



## AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA

OVER 50 YEARS AS THE VOICE OF GENERAL AVIATION IN AUSTRALIA

ABN 95 004 274 588 • ACN 004 274 588

*"The right to fly without unnecessary restrictions and costs"*

### **Senate Inquiry into the Administration of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) and related matters – June 2008**

#### Supplementary Submission by Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association of Australia

We advise a minor correction to our comment at the hearing. The correction does not alter the generality of our discussion and is made only to clarify the specific aircraft type discussed.

The type PA32R relates to Piper Lance or Saratoga (a 6 seat low wing aircraft used for private operations and some small charter and joyflight operations) not the Piper Chieftain as thought at the time. This is incidental to the nature of the questions and answers.

Our Vice President handled the matter of the Airworthiness Directive and advises this correction. He further notes that the intent of our long un-answered questions was very safety oriented – to determine why Australia is the only country to require this expensive safety work, as if genuine risk existed, no doubt other countries would have adopted this unique Australian decision, or noted PA32R falling out of their skies.

We have a concern with a comment made to the Enquiry yesterday by the CASA Industry Complaints Commissioner. In our viewing of the hearing we believe he stated that AOPA had made a number of submissions to him without providing fact or evidence. We believe this comment is deceptive and misleading the Senators, to our detriment, and that the CASA Industry Complaints Commissioner should be asked to 'show cause' by presentation of documentary evidence to substantiate his claim.

Our reason is that there is one outstanding enquiry where the ICC has been advised evidence is to follow, and this is the only case we believe lacks supporting documentation and evidence.

Correspondence relating to this case was tabled at the hearing yesterday, and I have attached further correspondence from AOPA namely our response of 30 June 2008 addressing Mr Hart's letter of 19 June. We believe the ICC comment unfairly maligns AOPA publicly but also indicates the CASA culture of which we commented. Most importantly, we treated our evidence as 'on oath' and believe the CASA ICC should act accordingly.

We seek your advice on whether we should challenge the comment once it is confirmed in the transcript and, if so, how we should do that? Alternatively, given the cut and thrust of such hearings, is it simpler that we advise the Chair of our concern and leave it at that? Or, do we take no action at all?

We acknowledge that AOPA is novice at such Hearings, and request more expert guidance to ensure we act in the proper manner over our concern.

Finally, in relation to the questions on notice received yesterday, answers are being prepared and will be lodged with the Committee by COB Monday 7 July 2008.

Tim Blatch  
Chief Executive Officer  
3 July 2008



**AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA**

OVER 50 YEARS AS THE VOICE OF GENERAL AVIATION IN AUSTRALIA

ABN 95 004 274 588 • ACN 004 274 588

*"The right to fly without unnecessary restrictions and costs"*

30 June 2008

Mr M Hart  
Industry Complaints Commissioner  
Civil Aviation Safety Authority  
Canberra ACT

Email to: [hart.michael@casa.gov.au](mailto:hart.michael@casa.gov.au)

Dear Mike

Reference your letter to Col Rodgers dated 19 June 2008 (received here 26 June). I apologise for the delay in response but I have been out of the office.

We have not pursued the matters raised by Col in his letter to Bruce of 26 March, mainly as one of the more blatant examples is now in the courts, and Col has been subpoenaed to appear. This makes it difficult for us to divulge the names & circumstances, as I am sure you would appreciate. I assure you that our initial correspondence was not vexatious, but as you are only too well aware, getting our members to waive their anonymity is difficult at best, and actually points back to the root of our complaint to Mr Byron.

Secondly, we did not wish to overload your office, given that you are heavily involved in the matters that we had previously presented to you, and we would have preferred to let those matters be resolved before providing you with further time-consuming investigations.

Thirdly, the original correspondence was an attempt to bring the individual matters directly to the attention of the CASA Chief Executive Officer, via a personal meeting. This obviously was not accepted by Mr Byron.

I hope that you will be able to agree that the matter is not closed, but delayed by other circumstances.

Regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'T Blatch', written over a horizontal line.

Tim Blatch  
Chief Executive Officer