

TALKBACK

Vengeance shortcomings

I READ the "Diving Vengeance" article in AIR ENTHUSIAST/FIVE with great interest and particularly the RAAF pilots' accounts of flying the Vengeance I. I carried out flight tests on the Vengeance IV at RAE, Farnborough in September 1944, having had experience of dive bombers such as the Skua, Chesapeake, Dauntless and Helldiver.

The shortcomings of the Vengeance I were reported to RAE as:

- (1) Poor take-off, even without bomb loads.
- (2) Bad view in normal flying attitude.
- (3) Complex fuel system.
- (4) Heavy out-of-trim rudder foot loads in a dive.

The Vengeance IV had, as the article described, a more powerful engine and increased mainplane incidence. It also had a simplified fuel system and spring tabs fitted to all control surfaces, and these major modifications eradicated all the faults, except that the view during the approach to the target still left something to be desired.

Apart from this latter criticism, the aircraft also had a very messily laid out cockpit from the instrumentation grouping point of view, so something drastic must have happened to change the ergonomic beauty of Flt Lt Place's Vengeance I cockpit into the chaotic layout in the later model.

However, in flight tests the Vengeance IV showed itself a first-class dive bomber with excellent handling characteristics but only moderate performance.

*Capt E M Brown
Cophorne, Sussex*

Clunk comment

I HAVE read with much interest Robert Bradford's story on the Avro Canada CF-100 in AIR ENTHUSIAST/FOUR. Your readers may be interested in knowing that there is a Mk IV "Clunk" at Duxford, Cambs. It was flown from Cranfield to Duxford in the spring of 1975 by the late Ormond Haydon-Baillie, the former RCAF pilot who was tragically killed while flying a Cavalier Mustang in Germany in July 1977.

Having been a Sabre pilot in Germany, on the same Wing as that inhabited by "Bruce the Moose" of 419 Squadron, I was initially somewhat perturbed by Mr Bradford's quotation from the 4 Wing Album; regarding "... the followers of 'Bruce the Moose', (who) hop into their all-weather Canucks and wave bye-bye to the ground-bound Sabre-drivers". However, Mr Bradford redeemed himself, in my eyes, later on in the article when he revealed that "at daybreak, the Sabres took over again".

May I point out what is possibly a typographical error on page 165: "the CF-105 Arrow programme having been cancelled in 1953 ..." should read, I believe, 1959.

It occurs to me that Mr Bradford might consider following up his excellent CF-100 article with the story of the Arrow. He will no doubt know that the demise of the Arrow, in practical terms, forecast the end of any possibility of a dynamic aerospace industry in Canada. It is certainly ironic to many of us who have served for many years in the

RCAF/Canadian Armed Forces, to speculate on "what might have been", had the government of the day gone forward with the Arrow programme. Indeed, at the present time, Canada has gone to the aviation industry with requests for proposals for a new fighter aircraft: the required specifications may not vary greatly from what was expected of the Arrow, some 20 years ago.

*Col A J Bauer
Canadian High Commission
London, W1*

Yes, the reference to Arrow cancellation in 1953 was a typographical error; 1959 is correct. An article on the CF-105 Arrow has been prepared for AIR ENTHUSIAST by Mr Bradford and will be published in a future issue. The author also wishes to point out that the reference in the article to Bomarc-Bs with non-nuclear warheads is an error; whereas Bomarc-A had a choice of warheads the B model was only nuclear and this was the cause of many of the debates over Canada's defences after Prime Minister Diefenbaker reported the acquisition of nuclear arms. — Ed.

Sectional information

I HAVE just received my second copy of AIR ENTHUSIAST and would like to commend you on a fine publication.

My hobby is the building and flying of scale model aircraft and the information and photographs contained in AIR ENTHUSIAST almost fills the bill for the new FAI scale rules. I say "almost", because the three-view drawings contained in the magazine do not, unfortunately, include fuselage cross-sections or an aerofoil section.

By leaving these two features out of the drawings, they are only good for Class II scale competition which is judged from a distance, not close up as is Class I.

The cockpit arrangement drawings are also much appreciated, although with the "Widow

from Hawthorne" the other glass areas would have to be detailed on a Class I model as well as the cockpit, and any layouts of sighting equipment or radar scanners would have been very handy to have.

*John Pickford
Invercargill, New Zealand*

Like our sister journal AIR INTERNATIONAL, this magazine is intended for the reader with a general interest in aviation history and it is not intended primarily for the aero-modelling community. Naturally, the interest and support of modelling readers is welcome, but the preparation of fuselage and wing cross-sections specifically for this group of readers would impose an unacceptable additional burden on our hard-pressed staff of artists. In many cases, accurate information on these sections is not readily available and although external shapes can, if necessary, be drawn from photographic reference with a high degree of accuracy, the same is obviously not the case with cross-sections. — Ed.

Another Libellula

FOLLOWING upon the edition of AIR ENTHUSIAST with the article on the Libellulas by Eric Brown, I think you may be interested in the enclosed GA of our supersonic transport project, prepared in 1946. It was intended that the prototype of this would be powered by a single projected 15,000 lb st (6810 kgp) plus Power Jets design with retrofit to two smaller engines when suitable units became available.

The design target was four hours duration at 1,000 mph (1 610 km/h) and 36,000 ft (10 973 m). Take-off weight was estimated at 80,000 lb (36 320 kg) fuel and 20 passengers. Although the aircraft would not have been suitable for scheduled services it would have been a magnificent research tool and would have solved many problems at relatively low cost.

*George H Miles
Shoreham Airport, Sussex*

This three-view drawing depicts the preliminary layout for a supersonic passenger transport, using the Libellula configuration, that was submitted to the British government by Miles Aircraft Ltd in June 1946.

