from a Burden", Volume 72, BDF, R13905 O-X-E, LAC, page 2

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 2.

provided by Air Command.²⁰⁰ All of this equipment and personnel had become part of a well-integrated North American air defence force, which was predominantly focused on providing the USAF and SAC with an in-depth defence and early warning capability rather than the protection of Canada's sovereign airspace.²⁰¹ Despite the importance that Trudeau had placed on the defence of both sovereignty and the US nuclear deterrent by Air Command, he was also not prepared to provide them with the necessary equipment.

In late 1977 the American military began to refocus its efforts on conventional forces as a result of ongoing nuclear limitation talks between President Jimmy Carter and Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev.²⁰² In 1978 President Carter created mobile task forces that could be sent anywhere in the world without drawing on the US military resources dedicated to NATO defence. Carter earmarked three Army divisions and one Marine division for these tasks.²⁰³ In addition, a new main battle tank was purchased for the Army, while the F-15, F-16, and F-18 fighters were introduced in large quantities into the USAF and the USN.²⁰⁴ However, most of these new aircraft were dedicated to the forward defence of NATO in Western Europe and not to NORAD.

While the US was busy trying to build up its conventional forces, Trudeau was trying to focus the efforts of the CF on North America. With the US beginning to place a much larger emphasis on conventional forces, President Carter began to ask Trudeau to focus the CF primary efforts on the defence of Western Europe and make North American defence a secondary objective. In October 1978, Minister of Defence Danson

²⁰⁰ Department of National Defence, *Defence 1977* (Hull, Quebec: Printing and Publishing Supply and Services Canada, 1977), 8.

²⁰¹ Howard Peter Langille, *Changing the Guard: Canada's Defence in A World in Transition* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 13.

²⁰² Richard W. Stewart, ed., *American Military History, Volume II: The United States Army in a Global Era, 1917-2003* (Washington: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2005), 375.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 379.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 379.

indicated in a speech that Canadian and American military officers had begun to undertake informal discussions to determine how best to make use of the small CF in the defence of the continent.²⁰⁵ As a result of these formal and informal discussions between members of both countries militaries and governments, a remarkable similarity in strategic views between the two armed forces began to develop during the second half of the decade. Through these meetings Canadian military officials began to look at Canada's strategic military questions through the eyes of the American military,²⁰⁶ which was beginning to directly affect the CF's strategic thinking and planning. While these discussions were very important to the continued development of Canadian-American military relations, they were a direct result of the lack of importance that Prime Minister Trudeau and his Cabinet were placing on the Canadian Forces.

A number of publications by the Department of National Defence and NDHQ during 1977 and 1978 indicated just how valuable the American nuclear deterrent, and, by extension, cooperation with the US military was to the federal government. *Defence 1977*, the annual publication on the state of the CF, illustrated the increased importance the Trudeau Government was putting on cooperating with the US. The document stated "Canada's overriding defence objective, therefore, remains that of contributing to the prevention of nuclear war. Attainment of this objective continues to rest on the maintenance by the United States of credible strategic retaliatory capabilities."²⁰⁷ The document went on to suggest that this deterrent was only protected by the cooperation of Canadian and American forces in providing air and naval defenses for US military

²⁰⁵ Joseph T. Jockel & Joel J. Sokolsky, *Canada and Collective Security: Odd Man Out* (Washington D.C.: The Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1986), 55.

²⁰⁶ Gray, *Canadian Defence Priorities*, 154.

²⁰⁷ Department of National Defence, *Defence 1977* (Hull, Quebec: Printing and Publishing Supply and Services Canada, 1977), 7.

installations.²⁰⁸ However, Washington was focusing on building up its conventional military forces in Europe, and ranked the defence of North America as a small priority.

The Prime Minister's desire to solely defend North America was reinforced in *Defence 1978*. This document argued that, while a Soviet attack on North America was unlikely, the only way an attack would not occur was to ensure that both Canada and the US maintain sufficient forces on the continent to deter any aggression.²⁰⁹ Despite the Americans moving towards Europe, Trudeau had made it abundantly clear that he wanted to move the CF away from their European commitments to focus on the defence of Canada and the US. However, the sheer number of defence agreements and the cooperation between the two armed forces meant that the Americans would have a significant voice in the creation of significant Canadian defence policies and objectives.

The air forces of the US and NATO had been re-equipped with modern interceptors and fighters while AIRCOM was stuck with the CF-101 Voodoo and CF-104 Starfighter interceptors to defend North America and Europe. Both types of these aircraft had been retired by almost every other NATO nation as they could no longer provide adequate front-line air defence capabilities and were rapidly outclassed by modern Soviet interceptor aircraft.²¹⁰ However, despite the cries from the Air Force of the need to replace these two aircraft that had been developed in the 1950s, Trudeau did not begin to seriously discuss their replacement until 1978. By delaying the purchase of a new, state of the art interceptor aircraft, Ottawa was slowly moving itself to more dependence on American air defence units. The USAF was in the process of introducing a number of

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 8.

²⁰⁹ Department of National Defence, *Defence: 1978 in Review* (Hull, Quebec: Canadian Government Publishing Centre: Supply and Services Canada, 1978), 8.

²¹⁰ Cuthbertson, *Canadian Military Independence*, 90.

new fighter and interceptor aircraft, as well as airborne early warning aircraft (AWACS), surface-to-air missile (SAM) systems and advanced ground radars based in the continental US.

Conclusion

By the end of the 1970s, it was becoming clear that Trudeau's desire to redirect the CF towards North America was designed to simply allow the Prime Minister to reduce the share that defence received from the federal government budget and redirect these expenditures towards social welfare projects. Upon the release of the 1971 White Paper, Trudeau had focused his abilities on the defence of Canadian sovereignty and the participation with the US in the defence of the nuclear deterrent. In a situation that had plagued his predecessor's in the Unification decade of the 1960s, Trudeau only managed to push the CF into further cooperation with the American military. In an attempt to make the CF an equal partner in North American defence, the federal Government had instead further reduced the capabilities of the Armed Forces. The reductions were so severe that Canadian military units in both Europe and in Canada had to develop close contact with their American counterparts for assistance in supply and certain combat support in the event of war with the Warsaw Pact.

One of the most important defence objectives of the 1970s had been the protection of Canadian sovereignty. NDHQ had been tasked with redirecting forces committed to Europe back to Canadian defence. However, with the large number of defence agreements signed between Ottawa and Washington, it soon became clear that the US would have to be closely consulted on almost all aspects of Canadian sovereignty protection. Air, Maritime and Mobile Commands all found themselves having to

cooperate very closely with the US armed forces, and American aircraft and naval vessels continuously patrolled Canadian airspace and sea approaches in the Arctic as well as patrolling airspace in the Maritimes and Ontario. In addition, Canadian Forces in Europe were continuously neglected and were reduced to a very small brigade group and air group within larger American air and ground forces. In order to accomplish their goal of assisting in the defence of Western Europe, CFE was forced to develop an unheard of interoperability with American Army corps it was tasked with reinforcing in the Central Army Group. Despite its small size, this air and ground commitment was shown as being extremely important in upholding NATO solidarity.

Even though the Trudeau Government was focused on limiting the number of American forces involved in the defence of Canadian territory, it also realized that the alliance with the United States was the most important aspect of Canada's national security. As Mobile Command was committed to maintaining its meager forces in Europe, the MoND looked towards Air and Maritime Command to become the main Canadian elements assisting in the defence of the American nuclear forces. Air Command was looked at, initially, as the most important branch of the CF in North American defence. Through NORAD and the Basic Security Plan, Air Command had effectively been dedicated to the defence of North American airspace since the early 1950s. Although its leaders took this objective seriously, the federal Government seemingly began to abandon it through the constant cutbacks in personnel and equipment. Air Command had developed a strong relationship with the USAF and began to look towards them for assistance in many of its North American objectives. A similar situation existed within Maritime Command for much of the decade.

As the protector of Canada's coasts Maritime Command had also been identified as an important element in the defence of North America. By 1975 the lack of desire by Trudeau and his Cabinet to increase the share of the federal budget dedicated to defence resulted in MARCOM unable to purchase much-needed modern warships and valuable equipment. This left Canada's admirals and senior naval officers with an increasing need for American assistance in the defence of Canadian waters. Maritime Command did not receive any increase in equipment, personnel or government funds. By 1979 the situation with Maritime Command had deteriorated to a point where the USN believed that it would have to protect the entire North American coastline, not just the US. In a similar reaction to the increasing cooperation between the Canadian and American militaries during the Unification decade, Trudeau was faced with a public outcry to reequip all three major branches of the CF in order to negate the increasing role that the US Armed Forces were being forced to take on in many of Canada's defence objectives.

By the end of the decade it was becoming clear to many in the Canadian and American governments and armed forces that the détente strategy that had dominated the 1970s would soon give way to a massive build-up of conventional forces. The US was not willing to do this alone and its close relationship with Canada meant that the CF would have to be re-equipped and built up during the 1980s. While the defence of North America had dominated Canadian defence policies during the 1970s, it was clear that the forward defence of Western Europe by conventional Canadian, American and NATO forces was going to dominate the CF in the next decade. With the election of a more hardline American president in 1980 and a stronger stance by NATO on the large Soviet

buildup in Europe, it was clear that Canada was going to have to rapidly shift its focus from North America and back to Europe in the 1980s.

Chapter Three **The Re-Equipping of the Canadian Forces, 1979-1989**

In late 1978 Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau began to feel pressure from Canada's European NATO allies and, more importantly, the United States regarding the dismal state of the Canadian Forces. Over the previous two decades the CF had been reduced in size and, despite the constantly changing objectives handed to them by the federal governments of Pearson and Trudeau, had not received any substantial new equipment since Unification in 1967. However, with the end of détente and a new hardline attitude by the US regarding the Soviet Union, it was becoming clear that the CF would have to be given increased manpower and new equipment to appease its US and NATO allies. For much of the Cold War, the main objective of the Department of National Defence in its relations with its southern neighbour was to ensure that Canada did not become a strategic liability to the US.²¹¹ With this scenario now looming, the successive governments of Trudeau and Brian Mulroney attempted to undertake a significant rebuild of the CF throughout the 1980s.

As tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union increased during the 1980s, so did the pressure the Canadian government felt from Washington in regards to the CF. Unlike the 1960s and 1970s, when Canadian politicians had pushed the Canadian military towards closer cooperation with the US, the 1980s signaled a shift in the military relationship between the two North American allies. With a rapidly heating Cold War, the US government and military took an active interest in the shape and size of the Canadian Forces and directly pressured Ottawa to provide the CF with new equipment for all branches of the military. From the American perspective, a substantially stronger

²¹¹ Middlemiss & Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence*, 152.

CF would not only help protect US strategic military interests, but it could also free up conventional US military assets for other commitments. As the CF was slowly rebuilt, Prime Ministers Trudeau and Mulroney worked closely with the US government in order to reshape NATO strategy and continental defence arrangements in order to meet the growing Soviet conventional threat, as perceived by Washington. Direct cooperation between the two governments also resulted in an increased cooperation between the CF and the American military.

With the end of détente and a growing arsenal of conventional forces in both NATO and the Warsaw Pact, Air Command began to work almost exclusively with the USAF and the Strategic Air Command (SAC). Both air forces worked tirelessly to integrate their fighter forces, as much as possible, so they could work seamlessly to defend North America in the event of a major conflict. In addition, Ottawa was heavily pressured by Washington to allow USAF interceptors, tanker aircraft, Airborne Warning aircraft (AWACS), and SAC B-52 strategic bombers to develop contingency bases throughout Canada. As a result, the equipment and personnel of Air Command were also ordered to work closely with these USAF units to develop strategies and plans for seamless deployment if these aircraft were forced to use Canada as an operating location. Finally, the 1986 renewal of the NORAD Agreement was heavily influenced by the fears of Washington directly violating Canadian sovereignty if Ottawa did not agree to the renewal of NORAD.

The close cooperation between the two militaries was not limited to the air forces but also spread to the land forces of North America. Mobile Command was almost entirely focused on defending Western Europe with their American partner. Strategists

and US Army commanders began pushing new land battle doctrines and strategies on their Canadian allies. These doctrines and strategies were readily accepted by Mobile Command to ensure that it maintained its capacity to operate with larger American divisions, corps and army groups in Europe. Furthermore, many members of the USMC and Army who worked closely with Mobile Command began to pressure Ottawa to restructure its land combat elements into units that would closely resemble US light mechanized divisions. While Canadian politicians eventually turned down this proposal, it did show the increasing cooperation between the US Army and Mobile Command in Europe and North America.

Finally, Maritime Command began to take on an increased role in USN war strategies and began to accept USN doctrine as the basis for its own strategies and naval doctrine. Beginning in the early 1980s, the USN wanted Maritime Command to focus solely on ASW operations with a fleet of destroyers and frigates for this specific purpose. The proposal by the Mulroney Government to purchase nuclear attack submarines (SSN) for Maritime Command was met with criticism from the USN, which eventually led to the scrapping of the whole SSN proposal. It was clear that the 1980s was to signal an increased cooperation between all aspects of the CF and their American counterparts.

The Buildup of the US Military under the Reagan Administration

After witnessing the violent takeovers of Nicaragua and Iran by anti-US forces as well as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, the Reagan administration – inaugurated in January 1981 – argued that the Soviet threat was greater than ever and needed to be countered by US military power. As a result Reagan adopted four initiatives related to the US conventional military forces: a) an increase in the USN's fleet from 450

to 600 combat vessels; b) a plan to pressure Soviet interests around the world to gain military leverage for the US; c) accelerate procurement and development of ‘smart’ weapons; and d) increase the level of training and combat preparedness for the US regular forces.²¹² These four initiatives were to increase the combat power available to the US military as well as ease any concerns of Washington’s European allies regarding the state of the US military. Whereas President Carter had reduced US defence spending and redirected these funds to social welfare programs, Reagan immediately began to increase the defence spending and compelled the Soviet Union to do the same in response. The following chart illustrates the increasing US defence budgets between 1980 and 1989.

US Defence Budget, 1980-1989²¹³

Year	Budget (in billions of USD)	Percentage of GNP
1980	134	4.90%
1981	157.5	5.20%
1982	185.3	5.80%
1983	209.9	6.10%
1984	227.4	6.00%
1985	252.7	6.20%
1986	273.4	6.20%
1987	282	6.10%
1988	290.4	5.80%
1989	303.6	5.60%

The chart clearly shows that Reagan and his Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger, increased the defence budget by almost eighty-six billion dollars in his first term as President. Reagan was using his first term in the Oval Office to significantly build up the US military in order to bring the Soviet Union to the bargaining table in the near

²¹² William Snyder, *Defence Policy in the Reagan Administration*, xvii.

²¹³ Government of the United States, *National Defense and Veterans- Summary: 1900 to 2002*, in the United States Census Bureau, <http://www.census.gov/statab/hist/HS-51.pdf> (accessed April 19, 2013).

future.²¹⁴ The new influx of dollars into the military allowed the US Army, Navy and Air Force to undertake a number of plans to reorganize and buildup the strength available to them.

The US Army in 1980 was in dire need of a massive reorganization and modernization scheme that would enable it to combat both the heavily armoured Soviet threat in Europe but also rapidly deploy light forces for any military contingency throughout the world. While Weinberger provided the Army with new funds, he tasked the two main Army commanders under Reagan, Generals Edward C. Meyer and John A. Wickman Jr., with undertaking these modernization and reorganization schemes while holding the US Army strength at 781,000 personnel.²¹⁵ By the end of 1987 the US Army had undertaken a number of modernization projects. The M1A1 Abrams had been introduced as the new main battle tank as well as a new infantry fighting vehicle (M3 Bradley), a new attack helicopter (the AH-64 Apache), artillery, air defence equipment and smart weapons for all branches of the Army.²¹⁶ Along with the new equipment, the Army was reorganized into twenty-eight divisions composed of both regular and reserve personnel and designed for combat in both Europe and anywhere else in the world.²¹⁷

While the Army had undergone a rapid reorganization and modernization project, the USN was tasked with a rapid expansion of its combat projection capabilities during the 1980s. The Navy was given the highest priority by both Reagan and Weinberger. Before a meeting of Congress in February 1982, Weinberger stated that the goal of the

²¹⁴ Peter R. Zwick, "American-Soviet Relations: The Rhetoric and Realism," in *Defence Policy in the Reagan Administration* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1988), 87.

²¹⁵ William O. Staudenmaier, "The Decisive Role of Landpower in US National Security," *Defence Policy in the Reagan Administration* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1988), 261.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 265.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 262.

new administration was “maritime superiority over any likely enemy.”²¹⁸ To accomplish this goal the USN was to undergo a rapid expansion of its combat projection capabilities in the number of warships it could put to sea. US Admiral Thomas Hayward argued in 1982 that the US needed a navy with fifteen carrier battle groups, a large sea-lift capability and one hundred state of the art attack submarines.²¹⁹ With the new levels of funding being poured into the Navy, it began to rapidly expand to meet President Reagan’s ambitious 600 ship navy plan. In 1980 the USN consisted of 497 combat capable vessels; by 1987 this had grown to 567 warships of all sizes.²²⁰ The USN benefited greatly under the Reagan administration as it saw the introduction of new warships of all sizes, from large aircraft carriers to smaller frigates and auxiliary vessels.

While the Navy was tasked with a rapid expansion of its forces, the USAF was given more funds in order to produce an effective anti-ballistic missile and air defence system in the US and in near-earth orbit. The USAF was tasked with undertaking one of Reagan’s most ambitious military projects in the 1980s, the development of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Weinberger created this initiative in order to provide the USAF with the equipment and ability to undertake an offensive defence of US and Allied territory during any potential conflict with the Soviet Union.²²¹ An active air defence by the USAF, according to Weinberger, would keep the Soviet forces off balance and allow the USAF and allied air forces to successfully absorb any Soviet nuclear attack.²²² Under the auspices of the SDI the Reagan administration sought to increase the number of

²¹⁸ John Allan Williams, “The US Navy under the Reagan Administration and Global Forward Strategy,” in *Defense Policy in the Reagan Administration* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press 1988), 289.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 291.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 290.

²²¹ Thomas A. Fabyanic, “The US Air Force: Force Structure, Changes, and Implications,” in *Defense Policy in the Reagan Administration* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1988), 316.

²²² *Ibid.*, 316.

aircraft available to the USAF. New versions of the F-15 and F-16 multirole fighters were introduced in large numbers along with the new B-2 Spirit stealth bomber, AC-130 Spectre gunship and numerous types of new multi-use helicopters.²²³ These new aircraft, when combined with the substantial USAF aircraft inventory in 1980, were to equip the US with the ability to provide a defence of American airspace and that of its allies in the face of any potential Soviet threats or aggression.

Overall, the US military benefited strongly from the increased budgets that Reagan provided for defence in the 1980s. The military had grown from 2.95 million personnel in 1980 to 3.3 million in 1985.²²⁴ The rapid growth in both personnel and budgets also allowed Reagan to begin to demand that Canada and its other NATO allies build up their conventional military strength and increase their defence budgets. Reagan made it clear that détente was over and it was now time for NATO to flex its military and economic muscles to counter the perceived Soviet threat.

Canadian defence spending during the 1980s increased dramatically over the decade. While the defence percentage of Canadian GNP fluctuated between 1.7% and 1.8% more money was injected into the Ministry of National Defence to complete a number of important procurement projects. Canadian defence spending did not increase rapidly like that of the US; however, it did represent a significant shift in the respective policies of both the Trudeau and Mulroney governments as both Cabinets made the Canadian Forces an important aspect of their platforms. Although the Canadian national defence budget did not increase as much as President Reagan and his administration

²²³ Fabyanic, "The USAF", in *Defence Policy in the Reagan Administration*, 326.

²²⁴ Lawrence J. Korb, "Did Readiness Get its Fair Share of the Defense Buildup in the First Reagan Administration," in *Defense Policy in the Reagan Administration* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1988), 414.

would have liked, the influx of new money allowed for a number of new weapons and equipment to be introduced into the armed forces that enabled the CF to undertake a larger role in both NATO and NORAD. The following chart illustrates the National Defence budget of Canada between 1980 and 1989.

National Defence Expenditures, Fiscal Years
1980-1989²²⁵

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Dollars (in millions)</u>	<u>% of GDP</u>
1980	\$5,298	1.70%
1981	\$5,975	1.70%
1982	\$6,903	1.80%
1983	\$7,209	1.80%
1984	\$7,900	1.80%
1985	\$8,386	1.70%
1986	\$9,143	1.80%
1987	\$9,708	1.70%
1988	\$10,206	1.70%
1989	\$10,982	1.70%

The influx of more funds into National Defence enabled a number of important procurement projects to be completed. These programs were to have an important role as they provided the CF with modern state-of-the art equipment that would enable the CF to work with the US in North American and European defence as an important ally. The New Fighter Aircraft program, which had started in 1977, was finally finished in April 1980 with the F-18 Hornet multirole fighter being selected as the winner, and 138 of these new fighters were delivered by 1988. This was followed by the introduction of the CP-140 Aurora maritime patrol aircraft to replace the ageing Argus in airborne ASW operations. Finally, the larger defence funds allowed Maritime Command (MARCOM) to order a new class of frigates specially designed for ASW and air-defence operations. All

²²⁵ Government of Canada, *Fiscal Reference Tables*, in the Department of Finance Archived Reference Tables, <http://www.fin.gc.ca/fit-trf/2011/fit-trf-1102-eng.asp#tb18> (accessed March 18, 2013).

three of these procurements showed Washington that Canada was indeed taking its defence seriously and also enabled the CF to take on a larger role in joint US-Canadian operations throughout the remainder of the Cold War.

Air Command's Cooperation with the USAF and SAC

Throughout the 1970s, Air Command had become the primary instrument of the Trudeau government to help protect Canadian sovereignty. As a result, it was almost always the first in line to get new equipment. However, in order to defend Canada, Air Command had to work very closely with the USAF. This cooperation led to the development of American and Canadian air units that worked almost exclusively with each other in preparation for a major conflict with the Soviet Union. By 1980 NORAD had come to be seen by many in Canada as a way of contributing to continental defence and also ensuring that the American government and USAF recognized Canada's sovereignty.²²⁶ The increasing tension and the desire for larger conventional forces in NATO led the USAF to directly pressure Air Command to adopt US strategies and doctrines concerning the air defence of North America and Western Europe.

While Trudeau had wanted Air Command to focus on the defence of Canadian airspace, he had failed to upgrade the aircraft available to them. By 1977 the three main aircraft in Air Command's inventory, the CF-104 Starfighter, CF-101 Voodoo, and CF-116 Freedom Fighter had all been introduced between 1961 and 1968 and were severely outmatched by Allied and Soviet aircraft. Due to pressures from US President Jimmy Carter, Trudeau instructed Minister of Defence Barney Danson in the summer of 1977 to replace all three aircraft with a new multi-role fighter that could provide interceptor

²²⁶ Stephen Clarkson, "NORAD: Does Canada Have an Option?" In *Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, Order of Reference Respecting NORAD*, Issue No. 46 (November 20, 1985), by Government of Canada (Ottawa: Queen's Printer), A39.

capabilities in NORAD as well as provide air defence and ground-support capabilities in NATO.²²⁷ There were five aircraft selected to take part in the competition: the Grumman F-14 Tomcat, McDonnell-Douglas F-15 Eagle, Panavia Tornado, General Dynamics F-16 Fighting Falcon and the McDonnell-Douglas F-18 Hornet.²²⁸ By early 1980, the F-14 and the Tornado had both been rejected because of the cost of purchasing 120 to 150 of these aircraft. The F-15, F-16 and F-18 were to provide the principle debate among Air Command and the Government about which aircraft was right for Canada.

Near the end of 1979, the short-lived Progressive Conservative (PC) government under Prime Minister Joe Clark did not have a clear idea of which aircraft would be ideal for Canadian and NATO air defence. The PC Minister of National Defence, Allan McKinnon, argued with the Commander of Air Command, Lieutenant-General G.A. MacKenzie, about which aircraft to purchase. General MacKenzie stated that Air Command believed that Ottawa should purchase two different aircraft, one for NATO objectives and one for NORAD missions. For NORAD, AIRCOM wanted the F-15 Eagle interceptor and for NATO they wanted the F-16 Fighting Falcon, which could provide both interceptor and ground-support capabilities.²²⁹ However, the Trudeau Government made it clear prior to its fall in 1979 that it wanted one aircraft that could do both jobs and not two separate aircraft. On 3 March 1980 the PC Government fell and was replaced by a Liberal government once again led by Trudeau. Upon taking office, Trudeau made

²²⁷ Canada, *SCEAND: Order of Reference Respecting: Main Estimates 1979-80 under National Defence*, Issue no. 6(Ottawa: Queen's Printer, May 15, 1979) in evidence from Honourable Minister of National Defence Barney Danson, 10.

²²⁸ Canada, *SCEAND: Order of Reference Respecting: Main Estimates 1978-79 under National Defence*, Issue no.19 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, May 30, 1978), in evidence from Deputy Minister of National Defence C.R. Nixon, 11.

²²⁹ Douglas L. Bland, "Canadian Neutrality: Its Military Consequences," in *The U.S.-Canada Security Relationship: The Politics, Strategy, and Technology of Defense*, ed. David G Haglund et al. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1989), 89.

Gilles Lamontaigne his new Defence Minister. His first goal was to reduce the number of aircraft in the competition and make it clear to AIRCOM that it would receive one class of aircraft to replace the ageing aircraft it currently possessed. The cost of the F-15, however, soon made Lamontaigne drop it from the competition, leaving only the de-navalized version of the F-18 and the F-16.

Both the F-18 and the F-16 went into the final competition in 1980. Once again the Government debated against Air Command about which aircraft to purchase. Minister of Defence Lamontaigne argued that as the F-16 was cheaper, more of these aircraft could be purchased under the \$2.4 billion budget for the project, therefore providing Air Command with more than the 150 aircraft originally projected to be purchased.²³⁰ While Air Command did indeed like the F-16 as a ground-support aircraft suitable for action in Western Europe, they did not believe that it was suitable to patrol the vast Canadian airspace in NORAD.²³¹ When the F-15 had been rejected, the Government had made it clear that they would only purchase one type of multi-role fighter to replace the three types currently serving in NORAD and NATO. As a result, AIRCOM worked diligently to have Ottawa announce the F-18 as the winner of the New Fighter Aircraft Project (NFAP).

AIRCOM pilots and commanders told Lamontaigne that the F-18 was ideal as it was equipped to carry long-range air-to-air missiles and had two engines, which was extremely important for any aircrew responsible for patrolling the vast Canadian

²³⁰ Canada, *SCEAND: Order of Reference Respecting: Main Estimates 1979-80 under National Defence*, Issue no. 6 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, March 15, 1979) in evidence from Andrew Brewin, 13.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, Appendix A6.

airspace.²³² Both of these important factors were not available on the F-16, as it had only one engine and by 1980 did not have the capability to carry long or medium range air-to-air missiles. As a result of both of these critical factors, Minister Lamontaigne along with Prime Minister Trudeau announced on 10 April 1980 that the F/A-18 Hornet had won the NFAP competition and would be purchased. Lamontaigne stated that this aircraft would provide both critical functions needed for AIRCOM.

The purchase of the CF-18 in early 1980 soon began to filter into the US and some in Congress soon began to wonder if the CF-18 was the best aircraft for Canada to purchase for NORAD operations. For much of the Cold War, the CF had devoted most of its air resources to air interception and combat forces. However, to become a joint partner in the defence of North America, Canada would have to acquire the type of military equipment that would allow it to work closely with the Americans in both air and maritime defence.²³³ This increased cooperation was characterized by the interest the USAF took in Canada's acquisition of a new fighter aircraft. Speaking before a congressional sub-committee in September 1981, USAF Colonel Robert Carlberg argued that the F-18 was a good aircraft that would allow the Canadian Air Command to adequately "defend the northern borders of the United States."²³⁴ While there was no evidence of direct USAF involvement in the NFA program, this statement by a USAF colonel effectively showed the importance they put on the necessity of a new Canadian fighter aircraft. Colonel Carlberg's statement also showed an increasing interoperability

²³² Canada, *SCEAND: Order of Reference Respecting: Main Estimates 1979-80 under National Defence*, Issue no. 8 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, March 22, 1979) in evidence from Brigadier-General Paul Manson (Program Manager, New Fighter Aircraft Program), 7.

²³³ Middlemiss and Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence*, 54.

²³⁴ John D. Harbron, "Strategy for a Strong Defence Industrial Base," Text of Remarks by John D. Harbron, Foreign Affairs Analyst, On the Occasion of a Joint Luncheon of the Aerospace Industries Association of Canada and the Aerospace Industries Association of America. In *Draft of Articles and Clippings, 1983-1984*, MG 31 D224 Volume 6, Library and Archives Canada.

between the USAF and Air Command as he did not distinguish one from the other but instead views them as one large force designed to protect North American airspace.

Congress also began to take an interest in the equipment that Ottawa was purchasing for Air Command. As early as 1978 the US Congressional Budget Office heavily debated the merits of Canada's purchase of the P-3C Orion ASW aircraft for long-range patrol of North American coastlines. Their conclusion was that the aircraft represented "a major contribution of land-based aviation to anti-submarine warfare" and that Canada would need more to adequately protect North America.²³⁵ While USAF officials defended Canada's air defence contribution to North America, they also began to place pressure, both official and unofficial, on NDHQ and the Prime Minister's Office to adopt American air defence proposals.

Officials from the USAF and Air Command had worked very closely together since the signing of NORAD in 1957. Throughout the next two decades this relationship was used to help provide Air Command with the abilities to defend Canadian airspace from external threats. However, with increasing tensions between the superpowers, the USAF began to place an increasing importance on Air Command's ability to assist them in its defensive strategies. A number of USAF proposals strongly emphasized the reshaping of Air Command along American lines. Two proposals in particular highlighted the new direct attitude the USAF was taking in regards to the needs of Air Command.

The first proposal, an unofficial one, had been submitted to AIRCOM in 1979 and suggested that Canada purchase either the F-14 or F-15 fighter in order to help the USAF

²³⁵ Joseph T. Jockel & Joel J. Sokolsky, "Emphasizing the Assets: A Proposal for the Restructuring of Canada's Military Contribution to NATO," *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 16, no. 4 (Autumn 1979), 18.

and USN defend the North Atlantic sea-lanes from Soviet aircraft.²³⁶ This proposal was followed in 1983 by an official proposal submitted from Washington, on behalf of USAF strategic planners, to the Canadian federal government requesting that Canada purchase up to twelve E-3 Sentry AWACS aircraft and five squadrons of F-15 fighters for continental defence.²³⁷ Furthermore, the Americans suggested that the previously purchased CF-18 fighters be transferred to assist the USAF in Western Europe.²³⁸ Not only would these proposals increase the strength of Air Command, but they would also increase the strength directly available to assist the USAF in a major conflict. Despite both of these proposals being rejected by Ottawa, it signaled to the federal government that the US wanted Canada to take on a larger role in both North American and NATO defence.

While Air Command did have units stationed with American squadrons in Germany, it mostly cooperated with the USAF in the defence of North America through NORAD. In the eyes of many American air force officials, a strengthened Air Command would help free up American air units for other military commitments.²³⁹ Not only did the USAF have to designate sufficient air defence forces to defend both American and Canadian airspace, but they also had to be prepared to designate aircraft to help the small Air Command transport fleet fly Canadian soldiers and equipment to Europe. In addition to publicly demanding that Ottawa upgrade its fighter fleet, the USAF also wanted

²³⁶ Jockel & Sokolsky, "Emphasizing the Assets," 18.

²³⁷ R.B. Byers et al., *The Canadian Strategic Review 1983*, (Toronto: The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies), 84.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 85.

²³⁹ David G. Haglund & Joel J. Sokolsky, "Introduction," in *The U.S.-Canada Security Relationship: The Politics, Strategy, and Technology of Defense*, ed. David G. Haglund et al. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press Inc., 1989), 6.

Canada to upgrade its ageing air transport fleet.²⁴⁰ Not only would this increase the aircraft available to the USAF in a major conflict, but it would also free up valuable USAF assets to transport American soldiers and equipment across the globe.²⁴¹ It was clear that with the end of détente the USAF wanted Canada to take on a greater role in its own security as they no longer wanted to reserve significant conventional forces for the defence of Canada. For the first time since the late 1950s, the US military was taking direct action to help the CF rebuild its strength. This new action by the USAF, however, was designed to bring Canadian air units into the larger American military strategies and plans for the defence of Europe and not North America.

Since 1968 the Canadian Forces had been oriented towards the continental defence of North America and away from Europe. This was especially true in regards to Air Command, which Trudeau saw as being the main force in protecting Canadian sovereignty. Unlike their northern neighbours, however, the USAF had never placed continental defence as a high priority and did not want to devote substantial resources to its defence.²⁴² Beginning in the early 1980s, the US began to become more concerned about Canada's European defence contributions than its share of North American defence.²⁴³ The new direct approach that the USAF was taking with Air Command was designed to increase Canada's military commitments to Europe and not North America.

A strong example of this new American desire was the proposal of USAF strategic planners regarding the defence of Iceland. Iceland was considered extremely

²⁴⁰ Bruce A. Harris, "Trends in Alliance Conventional Defense Initiatives: Implications for North American and European Security," in *The U.S.-Canada Security Relationship: The Politics, Strategy, and Technology of Defense*, ed. David G. Haglund et al. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press Inc., 1989), 57.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 57.

²⁴² Middlemiss & Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence*, 155.

²⁴³ Joseph Jockel & Joel J. Sokolsky, "Introduction: The Road from Ogdensburg," in *Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defence Cooperation: The Road from Ogdensburg*, ed. Joseph T. Jockel et al. (Lewiston NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 3.

important in the defence of the North Atlantic sea-lanes. Throughout the years it had become the sole responsibility of the USAF and USN to defend the island and provide fighters and ASW aircraft to the island in the event of hostilities. However, with the increasing military preference moving away from nuclear and towards conventional warfare, the USAF wished to divest itself of this commitment and looked towards the CF to take it up. American defence academic Paul George argued in 1982 that Canada take over the defence of Iceland, which would free up US Marines and Air Force assets for European defence.²⁴⁴ It was also suggested that Canadian CF-18 fighters and Aurora ASW aircraft take over for their American counterparts on Iceland in the defence of the North Atlantic.²⁴⁵ Not only would this free up American assets but it would also help the US redirect Canadian military priorities towards Europe and away from North America. At the same time it would place Air Command in an important ASW and interceptor role in the middle of the NATO sea-lanes.

While these arguments did have considerable support within elements of the US military, they did not hold any standing with senior American and Canadian military and defence officials. The US was not interested in handing over control of the defence of Iceland, which the Pentagon considered to be a key cog in NATO defence, to any of its allies. They would welcome Canadian support in the defence of Iceland but it would remain under US command. Despite these proposed plans never coming to fruition it did show a major effort by the Canadian and US governments to find an important position for Air Command outside of North America that also played into its two main strengths, air-to-air interception and anti-submarine warfare.

²⁴⁴ Harris, "Trends in Alliance Conventional Defense Initiatives," 58.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 59.

Finding a position for AIRCOM outside of North America was an opinion that was not only held by USAF officials but also by officials within Air Command. With an increasing priority being placed on conventional military forces by the US government, Canadian air force officials began to realize that their American allies would no longer settle for the laissez-faire attitude given to defence by previous governments. Brigadier-General Claude La France of Air Command illustrated this new attitude between Canadian and American air force officials to pressure Ottawa into reshaping Canada's conventional assets at a SCEAND meeting in 1985. At this meeting, General La France argued that détente was over and that Canada would quickly lose influence with the Americans unless the government provided the CF with the equipment and manpower to make a significant contribution to American and NATO defence.²⁴⁶ At another SCEAND meeting in 1985, Canadian defence analyst Stephen Clarkson argued that Canada had a further bilateral commitment to the US to rebuild the capabilities of the CF. This was because of the advanced degree of integration that the CF, particularly Air Command, had achieved in the US military structure and American strategic plans.²⁴⁷ If Canada wanted to maintain an influence with the USAF in the defence of North America, it would have to provide Air Command with the assets to make an identifiable contribution to American and NATO defence.

However, the USAF also wanted Canada to increase NORAD cooperation that would give the USAF access to Canadian facilities, equipment, and airspace. One of the most important events regarding USAF influence on Air Command was the NORAD

²⁴⁶ SCEAND, "Order of Reference Respecting NORAD," Issues no. 39 (October 15, 1985), by Government of Canada (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1985), 34. He stated that whatever "influence we have with our allies is in some instances due to their goodwill more than the hard counting of our military resources."

²⁴⁷ Clarkson, "NORAD: Does Canada Have an Option?," A38.

renewal process that occurred in 1985 and 1986. The difference between this NORAD renewal and previous agreements was that the USAF wanted direct access to Canadian airspace and facilities as well as an increase in Canadian air defence forces. On 18 March 1985 at the Quebec Summit, newly-elected Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and President Ronald Reagan released a statement to the public that effectively illustrated the new defence dynamic between the two allies: “We are neighbours and allies dedicated to the defence and nourishment of peace and freedom. The security of Canada and the United States are inextricably linked.”²⁴⁸ This statement was very significant as it was unlike previous Canadian government statements, which often went to great pains to illustrate the independence of the CF and Canada from the US Armed Forces.

This meeting was soon followed by the release of the *NORAD 1986* report by AIRCOM and the Ministry of National Defence. Despite the importance this document placed on the role of Air Command in North American defence, it also showed the increasing cooperation between Air Command and the USAF in both North America and Europe. The report identified that the Canadian and American air forces had begun to place an emphasis on interoperability and cooperation instead of strictly focusing on the protection of sovereign airspace. It stated that training exercises held between Air Command and USAF placed its main priorities to developing “interoperability, standardization of procedures, and training under different climatic conditions and levels of threat.”²⁴⁹ Furthermore, the report identified that both air forces had developed procedures to support each other at both home and abroad. The USAF was prepared to

²⁴⁸ Canada, *SCEAND: Order of Reference Respecting NORAD*, Issue No. 38 (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer October 10, 1985), in evidence from Mr. C.R. Nixon, 4.

²⁴⁹ Canada, *NORAD 1986: Report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence February 1986*, (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 1986), 13.

support Canadian operations with land and tactical air support that would be provided by US REDCOM, the Alaska Air Command, or the Joint Task Force, Alaska.²⁵⁰ In order to get the Canadian government to adopt USAF strategies and plans regarding European and North Atlantic defence, American officials made it clear that any American air units operating on Canadian soil would come under the command of Canadian air force officials.²⁵¹ This was a significant step by American military officials, who had previously been adamant about US forces in Canada operating under American and not Canadian national command. However, if Canada would not shift its focus away from continental defence, then the USAF made it clear that it would have to move significant forces onto Canadian territory to ensure the defence of North America.

One of the major issues facing continued AIRCOM-USAF cooperation was the heavily debated NORAD renewal, about which a decision was needed by the spring of 1986. Throughout 1985 the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence heavily debated the pros and cons of renewing or rejecting the NORAD renewal in 1986. The main point of opposition among members of SCEAND, the Canadian public and Members of Parliament was the US Strategic Defense Initiative initiated by President Reagan in 1981. The SDI was an undertaking that Reagan tasked to all branches of the US military to develop ground and spaced base defence systems designed to destroy any inter-continental ballistic missile (ICBM) fired at the US.²⁵² It was argued that the original NORAD Agreement was simply to protect Canadian and American airspace from attack by Soviet bombers or cruise missiles and that the SDI went outside of this

²⁵⁰ Canada, *NORAD 1986*, 13.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 13.

²⁵² Gerold Yonas, "The Strategic Defense Initiative," *Daedalus* 114, no. 2 Special Issue: Weapons in Space, Volume 1: Concepts and Technologies (Spring 1985), 80.

agreement. Many in the Canadian public believed that the US SDI was being designed so as to enable the US to conduct a first-strike against the Soviet Union while also being able to defend itself against any Soviet retaliatory nuclear strikes.²⁵³ As a result, many of the witnesses representing public pressure groups argued that Canadian air defence units would be used to help defend the US from a retaliatory strike that Washington had initiated.²⁵⁴ Despite this fear, members of the CF who were brought in front of the Committee argued that NORAD needed to be renewed for the protection of Canada.

Canadian AIRCOM Brigadier-General Claude La France contended that NORAD was beneficial to Canada and it needed to be renewed. He argued that while the SDI was designed to provide a greater defence of North America from a potential Soviet first-strike, the US was not demanding Canadian participation. He further stated that the USAF had even opted to include a clause in the NORAD renewal stating that Canada would not be asked to participate in the program unless Ottawa requested it.²⁵⁵ Participation with the US through NORAD had been vital to Canadian defence since it was introduced in 1957, and AIRCOM officials made it clear that without NORAD it would be difficult, if not impossible, for Canada to defend its own airspace and provide aircraft to NATO. General La France argued that AIRCOM would not be able to properly defend Canadian airspace with all 138 newly purchased CF-18 fighters, let alone provide aircraft for contingencies within NATO.²⁵⁶ As a result, AIRCOM needed NORAD to enable it fulfill its basic objectives of protecting Canada's sovereignty.

²⁵³ Canada, *SCEAND: Order of Reference Respecting NORAD*, Issue no. 48 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, November 21, 1985) in evidence from Mr. Bill Robinson, 6.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 6.

²⁵⁵ Canada, *SCEAND: Order of Reference Respecting NORAD*, Issue no. 39 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, October 15, 1985) in evidence from Brig.-Gen. Claude La France, 34.

²⁵⁶ Canada, *SCEAND*, Issue No. 39 (October 15, 1985) in evidence from Brig.-Gen. Claude La France, 38.

The result of these arguments in SCEAND was that the committee sided with the CF and recommended that the Mulroney government strive for two important goals in the NORAD Renewal Agreement. The first was that the government should negotiate with the US a joint arrangement for the air and naval defence of the Arctic Ocean; the second was for Canada and the US to take further steps to better integrate their command, control and communication systems with respect to the air and maritime defence of North America.²⁵⁷ With the approval of the NORAD renewal by SCEAND, Mulroney's Minister of Defence Erik Nielsen and his successor, Perrin Beatty, worked to renew NORAD with the US. With the approval of Parliament, Mulroney and Beatty worked with President Reagan and the US Department of Defense to renew NORAD, which was officially renewed in March of 1986.

However, even while the renewal agreement was being debated by Canadian politicians, the CF and USAF were working to better prepare for a Soviet assault on North America. Through the NORAD renewal discussions, the USAF had effectively gained access to Canadian Air Command facilities, personnel and equipment. While this was acceptable to Canadian government and military officials, the proposed plan outlined by American General Abrahamson, the commander of the US Strategic Defense Initiative Office, in early 1985 was not. General Abrahamson made it clear to American government officials that to successfully defend North America the USAF would have to deploy a substantial number of fighter squadrons, AWACS aircraft, radar, and air defence missiles to the Canadian north.²⁵⁸ He argued that there was no point in keeping these

²⁵⁷ Canada, *NORAD 1986: Report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, February 1986), 74.

²⁵⁸ Canada, *SCEAND: Order of Reference Respecting NORAD*, Issue no. 39 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, October 15, 1985) in evidence from Mr. Lawrence Hogan, 5.

forces in the US if they would have to be moved into Canada to be used effectively.²⁵⁹

The 1987 White Paper, *Challenge and Commitment: A Defence Policy for Canada*, stated that the USAF would forward deploy America AWACS aircraft to Canadian air bases on a regular basis while USAF interceptors would be dispatched to Canada during a crisis.²⁶⁰

For years Air Command had been adopting USAF strategies and doctrines while the politicians in Ottawa pushed it towards cooperation with the USAF that was so close many believed Air Command was being integrated into the American air force.

General Abrahamson had made it clear that Canada had committed Air Command to assisting the USAF in both the defence of North America and the defence of Western Europe. This American air force official was simply stating that his suggestion could become a possibility because of the increasing relationship between the two armed forces. Since Washington had taken an increased interest in the rebuilding of the CF in late 1979, the Canadian military had been inching itself closer and working on integrating key elements with the US Armed Forces in order to enhance, not infringe, Canadian sovereignty.²⁶¹ While Air Command received a lot of attention from politicians and the public because of its role in NORAD and protecting Canadian sovereignty, it was not alone and was simply part of a larger trend that affected all branches of the Canadian Forces and ultimately led to direct cooperation with the US.

Mobile Command and the US Army

Unlike Air Command, which focused mostly on North America, Mobile Command had focused on its various commitments to NATO in Western Europe and to

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 5.

²⁶⁰ Department of National Defence, *Challenge and Commitment: A Defence Policy for Canada* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1987), 18.

²⁶¹ Jockel, *Canada in NORAD*, 121.

United Nations operations. With the low priority that the Trudeau government had placed on NATO defence for most of the 1970s, Mobile Command was severely depleted. By 1981 it was in need of a major upgrade for most of its systems and needed highly trained personnel to help replace the thousands that it had lost since 1967. With the land forces being continually ignored, the forces in Europe, or bound for Europe in the event of hostilities, had begun to work very closely with their American Army counterparts to help ensure Canada's role in the defence of Western Europe and North America.

With the general lack of interest showed by the federal government, Mobile Command's leaders had developed a keen insight into the American Army and USMC and had begun to adjust their forces in order to cooperate very closely with the Americans in a war scenario. When Brian Mulroney took office as the new Prime Minister in September 1984 he found a Mobile Command that was constantly trying to adjust its plans and forces to strategic plans and trends coming out of the Pentagon.²⁶² While the Mulroney Government recognized the depleted state of Mobile Command, it was officials of the Reagan Administration and the American military who began to push the new Progressive Government to restore the capabilities and manpower that Canada's land forces were sorely lacking.

In a situation that was very similar to what had happened to the 4CMBG in Germany in the 1970s, the US Army began to work very closely with Mobile Command in an attempt to restructure Canadian defence plans for Western Europe. By 1983 Canada was responsible for committing 4CMBG in Germany, which was to grow to a light division in a crisis, and a CAST Brigade with air support to Norway.²⁶³ Seeing the dismal

²⁶² Middlemiss & Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence*, 1.

²⁶³ Harris, "Trends in Alliance Conventional Defense Initiatives," 55.

shape of Mobile Command, many officials of the US Army began to argue that Canada needed to reshape its focus on one area of Europe and not two. These same officials began to push Canadian defence officials to move out of Central Germany and only focus on Norway.²⁶⁴ Soon these Canadian military officials began to pressure the Mulroney Government, who began to see the benefits that Canada could reap by agreeing to this new American strategic plan. However, the Americans did not do this to help Canada but instead did it to simply free up valuable American conventional forces.

With the evident disdain of the détente policy by the Reagan Administration, the emphasis was beginning to move away from nuclear and towards conventional military forces. As these forces were expensive to maintain and operate, the US began to look towards its allies to take up part of the defence. President Reagan began to place an increased emphasis on the view that prosperous allies needed to assume greater military responsibilities in the defence of NATO.²⁶⁵ With this new policy in mind, American Army and Marine planners believed that if they could transfer Canadian land forces to the defence of Norway, they could free up forces to defend Germany. One of these principle assets was a USMC Expeditionary Brigade that had been promised to Norway with the Canadian CAST Brigade.²⁶⁶ In addition, the Canadian CAST Brigade and other forces dedicated to Norway had become an integral part of Washington's plans for the defence of Europe. Even though the CAST Brigade had never fully deployed to Norway, it was

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 55.

²⁶⁵ David S. Yost, "U.S. Military Power and Alliance Relations," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 517, Special Issue: New Directions in U.S. Defense Policy (September 1991), 85.

²⁶⁶ Johan Jorgen Holst, "The Pattern of Nordic Security," *Daedalus* 113, no. 2, Special Issue: Nordic Voices (Spring 1984), 205.

this commitment that the Americans took an intense interest in and wanted to integrate into its own forces in Northern Europe.

In the summer of 1984 the Reagan Administration pressed hard to restructure the force commitments to different areas of Europe. One of the major areas that Washington wanted restructured was the Canadian-American military units destined for Norway. As part of this desire, the US Army was instructed to create plans that would transform US light infantry units and Canadian Forces destined for Norway into robust, rapidly deployable military formations.²⁶⁷ In order to rapidly transport these forces over to Norway, the Pentagon also wanted a pooling of Canadian and American strategic sea and airlift capabilities, which basically became a way for including Canadian units into American troop deployment plans.²⁶⁸ The initial American plans attempted to maximize the available forces in Norway, and they also attempted to integrate the Canadian air, land, and naval units destined to Norway with their own forces. By creating these plans, it would help move the forces to Norway fast and efficiently, which would have had a large impact on the defence of Northern Europe in a time of increased hostilities. However, while these plans were created using existing forces destined for Norway, other informal plans created by American government and military officials called for the restructuring of Mobile Command along American lines.

Despite not yet being deployed as an entire brigade to its primary theatre of Norway, American military officials had integrated the CAST commitment into US military efforts for the defence of Europe. American defence analyst John L. Lellenberg made its importance to the US military evident in a meeting of American and Canadian

²⁶⁷ Adolf Carlson, *Who Will Stand the Nordic Guard? Determinants, Options and Bilateral Canadian-U.S. Responses to the Threat on NATO's Northern Flank* (Kingston, ON: Queen's University Press, 1991), 1.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

military officials in 1985. Lellenberg argued that the CAST commitment “is of the size, training and equipment needed to have a major impact on the battle and is also experienced in the Arctic conditions of Norway...it has significant fire support, anti-armor potential...and has some organic air defence.”²⁶⁹ In order to ensure that the Brigade would be committed to Norway, the Americans teamed it up with a USMC Brigade.

It was believed that placing the Canadian brigade with a mobile American brigade would help shape Canada’s commitment as well as show the American commitment to working closely with the Canadians. Furthermore, the organic air and sealift capabilities available to this USMC brigade would be able to help assist the transportation of the men and equipment of the CAST group to Norway.²⁷⁰ However, the US wanted to go further and pressed for the Canadian land forces to be restructured along American lines. If Canadian land forces could be structured on American lines than these units would be able to easily integrate into larger US divisions, corps and army groups in Europe and North America.

Officially, American government and military officials rarely questioned the role of the CF in NATO and instead focused on trying to get their European allies to increase military spending and manpower. Unofficially, however, members of the US Armed Forces wanted the CF to be restructured in order to better fit in with American units that they often worked side-by-side with. One of these unofficial proposals came about in late 1984 in the form of transformation of Mobile Command into American-style light-infantry units. First, it was argued that it would be cheaper to maintain light-infantry forces than heavy armoured formations and would also give Ottawa a greater military

²⁶⁹ Middlemiss & Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence*, 191.

²⁷⁰ Maloney, “Purple Haze,” 62.

flexibility in sovereignty and UN operations.²⁷¹ Both Canadian and American defence officials realized that the Canadian government had fiscal limitations and concerns over military interaction between the two North American neighbours.

Despite these concerns, Mobile Command conducted a study in the early 1980s to examine the feasibility of turning 4CMBG into a unit similar to a US Army Cavalry brigade, which was rapidly transportable and had both mechanized and heavy armour units.²⁷² Although this study was appealing to many in Mobile Command and CFE, it was rejected by NDHQ on the grounds that reorganizing Canadian forces to facilitate their incorporation into a US Army division would undermine Ottawa's desire to maintain a separate and distinctive Canadian identity in the CF.²⁷³ However, they also believed that this structure would help support American military objectives in Europe and at the same time provide Ottawa with greater flexibility of its land forces that they could use for inherent Canadian concerns. Furthermore, Mobile Command, which did not wish to lose its heavy armoured capabilities, did not have any desire to switch to a light infantry structure. They had successfully fought proposals from Defence Ministers Paul Hellyer and Donald Macdonald in the 1960s and 1970s that similarly wanted Mobile Command to adopt a light-infantry structure. As a result, many military commanders in Mobile Command assumed that this, and subsequent studies, were designed to have Mobile Command solely focus on Norwegian defence so that US Army and USMC units could be designated for other areas of Europe.

While the US and NATO considered the CAST commitment a key component of Norwegian defence, Mobile Command had always considered it as an utter failure and

²⁷¹ Carlson, *Who Will Stand the Nordic Guard?*, 63.

²⁷² Maloney, *War Without Battles*, 279.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, 280.

the forces could be used elsewhere. Since the Canadian government agreed to CAST deployment in Northern Europe in 1968, Mobile Command did not believe it could be successfully achieved, as Canada did not have its own organic air and sealift capabilities to transport it to Norway in time for the start of hostilities. As a result, the CAST deployment would always be dependent on Allied transport capabilities, which would already be severely strained in a crisis situation. In August 1986 the entire CAST brigade with its supporting elements deployed to Norway for the first and only time in OPERATION BRAVE LION.²⁷⁴ To transport and deploy the entire brigade group took thirty days, which was the projected length of any war in Europe between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.²⁷⁵ The failure of this exercise soon forced Defence Minister Beatty to reconsider the CAST commitment altogether. NATO strategists argued throughout 1984 and 1985 that to successfully defend Norway both the US and Canada would have to accomplish a number of important goals.

With the emphasis no longer on nuclear warfare but on conventional weapons, European NATO members, mainly Norway and Denmark, wanted both Canada and the US to take on a greater role in the defence of Norway and Northern Europe. They identified a number of items that both countries would have to work out in order to successfully defend Norway. First of all, they argued that Canadian land forces would have to be reoriented towards Norway and the Americans would have to enhance the capabilities of their light infantry divisions.²⁷⁶ In addition, the European NATO nations wanted the two North American countries to create an integrated deployment plan, which

²⁷⁴ Lieutenant-Colonel G.D. Hunt, "Reinforcing the NATO North Flank: The Canadian Experience," *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 16, no. 4 (April 1987), 32.

²⁷⁵ Middlemiss and Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence*, 191.

²⁷⁶ Sherwood S. Cordier, *The Defense of NATO's Northern Front and U.S. Military Policy* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1989), 8.

would depend primarily upon American air and sealift capabilities with Canadian naval escort vessels.²⁷⁷ Indeed, Canadian-American land forces did cooperate closely within North America, even though there was very little land threat to that continent. Despite these European desires, Bill McKnight, the Minister of Defence from January 1989 to April 1991, announced in November 1989 that the CAST commitment would be disbanded. He announced that the forces designated for it would be reoriented to Canada's commitment in CENTAG as well as to Allied Command Europe Mobile Force-Land (ACE) in Denmark and northern Germany.

In addition to this close cooperation in North America and Europe, Mobile Command was beginning to adopt many of the US Army's warfare strategies and doctrines for conflict in both North America and Western Europe. During the mid-1980s Mobile Command worked closely with the US Army in training to implement two important military plans, should the need for them have arisen: the Canada-US Land Operation Plan (LANDOP) and the continued development of the AirLand Battle Doctrine. Prime Ministers Trudeau and Mulroney began to recognize that American security requirements essentially bound Canada to American military concepts and strategies.²⁷⁸ Both of these plans were important to the conventional American military planning for both North America and Europe, and it quickly became clear that Mobile Command needed to closely cooperate with the US Army if these plans were to succeed.

While LANDOP had been designed by the two militaries as early as the 1960s, it came to take on a larger role in the 1980s when both NATO and the Warsaw Pact moved away from nuclear conflict and began to focus their efforts on conventional military

²⁷⁷ Carlson, *Who Will Stand the Nordic Guard?*, 65.

²⁷⁸ Douglas Bland, "Trends in Canadian Security Policy and Commitments," *Armed Forces & Society* 15, no. 1 (Fall 1988): 121.

forces. As a result, the US Army and Mobile Command practiced the implementation of LANDOP on an annual basis. The LANDOP plan called for the use of both Canadian and American land units in the defence of continental North America.²⁷⁹ Despite there being no immediate threat to North America from an enemy ground force, LANDOP also provided the framework for both the Canadian and American ground forces to develop important procedures and interoperability, which could both be used in any potential conflicts in Europe or across the globe.

The training that both Canadian and American ground forces had in North America also focused on the implementation of the US AirLand Battle Doctrine in any NATO-Warsaw Pact conflict in Europe. The AirLand Battle Doctrine that had been developed by the US Army during the early 1980s focused on how American and NATO forces would be able to win any conventional war with the numerically superior Warsaw Pact forces in Europe. The implementation of this doctrine was also a significant element of the combined training exercises held between Canadian and US forces in both North America and Europe. This plan emphasized that the armoured unit was the most important element of modern warfare, but for them to be used successfully they had to be supported by infantry, artillery, engineers and close-air support.²⁸⁰ Furthermore, this doctrine laid out what equipment was needed and how the forces were to be organized for the plan to be successful.²⁸¹ As 4CMBG was to be a reserve part of the US CENTAG, it became necessary for Mobile Command to become familiar with this US plan. In conjunction with this plan, and to ensure that Canada would be able to operate with the US Army in the event this plan was initiated, Mobile Command developed a plan to

²⁷⁹ Canada, *NORAD 1986*, 13.

²⁸⁰ Stewart, et al., *American Military History: Volume II*, 379.

²⁸¹ Stewart, et al., *American Military History: Volume II*, 379.

rapidly reinforce 4CMBG to allow it to take on a significant role in this new US doctrine. This new reorganization went hand-in-hand with AirLand Battle Doctrine and was designed to allow the Canadians to assist the US in the implementation of this plan.

Throughout the 1980s Mobile Command worked closely with the US Army and USMC in order to make the best possible contribution to the defence of NATO with the limited resources available to it. Despite finding that the CAST commitment was a total failure, resulting in its disbandment in 1989, Mobile Command redirected these forces to the US CENTAG in Germany. Furthermore, through annual exercises in both Europe and North America, Canadian and American land forces continued to develop a highly integrated set of procedures, tactics, equipment and training that had begun as early as 1962.

Maritime Command and a New Canadian Naval Defence Stance

While Mobile Command was focused on working with the American army in Europe and North America, Maritime Command was faced with both increased cooperation with the USN and an increase in criticism from the USN because of new naval defence plans put forward by Prime Minister Mulroney and his Cabinet. As a result of the lack of funding and the decreased emphasis on conventional forces by the Trudeau government throughout the 1970s, Maritime Command began the 1980s in extremely dire straits. MARCOM began the 1980s with a vital relationship with the USN in which American vessels often supported Canadian naval task forces and Canadian vessels worked almost exclusively on ASW operations in the North Atlantic. However, by the end of the 1980s this extremely close relationship between the two navies grew into one of the great Canadian military controversies of the Cold War—the decision by the

Mulroney Government to purchase nuclear attack submarines (SSNs) for Maritime Command. Despite this controversy the cooperation between the USN and Maritime Command emphasized the influence that the US military had on both the Canadian government and armed forces throughout the decade.

It became clear to the Trudeau government in early 1980 that they could no longer ignore the needs and forces of Maritime Command. This became a reality in the summer of 1980 with a demand by Canada's NATO allies, most specifically the US, for Ottawa to significantly upgrade and improve its forces. On 30 July 1980, NATO commanders in Brussels and Norfolk assigned Canada a new naval mission to train for in the event of a major conflict. This task was for Maritime Command to focus on anti-air and anti-surface capabilities designed to help escort USN aircraft carrier Strike Groups across the Atlantic where they could strike Soviet naval bases.²⁸² NATO naval commanders wanted Canada to field three such naval task forces by the end of 1987.²⁸³ It was clear that the USN and Canada's European allies wanted the Trudeau government to significantly improve its naval forces that were sorely lacking in almost every category. However, while Canada's NATO European allies wanted Canada to take on a larger role, they did not realize just how dependent Canada's naval forces had become on the USN as a result of constant budget cuts and force reductions during the tumultuous years of the previous decade.

The USN had long been after Ottawa to improve Canada's naval forces and found a new opportunity with the new demands made upon Canada by the NATO council in Brussels. While NATO made these new demands and objectives for Maritime Command clear to the Canadian government, they also failed to realize the lack of existing

²⁸² Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 288.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, 288.

capabilities of the Canadian navy. Soon after Trudeau agreed to the new NATO naval plans, Canadian naval officers made it clear to the federal government that every Canadian naval task force that could operate in the Atlantic would need a USN air defence frigate or destroyer for air-defence, as that was a capability that Maritime Command did not have.²⁸⁴ As Trudeau had scrapped the last Canadian aircraft carrier, *HMCS Bonaventure*, in 1970, naval officials argued that Canada would have three options to assist USN task forces and NATO convoys in air defence: provide their warships with advanced surface-to-air missile (SAM) defence systems, arrange for NATO land-based or carrier-based air coverage for their routes, or rely on the air defence capabilities of the USN to defend Canadian warships escorting NATO convoys.²⁸⁵ While these options were made clear to MARCOM in 1977, it was in 1980 that they were given the funding and permission to develop a new Canadian Patrol Frigate for future operations. It was on these new vessels that MARCOM officials hoped to develop a better ship-based air defence platform. Two of these three options were entirely dependent on the forces of the USN, which itself was undergoing a vast change and vastly desired that Maritime Command develop its own air defence capabilities.

Within NATO, convoy escort and maritime defence of the Atlantic in the early 1980s were focused on the maritime forces of the RN, USN and Maritime Command. However, the election of Ronald Reagan to the presidency resulted in the USN being forced away from purely defensive operations and developing a more forward defence strategy. Beginning in the summer of 1981, the USN began to concentrate its resources on super-carrier battle groups and began to push for its allies, particularly Canada and the

²⁸⁴ Milner, *Canada's Navy*, 291.

²⁸⁵ Lindsey, "Protection of Shipping in the 1980's," 10.

UK, to take on the responsibility of convoy protection and ASW operations in the Atlantic.²⁸⁶ Maritime defence of the North Atlantic had long been the primary responsibility of Canadian and American naval forces. While these two forces worked together under the auspices of NATO's Atlantic Command and not a bilateral agreement, they practiced naval operations in the Western Atlantic exclusively together and not with other NATO naval forces.

Canada's MARCOM began to operate almost exclusively with the US 2nd Fleet in the Western Atlantic, while MARPAC worked solely with the US 3rd Fleet, based out of Pearl Harbor.²⁸⁷ Canadian naval operations in Canada's area of responsibility were all closely coordinated with those of the American fleets, and the USN provided Maritime Command with submarines and helicopters to assist in ASW training when these forces were unavailable to Canadian commanders for training.²⁸⁸ With this close working relationship and in conjunction with the new US Forward Maritime Defense Strategy in 1983, the Canadian government was forced to rapidly push forward with a number of procurement and shipbuilding plans to rapidly modernize its naval forces.

The American Joint Chiefs of Staff, under orders from President Reagan to develop a plan to contain the Soviet Navy before it could reach the North Atlantic sea-lanes in a conflict, developed the American Forward Maritime Defense Strategy.²⁸⁹ Keeping the North Atlantic sea-lanes open to NATO warships and merchant vessels

²⁸⁶ Cordier, *The Defense of NATO's Northern Front*, 24.

²⁸⁷ Joel J. Sokolsky, *Defending Canada: U.S.-Canadian Defence Policies* (New York: Priority Press Publications, 1989), 36.

²⁸⁸ George Lindsey, "Canada-U.S. Defense Relations in the Cold War," in *Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defense Cooperation: The Road from Ogdensburg*, ed. Joel J. Sokolsky et al. (Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 76.

²⁸⁹ Ronald O'Rourke, "The Future of the U.S. Navy," in *Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defense Cooperation: The Road from Ogdensburg*, ed. Joel J. Sokolsky et al. (Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 291.

would be critical in defeating any Soviet invasion of Western Europe. While the USN would provide the main offensive forces for this operation, it would need the support of its NATO allies in order for the strategy to be truly successful. As a result, American naval and government officials began to place increased pressure on their NATO partners to rapidly modernize and expand their naval fleets. As the USN was trying to contain the Soviet Navy in its bases in northern Russia, ASW and convoy protection would be largely dependent on the other NATO allies' escort vessels. USN commanders saw Canada's commitment of ASW forces to the North Atlantic favourably, as it freed up American naval vessels for this new forward defence strategy.²⁹⁰ With this pressure from the USN and Reagan administration, Trudeau realized that MARCOM's current fleet needed to be upgraded and a new class of modern frigates was essential.

In 1983 the Trudeau government approved the budget and design for the Canadian Patrol Frigate Project. The project was awarded to Saint John Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company on 29 June 1983 with a target budget of \$2.584 billion.²⁹¹ This project was to introduce a new class of general-purpose frigates, with emphasis on air-defence and ASW capabilities, into Maritime Command by the middle of the 1980s.²⁹² With a planned acquisition of twelve state-of-the-art naval frigates, Maritime Command would be able to take its role in the USN's maritime strategy. However, while the naval commanders in Halifax and Ottawa applauded this purchase, it also signified that Maritime Command would follow its traditional policy of focusing on ASW operations

²⁹⁰ Joseph T. Jockel, "U.S. Interests and Canadian Defence Policy in the 1990's: New Epoch, New Era; Old Agenda," in *Canada and NATO: Uneasy Past, Uncertain Future*, ed. Margaret O. MacMillan et al. (Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo Press, 1990), 116.

²⁹¹ Middlemiss and Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence*, 201.

²⁹² Statement of Derek Blackburn, 8 June 1987, House of Commons, *Debates*, Session, 1987, Vol. VI: June 2- June 30, pp. 6617-7905, *Mr. Derek Blackburn, June 8 1987*, 6783.

while leaving the larger naval tasks to the Americans. The USN gladly approved of this new Canadian proposal, as it would free up American resources for aircraft carriers and SSNs while having Canada focus on smaller, less expensive vessels like destroyers and frigates.²⁹³ Despite the USN's desire for larger Allied surface fleets, it did not want any of its allies to interfere with its own plans and capabilities.

The USN considered itself as the primary adversary of the Soviet Navy and, therefore, discouraged its NATO allies from developing any of their own force projection vessels, which could lead to an ally taking on the Soviet Navy without the USN's assistance.²⁹⁴ As a result, Canadian naval commanders and the Trudeau government were able to develop a new force structure that was based upon frigates, destroyers and maritime surveillance aircraft. Ottawa did not look to purchase any of the larger vessels, which were considered too expensive for Maritime Command, and instead would be able to integrate its smaller vessels into larger American naval task forces.

The rearming of Maritime Command was to become the focal point of newly elected Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's defence policy in the fall of 1984. However, whereas the Trudeau government had focused on procuring new frigates, destroyers and maritime patrol aircraft, Mulroney also began to discuss the possible acquisition of nuclear attack submarines for the CF. At the beginning of 1985, NATO and Canadian analysts began to propose that the Canadian government purchase SSNs as an alternative to building a large number of escort warships.²⁹⁵ It was believed that a fleet of SSNs would allow Canada to better defend its NATO maritime commitments as well as enabling Maritime Command to help defend important sea-lanes around the globe.

²⁹³ Jockel, "U.S. Interests and Canadian Defence Policy in the 1990's," 116.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 114.

²⁹⁵ Jockel & Sokolsky, "Emphasizing the Assets," 18.

However, despite the discussions that went on between analysts, it was not until the beginning of 1987 that Mulroney began to seriously consider the purchase of SSNs for Maritime Command. It was this announcement in the 1987 Defence White Paper that was to lead to the direct involvement of the USN and government in Canadian maritime defence to ensure that this purchase would not occur.

In June 1987 the Mulroney government released its new defence policy in *Challenge and Commitment: A Defence Policy for Canada*. While many of the items outlined in the document were greatly approved of by the US military and government, there was one proposal within the document that did not go over well: the purchase of nuclear attack submarines. The document argued that a fleet of nuclear-powered submarines would enable Canada to better defend her NATO commitments in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.²⁹⁶ Furthermore, the document stated that these submarines would complement Canada's maritime aircraft and surface ships in a "vivid demonstration of Canadian determination to meet challenges" in the Pacific, Atlantic and Arctic Oceans.²⁹⁷ While the new policy outlined the Mulroney government's determination to increase the forces available to Maritime Command to enable it to better support the American naval forces, the USN argued vehemently against Canada acquiring such advanced technology.

NATO analysts applauded the proposed Canadian purchase. They argued that the SSN was a more effective weapon for sea-denial roles in the Atlantic and Pacific than

²⁹⁶ Department of National Defence, *Challenge and Commitment: A Defence Policy for Canada* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1987), 53.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 53.

maritime aircraft, diesel submarines and surface warships.²⁹⁸ However, while this purchase could help American naval power, the USN immediately began to pressure members of its own government to dissuade Ottawa from making this purchase. The USN argued in the fall of 1987 through a number of NATO articles that the SSN was a power-projection weapon and was not a great weapon for convoy and coastal defence operations.²⁹⁹ While the USN expressed their concern of this proposed Canadian naval purchase in Congress, they did not make any direct lobbying to either MARCOM officials or the Canadian government. Instead, USN officials, particularly USN Submarine Command, relied on its supporters in Congress to lobby on their behalf in Ottawa. The Americans wanted Maritime Command to continue to focus on operating small escort ships and patrol aircraft for ASW operations and not on nuclear powered submarines. Washington did not want the other North American nation to acquire SSNs, as they would have to share and coordinate the movements of their submarines with Ottawa.

The USN feared that Canadian SSNs would be used to project Canadian sovereignty into the Arctic Ocean.³⁰⁰ This Maritime region had been the sole domain of American nuclear submarines for several decades and they did not wish to have to share this region with another ally, even one so close as Canada. The USN argued that the SSN purchase would not be used to defend the Arctic against Soviet forces but would instead be used to trail and monitor the activities of USN forces operating in secret.³⁰¹ They

²⁹⁸ R.B. Byers, "The 1987 Defence White Paper: An Analysis," *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 17, no. 2 (Autumn 1987), 18.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 18.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 18.

³⁰¹ Canada, *SCEAND: Consideration of the White Paper on National Defence*, Issue no. 24 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, February 2, 1988), in evidence from Mr. T. Frith, 16.

feared that they would have to coordinate their top-secret submarine operations in the Arctic with Maritime Command. This belief came from the detailed naval plan called the Canada-US Maritime East Operations Order (MAREASTOP). This plan was the basic document for East coast operations; however, Ottawa wished to expand this order into the Arctic Ocean as well. It calls for the detailed direction and guidance for coordinated naval operations of both countries and also calls for mutual maritime training and a command-and-control relationship between the two navies.³⁰² If Canada were to acquire these submarines and expand the plan into the Arctic, it would force the USN to coordinate their submarine routes and patrol areas with Canada's submarine commanders.

It was made clear in the 1987 Defence White Paper that Canada needed this new weapon to help it maintain the sovereignty of its Arctic. While the document focused on defending Canada from Soviet naval forces, it also stated that the SSN program would strengthen Canadian sovereignty as they could monitor the many activities of USN submarines in the Arctic.³⁰³ Indeed, Canadian naval analyst John Harbron argued in a series of articles that if Canada did not acquire submarines to defend the Arctic then it would continue to be the sole domain of USN submarines.³⁰⁴ It was argued among NATO analysts during 1987 and 1988 that this acquisition would provide NATO with an improved defensive ability in the Western Atlantic. NATO analyst Joel Sokolosky stated that the USN wanted Canada to continue to focus on air and surface ASW forces; however, he also pointed out that these submarines would enable USN SSNs to move

³⁰² Canada, *NORAD 1986*, 14.

³⁰³ Department of National Defence, *Challenge and Commitment: A Defence Policy for Canada*, 50.

³⁰⁴ John D. Harbron, "There is Need for Canadian Nuclear Submarines, *Peterborough Examiner* (Saturday May 30, 1987), in *Draft of Articles and Clippings, 1987-1989*, MG 31 D 224 Volume Six, Library and Archives Canada.

into forward defensive positions and would improve the allied position in naval rear areas.³⁰⁵ Despite the USN not directly lobbying the Mulroney Government or MARCOM commanders, they still attempted to influence the purchase by lobbying Congress to nullify the purchase. As the projected winner of the SSN Acquisition Program was the British *Trafalgar Class*, USN officials pressured Congress to nullify this sale, as it would involve sensitive American built nuclear technology.³⁰⁶ While the USN had an agreement with the RN, they did not have one with MARCOM and, therefore, argued that the nuclear technology aboard the *Trafalgar Class* could not be sold without American permission.³⁰⁷ Despite the intense lobbying the USN was conducting in Congress to nullify this deal, the Mulroney Government continued to press on with the planned purchase.

The Canadian and American naval forces had developed a long history of working closely together in NATO and non-NATO naval operations. However, the USN had a well-earned reputation for often getting its demands and proposals passed in Washington, which ensured that any dealings the CF or Ottawa had on SSNs with the Americans difficult during 1987-88.³⁰⁸ US defence analysts pointed out to Maritime Command in 1988 that Canadian ties to the USN were exclusively with the surface fleet and that the US submarine fleet did not welcome Canadian cooperation in the Arctic.³⁰⁹ Furthermore, the USN argued that their SSN operations in the Arctic and around the globe were classified and that if they were forced to coordinate their movements with

³⁰⁵ Sokolsky, *Defending Canada*, 43.

³⁰⁶ S. Mathwin Davis, "Nuclear Submarines for Canada: A Technical Critique", in *The U.S.-Canada Security Relationship: The Politics, Strategy, and Technology of Defense*, ed. David G. Haglund et al. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1989), 224.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 225.

³⁰⁸ Joseph T. Jockel, "The U.S. Navy, Maritime Command, and the Arctic," *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (Winter 1989), 30.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 30.

Canadian SSNs then it would be easy for the Soviets to intercept these movements and plans.³¹⁰ Despite all the advantages that SSNs could bring to the defence of North America and NATO sea-lanes, the US refused to budge from their stance.

In April 1989, Minister of Defence Bill McKnight announced a series of defence cuts in the Canadian federal budget. Among the items that were cut from the CF was the funding made available to purchase the nuclear attack submarines.³¹¹ This was seen favorably in Washington as it continued to allow US nuclear submarines free reign in the Arctic Ocean.³¹² While the SSN acquisition program was soon forgotten, it is a clear example of the US military taking direct involvement in the rebuilding of the Canadian Forces during the 1980s. For the previous two decades the USN had always provided encouragement and support for their Canadian counterparts from afar, they were now taking direct measures with Maritime Command to ensure that it did not acquire SSNs.

Conclusion

The beginning of the 1980s signaled a new era for the Canadian Forces. For the first time in nearly two decades, the dismal shape of the military was the centre of attention in Ottawa. The 1980s also brought with it an end to the policy of détente between the US and USSR. With its end came an increased aspiration for conventional forces. As the CF was in such a dilapidated state, it was clear to all involved that it would have to be 'rebuilt' in order to satisfy the security concerns of Washington. The successive governments of Pierre Trudeau and Brian Mulroney worked closely with their American ally to ensure that the CF could make a useful contribution to North American

³¹⁰ Jockel, "The U.S. Navy, Maritime Command, and the Arctic", 27.

³¹¹ Jockel, "U.S. Interests and Canadian Defence Policy," 117.

³¹² Ibid., 117.

and NATO defence. However, with the new equipment and priority the CF also saw increased participation with their US counterparts in all aspects of defence.

Air Command began to immediately see an increased working relationship with the USAF that continued throughout the decade. While Ottawa was concerning itself with renewing the NORAD Agreement, the USAF worked Air Command to find a position that played to AIRCOM's strength in NATO defence. They also pressured the Canadian government to purchase F-14 and F-15 fighters along with E-3A Sentry AWACS for the defence of both North America and the proposed defence of Iceland. The USAF clearly wanted Air Command to develop more capabilities, which would then free up USAF units for other duties. In addition to wanting Air Command rebuilt along American lines, the USAF also pressured for, and received, permission to develop contingency bases throughout the Canadian North for their aircraft. Although the Canadian government rejected the US proposals for the defence of Iceland and the composition of its air force, the NORAD Agreement was re-signed and Air Command took on an increased participation with the USAF in both North America and Europe.

Unlike Air Command, Mobile Command was almost entirely focused on the defence of Western Europe. It did this by working in conjunction with the US Army and USMC units it was designated to support. In a situation similar to Air Command Washington directly pressured the Canadian military and government leaders to reorganize Mobile Command into units similar to the new US Army light divisions that were coming into being. Furthermore, the Americans forced Mobile Command to accept the new American AirLand Battle Doctrine for the defence of NATO. Once again Mobile

Command found itself forced to working very closely with the US land forces in both Europe and North America.

Finally, Maritime Command found itself at the centre of a major dispute between Ottawa and Washington concerning new Canadian defence plans. While Canadian vessels and maritime aircraft often worked with large USN task forces on ASW and convoy protection duties, it was now faced with the direct involvement of USN officials in its own naval plans. Prime Minister Mulroney worked very hard to purchase a number of nuclear-attack submarines for Maritime Command, which would have substantially increased its capabilities. However, the USN viewed this as a potential threat to its own submarine operations in the Arctic and worked hard to prevent Ottawa from making this purchase. In the end Mulroney was forced to cancel the project because of financial limitations, but the proposed acquisition and the US response showed the American desire to keep MARCOM out of the Arctic Ocean and simply wanted it to continue in providing escort ships for larger American task forces and convoys.

The 1980s was signaled by the buildup of conventional forces in both NATO and the Warsaw Pact, along with a more hardline stance on the USSR and its allies by NATO political leaders. The new US Government under President Ronald Reagan began to heavily buildup the US conventional military forces and began to pressure its allies to do the same. The governments of Pierre Trudeau and Brian Mulroney once again pushed the Canadian Forces into ever-closer cooperation with their US counterparts. In order to protect Canada from unwanted US protection both governments undertook a series of expensive equipment purchases for the CF. While these provided the military with the state-of-the-art systems it needed to protect Canadian sovereignty, they also pushed the

CF into a closer stance with the US. Even though these purchases were expensive it allowed the Trudeau and Mulroney Cabinets to work without a lot of US criticism, unlike its NATO allies in Europe. Furthermore, Ottawa was able to keep its defence budget relatively stable between 1.7% and 1.8% of GDP while most of NATO were significantly raising their defence budgets in both relative terms and as a percentage of their GDP.

With the rapid increase of the US military by Reagan, Ottawa was able to keep its force numbers relatively stable and focus its forces on defending strategic locations important to the US within both North America and NATO. By accomplishing this goal and acquiescing to US demands for modern equipment for the CF, the Trudeau and Mulroney governments were able to increase the combat capabilities of the CF as well as satisfy the US demands that Canada was taking its military defence seriously. This also enabled both governments to ward off any potential sovereignty problems by having to depend on US aircraft and naval vessels to defend sovereign Canadian airspace and waterways. By increasing the dollars available to the CF the Trudeau and Mulroney Cabinets had accomplished the same two goals of their predecessors over the previous two decades: a) ensuring Canadian sovereignty by showing the US that Ottawa cared about military defence and; b) keeping Canadian defence budgets relatively stable by having the CF work closely with the US military and adopting American military methods within the CF.

Conclusion

On 3 December 1989, American President George H.W. Bush and Soviet General Secretary of the Communist Party Mikhail Gorbachev met at the Malta Summit and declared that the Cold War was over.³¹³ With the rapidly thawing relations between the US-led West and the Soviet Union, many NATO nations subsequently began to rapidly decrease the size and budget of their militaries. Canada was no different, and with the election of Jean Chretien as the Prime Minister in 1993, the Canadian Forces saw their budget and size rapidly reduced. Under the leadership of Prime Minister Chretien, the CF participation with the US military rapidly dwindled as Ottawa, along with most of its NATO allies, no longer perceived any large-scale threat to their national security. What was to become known by members of the CF and the Canadian defence community as the 'Decade of Darkness' almost resulted in the temporary halt of Canadian-American military relations.³¹⁴ Indeed, Canada was far from the only NATO nation who conducted a rapid reduction in its conventional military forces, as with the *raison d'être* of the Alliance gone, NATO itself began to come under threat of being dismantled.

The end of the Cold War and the election of Chretien almost signaled the end of the intricate defence relations between the two North American neighbours that had been developed and refined for over forty years. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, both the Mulroney and Chretien governments were able to redirect funds destined for the CF towards social welfare programs, healthcare and education.³¹⁵ The military reforms that had been undertaken in the 1980s were quickly thrown to the wayside as the military

³¹³ Gwynne Dyer, *War: The New Edition* (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 2005), 339.

³¹⁴ Granatstein, *Canada's Army*, 382.

³¹⁵ Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Ltd., 2007) 270.

experienced a rapid force reduction similar to that which was going on throughout NATO, including the US.

National Defence Expenditures, Fiscal Years 1990-

Year	Total Dollars (in millions)	% of GDP
1990	\$11,323	1.70%
1991	\$10,759	1.60%
1992	\$10,780	1.50%
1993	\$11,087	1.50%
1994	\$10,580	1.40%
1995	\$9,817	1.20%
1996	\$8,807	1.10%

While the CF worked to continue their military relationship with the US, it was becoming more difficult as politicians and diplomats in Ottawa no longer viewed the CF as an important element of Canada's foreign policy, due to a lack of perceived threats to Canada across the globe. NATO, NORAD and the common defence of the West against the Warsaw Pact had been the main reasons for Canadian governments to maintain a significant regular military and strive for defence cooperation with Washington. However, with the threat from the Soviet Union now gone and with Canada's continued involvement in the NATO and NORAD alliances being questioned, the CF saw its main defence objectives being questioned. Instead of continuing to further the development of military relations between the two nations, Ottawa put them on hold in order to focus on internal political issues.

The 1990s became some of the toughest years that the Canadian military had experienced since the end of the Second World War. Throughout the decade the CF were characterized by "personnel burn-out, equipment rust out and the myriad embarrassments

³¹⁶ Government of Canada, *Fiscal Reference Tables*, in the Department of Finance Archived Reference Tables, <http://www.fin.gc.ca/fit-trf/2011/fit-trf-1102-eng.asp#tb18> (accessed April 29, 2013).

of the...disbanding of the Canadian Airborne Regiment.”³¹⁷ Jean Chretien’s tenure as Prime Minister also brought about increasingly vocal calls by the American Department of Defense to increase Canadian defence spending, a situation eerily similar to that of Trudeau in the late 1970s.³¹⁸ While Chretien did not pull back from the NATO or NORAD agreements, he also did not see the CF as playing an important role in either of these important alliances. Instead he chose to redirect funds towards paying off the expanding Canadian national debt and improving health and education across Canada. Despite Chretien’s success in trimming down the Canadian debt and vastly improving the health and education sectors, he used the new geo-strategic situation to reduce the military as well as reduce defence budgets and personnel strength of the CF.³¹⁹ However, in a situation that mirrored that of Trudeau in the 1970s, Chretien continued to send the CF on worldwide UN and NATO missions that stretched the CF to the breaking point and once again brought calls from Washington to increase the budget, equipment and personnel available to the CF.

Throughout the Cold War, the Canadian and United States militaries worked closely together in both North American and European defence. While the US had been interested in a bilateral defence agreement with Canada since the Second World War, Ottawa had no interest in a bilateral alliance and instead strove to become a political equal with Washington in North American defence issues. In 1963, when Lester B. Pearson became the new Prime Minister of Canada, and with the subsequent appointment of Paul Hellyer as his Minister of National Defence, the Canadian military began to be turned towards the large American armed forces. Prior to 1963, the Canadian armed

³¹⁷ Martin Shadwick, “The Chretien Legacy”, *Canadian Military Journal* 4, no. 4 (Winter 2003-2004).

³¹⁸ Ibid.

³¹⁹ Ibid.

forces had a historical defence relationship with the United Kingdom that had stretched back to the colonial militia era of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, with the end of the Second World War, the UK was no longer in an economic or military position to maintain a strong bilateral arrangement with Canada. Furthermore, with the many conflicts ongoing in the former colonies of the British Empire, the Canadian government felt that it needed to move itself away from the military shadow of the UK and towards a new distinctly Canadian model. However, in the process of moving the military away from the UK, Pearson and Hellyer instead began to move it towards greater cooperation with the US armed forces.

From 1963 to 1989, policy-makers in Ottawa often held a similar view in regards to North American defence relations. This view was that because of the high costs necessary to defend a country of Canada's size, defence agreements with the US should be pursued, as they would help guarantee Canadian sovereignty and security at a low cost for Ottawa.³²⁰ Throughout this period Canada developed a 'special relationship' with the US in defence affairs, which was based on common international goals and economic practices.³²¹ As a result of the powerful nuclear and conventional forces of the US, Ottawa did not consider the risk of an attack on North America very likely for much of the period. As a result, the federal governments often focused their military efforts on the protection of Canadian sovereign airspace and waterways.

Beginning in 1964 with the tabling of the Pearson government's new White Paper on Defence, Ottawa embarked on a path that would bring the Canadian military ever closer to the US military. By 1989 the Canadian Forces and the Ministry of National

³²⁰ Howard Peter Langille, *Changing the Guard: Canada's Defence in a World in Transition* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 10.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

Defence had developed an intricate relationship with their American counterparts. As scholars Joel Sokolsky and D.W. Middlemiss argue, the US “always has a security interest in Canada, and Canada has an interest in not becoming a strategic liability for the United States.”³²² It was this interest in not becoming a ‘strategic liability’ to the US that guided successive Canadian defence policies from 1963 to 1989. If Canada was to become a liability for the US in North American defence, then scholars, politicians and military officials firmly believed that the US would simply take over the responsibility for the defence of Canada, which would have had grave impacts on Canadian sovereignty. For the governments of Pearson, Pierre Trudeau and Brian Mulroney, the only way to not become a liability to the American defence establishment was to have the CF work closely with the US military in order to show Washington that Ottawa took its defence seriously.

While the Canadian military had begun to work with the US military since the onset of the Second World War, it was not until the appointment of Paul Hellyer as the Minister of National Defence and the tabling of the White Paper on Defence in 1964 that the Canadian armed forces began to reorient towards the US. Hellyer was given free-reign by Pearson in his attempt to eliminate many of the ties between the Canadian and British military forces. However, in his desire to eliminate these traditions as fast as possible, Hellyer failed to allow time for the introduction and creation of distinct Canadian military traditions. This void simply moved the Canadian military towards the traditions of the US armed forces.

Fundamental to Hellyer’s White Paper was the plan to reorganize the Canadian armed forces into a unified force where all three branches would support and work

³²² Middlemiss & Sokolsky, *Canadian Defence*, 137.

together in common goals. However, instead of creating a distinctly Canadian format for this new potential tri-service force, Hellyer originally looked towards the United States Marine Corps as the ideal organization and structure for Canada's new military reorganization. This idea had been speculated by retired Canadian General Guy Simonds in 1964 and brought to the attention of Hellyer by former General Charles Foulkes. While Hellyer believed that the USMC structure was ideal for a military the size of Canada, it became the focal point for the fight against unification by members of the military and the public. While Hellyer had planned to create a tri-service force in order to reduce wasteful defence spending occurring because of the intense competitions between the military branches, it was clear by 1965 that a USMC structure would require an exorbitant amount of new funding for the military. To successfully transform the Canadian armed forces into a USMC-style organization would require a vast amount of money for new equipment. The staggering costs of new equipment as well as military and government pressure to ensure that the Canadian military did not become a wing of the US armed forces resulted in this potential USMC organizational scheme being scrapped by Hellyer by the end of 1965. Despite this, the personnel and officers of the Canadian military began to see the writing on the wall and soon found themselves working more closely with their American counterparts in exercises in North America as well as movement towards the US Army and US Air Force in Germany.

The rise of Pierre Trudeau to the Prime Minister's office in 1968 resulted in the CF's roles and objectives being changed once again. In a situation vastly different from Pearson's tenure as PM, the CF saw their military objectives being reoriented towards North America and away from the internationalism that had distinguished the Pearson

years. Trudeau and Donald Macdonald, his Minister of Defence from 1970 to 1972, firmly believed that as Western European countries had been rebuilt both economically and militarily, they did not need CF personnel permanently stationed on the continent to help them defend Europe. Instead, Trudeau originally wanted to withdraw these forces and have them focus on defending Canada and North America. As a result of these two goals, Trudeau and Macdonald switched the military's main objective from the defence of Western Europe to the defence of Canadian sovereignty and North America. This new primary objective was designed by Trudeau to attempt to redress the rather lopsided American military dominance in North America. However, while Trudeau wished to address this imbalance, he also soon realized that the two countries had created an intertwined continental defence through the many treaties and agreements signed since the beginning of the Second World War.

To ensure that the US never took over sole responsibility for the defence of North America, Trudeau wanted the Canadian Forces in Europe to be redirected back to Canada, which he believed would help protect Canada's sovereignty from unwanted American military assistance. Furthermore, having these forces at home would enable Trudeau to indicate to Washington that Canada was making a large contribution to the defence of the US nuclear deterrent in North America. The defence of the US nuclear deterrent had been one of the cornerstones of Canadian defence policy since the creation of NORAD in 1957. Previous Canadian governments believed that the best way to defend this was the forward defence of North America in Western Europe. Trudeau, however, argued that as Western Europe now had the ability to defend itself, the CF in Europe needed to be brought back home to focus on the defence of Canada and the US nuclear

forces. Despite these goals, Trudeau did not withdraw Canadian military forces from Europe but simply reduced the air and land components stationed in Europe. Furthermore, in his attempt to redirect the military's priorities back towards North America, he significantly reduced the defence share of Canada's gross national product, which had fallen to one of the lowest in NATO by 1976. With the CF in dire need of new equipment and a movement towards conventional forces by the US and NATO, Trudeau was pressured to 'rebuild' the CF by Canada's Alliance partners by the end of the decade.

By 1978 the NATO and the US began to severely pressure the Trudeau Government to re-equip the CF, which was using equipment that was rapidly being retired by other NATO allies and that was not suitable for modern combat operations in Europe or any high-intensity combat zone. In standing with one of Canada's fundamental foreign policies, that of not becoming a strategic liability of the US, the Trudeau and Mulroney governments began to undertake a rapid modernization program of the CF. In addition to this modernization program, Ottawa began to work closely with Washington to help reshape NATO and North American defence strategies and policies. As Ronald Reagan began to build up the conventional forces of the US, he also demanded that the rest of NATO follow suit.

Air Command worked directly with the USAF in order to create an integrated air defence strategy using the fighter and air defence forces available to both countries to defend North America in the event of a major conflict. The Canadian purchase of the CF-18 Hornet fighter aircraft and the heavily-debated 1986 renewal of the NORAD Agreement allowed Ottawa to participate as a partner, and not a dependent, in the air defence of North America. In West Germany Mobile Command worked tirelessly to be

able to work seamlessly with I (US) Corps in the event of war. This was followed by a number of US Army doctrines and strategies being adopted by Mobile Command in both Canada and West Germany. While forces of Mobile Command retained their Canadian identity, they had to be prepared to operate within larger American divisions, corps and army groups throughout Europe in the event of war.

Despite the work that Air and Mobile Commands were doing to assist the US in the defence of the West, Maritime Command found itself at the centre of a major re-equipment controversy between Ottawa and Washington. While Canadian warships had developed a close working relationship with the USN since the end of the Second World War, the RCN found itself under fire when Prime Minister Mulroney announced his government's intention to purchase a fleet of nuclear-attack submarines for ASW operations and surveillance of Canada's Arctic region. The USN, however, viewed the Arctic as an essential area of operations for its own fleet of nuclear submarines and did not want to have to share this area with Canadian submarines. Furthermore, USN officials were concerned that they would have to provide Ottawa with the locations of their submarines in the Arctic, which could then find their way into the hands of Soviet officials. The Mulroney Government, because of financial limitations, canceled the project in 1988, but this episode did provide one of the biggest examples of direct American involvement in Canadian defence operations.

Throughout the Cold War, the US and Canada developed a close working relationship in security and defence matters. In North America, Western Europe and across the globe, the militaries of both countries worked together and assisted each other when necessary. Both the Canadian and American militaries predominantly developed

their tactics and strategies based on the forward defence of North America in Europe, as there was a very low risk of a major assault on North America for much of the period.³²³ While Canadian governments often trumpeted continental defence as their primary security objective, the reality was both the US and Canada oriented their forces towards Europe and did not pay considerable attention to defensive preparations in North America.³²⁴ For much of the Cold War the majority of Canadian air, land and naval units were either working directly in the defence of Western Europe or were planned as reinforcements in the event of any conflict. Canadian land and air units in Europe worked directly with their American counterparts, as they were part of larger American units for much of the Cold War. Meanwhile, MARCOM participated in larger USN task forces in preparing for ASW and convoy escort operations in the North Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. Despite some concerns from Canadian politicians throughout the period, Ottawa often felt comfortable working with Washington concerning defence preparations, as it was similar to the defence participation with London that had dominated Canadian security policy since the eighteenth century.

Despite the importance that is placed upon Canadian-American defence relations by Canadian military scholars, few provide an in-depth analysis of the 1963 to 1989 period. It was during this period of intense international tensions that the Canadian-American defence relationship really developed into a well-honed military alliance. Throughout the three decades of leadership under Pearson, Trudeau and Mulroney the Canadian Forces developed an increasingly 'special relationship' with their counterparts

³²³ David S. Sorenson, "The Future of the North American Air Defense System", in *Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defence Cooperation: The Road from Ogdensburg*, ed. Joel J. Sokolsky et al. (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mullen Press, 1992), 264.

³²⁴ *Ibid.*, 264.

in the US armed forces. This ‘special relationship’ was not brought about by American military and political leaders but was instead created by Canadian political leaders pushing the CF closer to the US. The numerous attempts by Canadian politicians to create and retain a distinctly Canadian military identity only resulted in Canadian defence institutions being pushed into closer cooperation with their American allies in military operations in North America and throughout the world.

While North American military scholars often acknowledge that Canadian-American defence participation really took off during the Cold War, few actually provide an in-depth analysis of this period, with most scholars only providing a brief overview of the Cold War. The works that do examine this period of North American defence relations predominantly examine either the government interactions between Ottawa and Washington or the military cooperation between the CF and US armed forces. However, both of these are instrumental elements in understanding the Canadian-American defence cooperation and need to be examined together and not separately. Another gap in the literature of this subject is that scholars tend to focus on the Second World War and the end of the Cold War, often marginalizing the 1963 to 1989 period. Three chronological periods have been examined in the course of this thesis in order to provide a concise overview of Canadian-American defence relations during the Cold War and to identify what group brought about this increased cooperation.

From the beginning of 1963, when Canadian Prime Minister Pearson appointed Paul Hellyer as the new Minister of National Defence, through to the end of 1989, it was clear that it was the Canadian federal government that was pushing the Canadian military into increased cooperation with the United States. Despite the concerns of some Canadian

politicians about this increased cooperation, they inadvertently continued to push the Canadian Forces ever closer to the US. The end result was that by the end of the Cold War, the US had replaced the UK as Canada's primary military partner and ally. While politicians in Ottawa continuously questioned this relationship, members of all Canadian political parties came to recognize the benefits that increased military cooperation between the two countries would have for Canada.

Cooperation with the United States in military affairs enabled political and defence officials in Ottawa to accomplish a number of objectives throughout the period. First, this cooperation enabled Ottawa to keep defence budgets relatively stable throughout the Cold War. By keeping the defence budget stable, the governments of Pearson, Trudeau and Mulroney were able to redirect funds that would have been sent to national defence towards the creation of new social welfare programs throughout Canada. The presence of the large US armed forces enabled Ottawa to focus on internal issues instead of its international military objectives. The second benefit was that having the Canadian Forces work closely with the US military allowed Ottawa to show the US government that it was able to make a contribution to North American and NATO defence. This objective became very important to Canadian military and political leaders because if they did not prove to the US that they could make a meaningful contribution to Western defence than the US would simply take over for the defence of North America, which would have had grave consequences on Canadian sovereignty. By the end of the Cold War, Canadian defence cooperation with the US was as much about ensuring Canada's sovereignty than anything else.

While American political and defence officials came to welcome this increased cooperation throughout the period, they were always cautious in making any military demands of Canada because of the highly developed anti-American sentiment throughout Canada. Ottawa continuously wanted to focus its military capabilities on North American defence while Washington strove to have Canada take on a larger role in NATO and European defence. Despite the rapidly changing size and objectives of the CF during the Cold War, the one constant was the cooperation with the US that was being pushed on it by politicians in Ottawa. The only way for Canada to live under the large US defence umbrella was for Canadian politicians to prove that they were willing to participate with the US in Western defence. American military equipment, strategies, training methods and organizations were gradually adopted by the CF during the Cold War in an effort by Canadian politicians to ensure that Washington remained convinced in Canada's ability to protect the northern portions of North America and, as a result, the US nuclear and conventional military deterrent.

As Canada is the only ally directly involved in the defence of the United States, the defence relations between the two countries have been extremely close. The formal agreements and interactions between the two allies during the 1964-1989 period created a framework for military relations that was to extend past the end of the Cold War. North American defence analyst Joel Sokolsky states that these relationships go well beyond formal institutions and “involve a whole network of formal contacts between the services, notably in the air forces, navies and defence bureaucracies.”³²⁵ Even though the US military dwarfed the CF and was capable of defending the entire continent, both

³²⁵ Sokolsky, *Defending Canada*, 9.

Washington and Ottawa recognized that it was important that both countries participated in the defence of North America and that of Western Europe.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Record and Manuscript Groups, Library and Archives Canada

RG 2, Privy Council Office Records

MG 26 N3, Lester B. Pearson Papers

MG 31 D224, John D. Harbron Papers

MG 32 B25, Barney Danson Papers

MG 32 B33, Paul Hellyer Papers

Memoirs

Allard, Jean Victor. *The Memoirs of Jean V. Allard*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1988.

Hellyer, Paul. *Damn the Torpedoes: My Fight to Unify Canada's Armed Forces*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc., 1990.

Parliamentary Records

House of Commons, *Debates*

Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*

Government of Canada Official Publications

Challenge and Commitment: A Defence Policy for Canada. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1987.

Defence 1976. Hull, Quebec: Supply and Services Canada, 1976.

Defence 1977. Hull, Quebec: Supply and Services Canada, 1977.

Defence: 1978 in Review. Hull, Quebec: Supply and Services Canada, 1978.

Defence in the 70s: A White Paper on Defence. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1971.

White Paper on Defence. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, March 1964.

Other Primary Sources

Byers, R.B., et al. *The Canadian Strategic Review 1983*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1983.

Department of Finance Archived Reference Tables. "Fiscal Reference Tables, 2011." <http://www.fin.gc.ca/frt-trf/2011/frt-trf-1102-eng.asp#b18> (accessed March 18, 2013).

Secondary Sources

Andrew, Arthur. *The Rise and Fall of a Middle Power: Canadian Diplomacy from King to Mulroney*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, 1993.

Axworthy, Tom. *Soldiers Without Enemies: A Political Analysis of Canadian Defence Policy, 1945-1975*. PhD Thesis: Queen's University, 1978.

Bland, Douglas. *Canada's National Defence: Volume I, Defence Policy*. Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, 1997.

Bland, Douglas. "Trends in Canadian Security Policy and Commitments." *Armed Forces and Society* 15, no. 1 (Fall 1988): 113-130.

Blaxland, John C. *Strategic Cousins: Australian and Canadian Expeditionary Forces and the British and American Empires*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006.

Bothwell, Robert. *Alliance and Illusion: Canada and the World, 1945-1984*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007.

Brown, James and Snyder, William, eds. *Defense Policy in the Reagan Administration*. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1988.

Byers, R.B. "The 1987 Defence White Paper: An Analysis." *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 17, no. 2 (Autumn 1987): 11-22.

Carlson, Adolf. *Who Will Stand the Nordic Guard?: Determinants, Options, and Bilateral Canadian-U.S. Responses to the Threat on NATO's Northern Flank*. Kingston, ON: Queen's University Centre for International Relations, 1991.

Cohen, Andrew. *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World?*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2003.

Conrad, Lieutenant-Colonel John. *Scarce Heard Amid the Guns: An Inside Look at Canadian Peacekeeping*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2011.

- Cordier, Sherwood S. *the Defense of NATO's Northern Front and U.S. Military Policy*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1989.
- Cuthbertson, Brian. *Canadian Military Independence in the Age of Superpowers*. Don Mills, ON: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1977.
- Diubaldo, R. J. and S. J. Scheinberg. *A Study of Canadian-American Defence Policy (1945-1975): Northern Issues and Strategic Resources*. Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 1978.
- Dyer, Gwynne. *War: The New Edition*. Toronto: Vintage Canada, 2005.
- Galloway, Strome. *The General Who Never Was*. Belleville, ON: Mika Publishing Company, 1981.
- Gosselin, Major-General Daniel. "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Armed Forces is Forty Years Old- Part One." *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 6-15.
- Gosselin, Major-General Daniel. "Hellyer's Ghosts: Part Two." *Canadian Military Journal* 9, no. 3 (2009): 6-16.
- Granatstein, J.L. "The American Influence on the Canadian Military, 1939-1963." *Canadian Military History* 2 (1993): 63-73.
- Granatstein, J.L. *Canada's Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.
- Granatstein, J.L. *Who Killed the Canadian Military?*. Toronto: HarperCollins Canada, 2004.
- Gray, Colin S. *Canadian Defence Priorities: A Question of Relevance*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Company Limited, 1972.
- Haglund, David G., et al. *The U.S.-Canada Security Relationship: the Politics, Strategy, and Technology of Defense*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989.
- Hammond, Major Lee John. "Joint Amphibious Capabilities- Past Lessons, Future Options." *Canadian Army Journal* 8, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 14-35.
- Hasek, John. *The Disarming of Canada*. Toronto: Key Porter Books, 1987.
- Hertzman, Lewis, et al. *Alliance and Illusions: Canada and the NATO-NORAD Question*. Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig Ltd., Publishers, 1969.

- Holst, Johan Jorgen. "The Pattern of Nordic Security." *Daedalus* 113, no. 2 Special Issue: Nordic Voices (Spring 1984): 195-226.
- Horn, Colonel Bernd. *From Cold War to New Millennium: the History of the Royal Canadian Regiment, 1953-2008*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2011.
- Horn, Colonel Bernd, ed. *The Canadian Way of War: Serving the National Interest*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2006.
- Hunt, Lieutenant-Colonel G.D. "Reinforcing the NATO North Flank: The Canadian Experience." *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 16, no. 4 (April 1987).
- Jockel, Joseph T. and Joel Sokolsky. *Canada and Collective Security: Odd Man Out*. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1986.
- Jockel, Joseph T. *Canada in NORAD, 1957-2007: a History*. Kingston, ON: School of Policy Studies Queen's University, 2007.
- Jockel, Joseph T., and Joel S. Sokolsky. "Emphasizing the Assets: A Proposal for the Restructuring of Canada's Military Contribution to NATO." *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 16, no. 4 (Autumn 1979): 17-20.
- Jockel, Joseph T. & Sokolsky, Joel J. et al. *Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defence Cooperation: The Road from Ogdensburg*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press, 1992.
- Jockel, Joseph T. "The U.S. Navy, Maritime Command, and the Arctic." *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (Winter 1989): 32-39.
- Lagasse, Philippe. "Northern Command and the Evolution of Canada-U.S. Defence Relations." *Canadian Military Journal* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2003): 15-22.
- Langille, Howard Peter. *Changing the Guard: Canada's Defence in a World in Transition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Lindsey, G.R. "Protection of Shipping in the 1980s." *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (Winter 1977-1978): 6-13.
- MacMillan, Margaret O., et al. *Canada and NATO: Uneasy Past, Uncertain Future*. Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo Press, 1990.
- Maloney, Sean M. "Global Mobile II: The Development of Forces Mobile Command, 1965-1972." *Army Doctrine and Training Bulletin* 4, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 7-23.
- Maloney, Sean M. "Purple Haze : Joint Planning in the Canadian Forces from Mobile Command to J-Staff, 1975-1991 (Part 1)." *Army Doctrine and Training Bulletin* 5, no. 4 (Winter 2002-2003): 57-72.

- Maloney, Sean M. *War Without Battles: Canada's NATO Brigade in Germany 1951-1993*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Trade, 1997.
- Massie, Justin. "Canada's (In)dependence in the North American Security Community: The Asymmetrical Norm of Common Fate." *American Review of Canadian Studies* 37, no. 4 (2007): 493-516.
- Middlemiss, D.W. & Sokolsky, J.J. *Canadian Defence: Decisions and Determinants*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Canada, Inc., 1989.
- Milner, Marc. *Canada's Navy: The First Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.
- Morton, Desmond. *A Military History of Canada, Fifth Edition*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Ltd., 2007.
- Shadwick, Martin. "The Chretien Legacy." *Canadian Military Journal* 4, no. 4 (Winter 2003-2004): 68-69
- Sokolsky, Joel J. *Defending Canada: U.S.-Canadian Defense Policies*. New York: Priority Press Publications, 1989.
- Stewart, Richard W. et al. *American Military History, Volume II: The United States Army in a Global Era, 1917-2003*. Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2005.
- Stouffer, Major Ray. "Cold War Air Power Choices for the RCAF: Paul Hellyer and the Selection of the CF-5 Freedom Fighter." *Canadian Military Journal* 7, no. 3 (Autumn 2006): 63-74.
- Swanson, Roger Frank. "Deterrence, Détente, and Canada?" *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science* 32, no. 2 (1976): 100-112.
- Tracy, Nicholas. "NATO in Canadian Defence Policy." *Canadian Defence Quarterly*, Special Edition, no. 1 (1988): 68-76.
- Unknown Author. "On Guard For Thee? Canada's Shrinking Military." *CBC News*, June 28, 2005.
http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/cdnmilitary/shrinking_military_table.html
(accessed March 18, 2013).
- Yonas, Gerald. "The Strategic Defense Initiative." *Daedalus* 114, no. 2 Special Issue: Weapons in Space, Volume I: Concepts and Technologies (Spring 1985): 73-90.

Yost, David S. "U.S. Military Power and Alliance Relations." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 517 (September 1991): 80-93.