

ORIGINAL ENGLISH  
7th April, 1952

TOP SECRET  
SUMMARY RECORD  
AC/15-R/1

WORKING GROUP ON AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION PLANS IAG

Summary Record of the 1st Meeting held  
at 38, Chessan Place, London, E.W.1, on  
Monday, 7th April, 1952 at 5 p.m.

PRESENTERS:

Chairman - Group Captain Leigh (United Kingdom)			
Major N. Cambier	(Belgium)		
Mr. R.G.C. Smith	(Canada)		
Commandant Rozoy	}		
Ingénieur en Chef Hatin		}	
Ingénieur Grébil			(France)
Gen. C. Alippi	}		
Gen. Aldo Remondino		(Italy)	
Lt. Col. Jansen Schoenhoven	}		
Mr. H. De Vries		(Netherlands)	
Dr. P. Schoenmaker			}
Mr. A.E. Van Braam Houckgeest			
Brig. Gen. D.F. Callahan	}		
Mr. J.L. Ingoldsbey		(United States)	
Lt. Col. C.J. Bennett			}
Mr. H.E. Hancock	}		
Capt. H.A. Traill		(United Kingdom)	
Wing Cdr. A.R. Collins			}
Wing Cdr. W.H.G. Mansures			
Wing Cdr. G.F. Jacobsen	(SHAPE)		
Sir Roy Fadden	(WATO, DPP)		

INTERNATIONAL STAFF

Mr. Stinghamer  
Miss K. Cameron

1.

1. The Working Group elected Group Captain Leigh (United Kingdom) to the Chair.

2. THE CHAIRMAN recalled that the present Working Group had been set up by the Council Deputies to review the recommendations in the Report of the Combined Aircraft Production Working Party in the light of the comments of the national governments and to report its findings to the Council. Comments had now been received from Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, France, the United Kingdom and the United States; Norway and Denmark had signified that they had no comments to make. Three factors made a review of the Report necessary:

- (a) It had been compiled before the TCC force build-up recommendations were submitted to the North Atlantic Council at Lisbon and was therefore somewhat out of date;
- (b) Air training requirements might be somewhat different as a result of the examination carried out by the Ad Hoc Air Training Committee in Washington;
- (c) The Report did not take account of the proposed German contribution.

3. THE CHAIRMAN proposed that the Working Group adopt the following procedure:

- (a) A small fact finding military sub-committee be set up to re-assess requirements in view of the findings of the Lisbon Conference;
- (b) The Working Group proceed meanwhile to examine the national comments and attempt a realistic assessment of the possibilities of additional aircraft production;
- (c) When the military sub-committee reported its findings, the Working Group would re-assess deficiencies. It should complete its work by 19th April.

4. THE WORKING GROUP adopted the Chairman's proposal and

- (i) Appointed a Military Sub-Committee consisting of representatives of the United Kingdom, France and Italy, under the Chairmanship of Wing Commander Jacobsen (SHAPE). The Sub-Committee should complete its work by the evening of Thursday, 10th April.
- (ii) Agreed to meet again on Wednesday, 9th April at 9.30 a.m. to consider the national comments on AWP/51.

1.

2./

5. THE WORKING GROUP generally agreed that the main problem was one of finance, which was outside its terms of reference. The task of the Working Group was to report speedily to the Council on the capacity for additional aircraft production in the various countries. It would then be for the Council to consider the urgent question of finance.

6. THE UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE referred to a recommendation contained in the United States' comments on AWP/51 (AC/16-D/4, paragraph 6) that "the Standing Group direct a critical review of aircraft and engines that will be available from European resources to meet NATO requirements as of a given date such as the 1st July, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955." He said that there was no intention that the Working Group itself should undertake this review, which would be a lengthy task, but he hoped that it would support the proposal for such an examination.

7. THE FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE thought that it might be advisable to take into account also production possibilities beyond the end of 1954 (the target date for the TCC build-up recommendations) and up to the middle or end of 1955. Study of air training requirements might also be based on this longer period.

8. The Working Group then discussed whether in examining production possibilities to meet NATO requirements it should take as a basis the TCC build-up recommendations up to the end of 1954 or the requirements set out in FC.26/1 (Final), on which the original AWP/51 Report was based, and which were the final target.

9. THE FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE pointed out that there was a considerable difference between the objectives fixed for France in the TCC recommendations and those set out in FC.26/1. He would raise the point again when the Working Group came to examine the French comments on AWP/51.

10. After further discussion, THE WORKING GROUP agreed generally that its study should be based on the build-up recommendations in the TCC Report, which had been accepted by the North Atlantic Council at Lisbon. It was, however, of the opinion that a long term review of production possibilities was advisable and it would recommend this to the consideration of the Council in its Report.

11. The Working Group adjourned at 6 p.m.