

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
) DUTY ON WHICH ENGAGED:	COURT OF INQUIRY, INVESTIGATING OFFICER
) Mutual instrument flying	OR COMMANDING OFFICER'S REPORT: // DO TOCY / TO
NATURE OF ACCIDENT AND STAGE OF FLIGHT: LAC Johnston was pilot of A/C and LAC McCool was authorized to practise instrument flying. A/C was flown in low aerobatic manoe vres at Hainsville, Ont. Aircra crashed during these manoeuvres out of control. PRIMARY CAUSE: Attempting to execute aerobatic	Court of Inquiry DATE: COMPOSITION: Pres. S.L. (C471) Kennedy, H.M. R.C.*.F. Rockliffe Mem. F/O. (C3127) Morris, H.K. P.O. (J8146) Saville, J.W. RECOMMENDATIONS: Endeavour to place student pilots at Training Schools well removed from their home districts. Have new- spapers carry request for communities to immediately
at too low an elevation.	o d (aggressed a).
at too low an elevation.	
9. Out of Cantra	
9. Out of Cantra	ACTION TAKEN: (A) DISCIPLINARY (B) TECHNICAL (C) OTHER Conclusions of A.I.B. It is not considered that there is sufficient evidence to justify the finding and it is considered that further evidence must have been available. It is further considered that there is no evidence in the COURT to justify the statement of the COURT Appendix Well appendix
at too low an elevation.) 9. Qut of Control) SECONDARY CAUSE OR CONTRIBUTING FACTORS: Lost control of aircraft too ele	ACTION TAKEN: (A) DISCIPLINARY (B) TECHNICAL (C) OTHER Conclusions of A.I.B. IT IS NOT CONSIDERED THAT THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO JUSTIFY THE FINDING AND IT IS CONSIDERED THAT FURTHER EVIDENCE MUST HAVE BEEN AVAILABLE. IT IS FURTHER CONSIDERED THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE IN THE COURT TO JUSTIFY THE STATEMENT OF THE COURT, APPENDIX "E" IST PARAGRAPH. THIS WAS A DUAL CONTROL AIRCRAFT AND OUTSIDE OF THE AUTHORIZATION SHEET.
9. Qut of Contra) Secondary cause or contributing factors:	ACTION TAKEN: (A) DISCIPLINARY (B) TECHNICAL (C) OTHER Conclusions of A.I.B. It is not considered that there is sufficient evidence to justify the finding and it is considered that further evidence must have been available. It is further considered that there is no evidence in the Court to justify the statement of the Court, Appendix "E" ist paragraph. This was a dual control algeraft and outside of the authorization sheet there is no evidence as to who was flying the algeraft at the time of the crash. For these two reasons the Court is being returnes. RECORDED BY