

$\mathcal{L}$	<b>()))</b> ))))))))))	) )	<b>)</b> 3	9 3	<b>)</b>	) ) )	0000	) ) )	<b>3</b> 3	)
<b>(</b> )	DUTY ON WHICH ENGAGED:	COURT	OF INQU	IRY, HN	STIG	ATING OFFI	CER MULT			)
)	Ferrying Aircraft from Winnipeg	OR COM	MANDI	IG OFFIC	ER'S	REPORT:	M/PCL/XN	1		)
)	to Yorkton. NATURE OF ACCIDENT AND STAGE OF FLIGHT:	DATE:				OF INQUIRY	<b>.</b>			)
)	Collision in the air. That FLYING		SITION:	•	7-5-41	1. 30	A/XA			)
Ó	OFFICER SMITH FLEW HARVARD A/C NO. 3809 IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO ENTAIL RISK OF COLLISION WITH HARVAR	KD.			SQUADE	RON LEADER	R.E. DUPONT.	RAF 37298	į.	)
.)	A/C 3808. THERE IS A STRONG POSSIBILITY THAT ROL					OFFICER	M.E. GRANT.	C 1466		)
)	ALP CAUSED BY AN AIRCRAFT AHEAD MIGHT HAVE CAUSED	RECOM	MENDAT	IONS:	FLYING	G OFFICER	E.W.C. SHARPE.	C 2797		)
``)	MOMENTARILY WHIEL HE WAS ATTEMPTING TO CHANGE HIS	5	T	IAT PILO	TS BE	I MPRESSED	WITH THE NECESS	ITY OF DISC	CUSSING	€
5	PRIMARY CAUSE: NO EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT A LACK OF									)
•	SUTTON HARNESS IN THE AIRCRAFT CONCERNED WOULD HE	FICER SMITH TO LOSE CONTROL OF HIS PLANE  LY WHIEL HE WAS ATTEMPTING TO CHANGE HIS IN FORMATION WITH SGT. ENGLAND. THERE IS CAUSE: NO EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT A LACK OF RNESS IN THE AIRCRAFT CONCERNED WOULD HAVE E ACCIDENT, BUT IT IS THE OPINION OF THE THAD BOTH PILOTS BEEN SECURED IN THEIR  THAT AIRCRAFT BE PROHIBITED FROM BEING FLOWN WITHOUT								
)	CAUSED THE ACCIDENT, BUT IT IS THE OPINION OF THE				-					्र
<b>,</b>	SEATS BY A SUTTON HARNESS THEY WOULD HAVE HAD	ACTION		•						⋺
<b>\</b>	BETTER CONTROL OF THEIR AIRCRAFT; ALSO THAT FLYTT	(A)	DISCIPLI	NARY (B	) TECH	INICAL (C)	OTHER			``
١	SLIDING CANOPY WHILE HIS AIRCRAFT WAS DIVING									ر ۱
<i>)</i> 	INVERTED. THIS WOULD HAVE ENABLED HIM TO USE HE	S					·			ر د
2	PARACHUTE.									ر
•	SECONDARY CAUSE OR CONTRIBUTING FACTORS:									٠.
							RECORDED BY		DATE	)
						•			•	)
Q							CHECKED BY		DATE	.)
	))))))))))	<b>O</b>	) )	<b>)</b>	)	<b>)</b> ) )	) ) ) )	) ) )	) ]	)

A STATE OF THE PARTY PROPERTY OF THE PARTY O