

## Concerned Members Group

C/o The Flying Tigers,  
P.O. Box 148,  
Boonah 4310

Dear RAAus Member,

### •There is a dangerous loophole in the RAAus Constitution

Definition:

**loophole** - an ambiguity (especially one in the text of a law or contract) that makes it possible to evade a difficulty or obligation.

Note the word “obligation”.

Extract from the RAAus Constitution:

“20 (x) Any decisions of the Executive or the Board made in accordance with this Constitution shall be binding on all Members and shall take effect notwithstanding any inconsistency with any decision of or any by-law or constitutional provision of any member Club or Association.”

It recently came to light that the RAAus Board has the constitutional right to make decisions on behalf of, and binding on, all the members of the RAAus. At first glance, you may think that it is acceptable for the Board to make these decisions, thinking that they are there to protect our rights.

But, it is entirely possible that due to workload, personal bias, failure to “read between the lines”, or other pressures, beliefs, or oversights, that the board may fail to represent the members adequately.

### •A Recent Specific Example

At a recent meeting the Board voted to accept a proposal by CASA to remove the exemption of some RAAus registered aircraft, from the carriage of Electronic Locator Transmitters (ELTs).

While some disagreed with the proposal, arguing that the members needed consultation, others considered this unimportant, or even failed to see the ramifications, and the proposal was accepted, creating a worrying precedent.

Now, before I continue, I have to point out that some people have accused me of arguing “against the commonsense safety interests of the members”, so I must point out very clearly:

***This is not an argument for or against the carriage of ELTs.***

Please read and understand!

### •Hypothetical Scenario #1

Many ultralight pilots have come from the ranks of GA fliers. Often, because they are no longer able to pass a GA medical, so persue ultralight flying as the only remaining way to do what they love to do.

What might happen if CASA proposed that ultralight pilots be required to pass the same medical as GA pilots? Could this happen? If the RAAus Board so decided, yes it could. And we would have no recourse.

They did it on the issue of ELTs, didn't they?

## •Hypothetical Scenario #2

A new draft proposal by CASA includes the paragraph:

“the aeroplane must not be flown inside an area designated as an area where the operation of an aeroplane to which this Order applies would constitute a hazard to other aircraft.”

Consider:

Do you think CASA might like to remove low-speed ultralights from controlled airspace? What if you fly a low-speed aircraft and regularly use Coff's Harbour airfield?

At present, if you have a PPL (as many of us do), a transponder and VHF, you are fully entitled to fly within controlled airspace in the same way as GA pilots.

What might happen if the RAAus Board became “stacked” with owners of high-performance ultralights? Might they be bothered if sub 80kt aircraft were denied access to CTR airspace because they were “too slow”?

However, this will not affect GA registered aircraft, only RAAus registered aircraft. So we could have the absurd situation where say, a Lightwing, cruising at 75 kts, may NOT be allowed into CTR, while a Tiger Moth cruising at 75 kts, may, because it's GA registered.

Ultimately, this affects ALL pilots, GA and ultralight. We perceive a gradual erosion of “privileges” we all once took for granted.

- Think: ASIC Cards.
- Think: Administration costs for medicals.
- Think: you now pay a lot of money for Terminal charts, ERSA, etc, which once were free. (If your memory goes back that far).
- And we haven't even mentioned the spy-in-the-sky ADSB yet. But please don't get us started on that!!

**PRESERVE OUR RIGHTS. CONSULTATION MUST BE REQUIRED ON ITEMS WHICH MAY IMPACT US FINANCIALLY OR OPERATIONALLY**

## •Please vote

If you agree that the Constitution needs to be changed to better protect the members' interests, please sign the online petition.

If you have no email address, or would prefer to return your vote in writing, please print this form, sign and return to the address shown above.

## •Clubs

You may consider passing this petition around for your members to sign.

## •Petition:

We the undersigned members of Recreational Aviation Australia request, where it is practical, that the committee first publish in the magazine proposed decisions which will have a significant and/or notably adverse affect on the rights, privileges, financial and operational obligations of the members.

We envisage that an amendment to the constitution will be necessary:

"The RA-Aus Board is required, where it is practical, to first publish in the magazine proposed decisions which will have a significant and/or notably adverse affect on the rights, privileges, financial and operational obligations of the members. The definition of the words significant, and adverse, in this context will be determined by a simple majority of Board members"

I am a member of RAAus, and I have signed this petition only once.

Name	Address	Signature