

## THE MONOSPAR MONOPLANE

### A Small Twin-Engined Cabin Aircraft

WE were recently privileged to fly this machine, and found it one of the most interesting little aircraft we have ever been in. No doubt many people at Hanworth will have already seen it, but for the benefit of those who have not, we will give a brief description of its main features. Details may not yet be divulged, as it is not properly on the market, but so much has been rumoured about this little machine, that no doubt its general specification will prove interesting. It is a low wing three-seater machine having provision for a third passenger behind the front two seats which are side-by-side. It is, of course, a completely closed-in cabin, and is also a twin-engined machine, having at present two 50-h.p. Salmson engines.

These drive tractor airscrews, and are situated quite close to the fuselage, so much so that four-bladed airscrews are necessitated. Dunlop wheels and Bendix wheelbrakes are fitted in such a manner that they work both in conjunction with the control column and the rudder bar.

When desired, they can be connected to the control column, so that both brakes are locked on when the column is held back, using left rudder will then release the right brake, and vice versa, so that these, together with the two engines, makes taxiing upon the ground almost a pastime, and it is really amazing to get in the machine and find how

easy it is to turn complete circles on one wheel and manoeuvre wherever one wants to. In the air, the machine bears out to a very large extent all one is led to expect of it. Even with these engines, for it was originally designed to take engines of a larger horse-power, the take-off is phenomenal, and it should be almost fool-proof. It can be turned with ease against one engine with the other one stopped, and all the controls appear to be exceptionally effective. There are, of course, several modifications which will have to be made, but that is only natural, as this first machine is frankly an experimental one, but, of course, embodies the Stieger monospar principle, both in the wing and the fuselage, and it will be interesting to see what part of the performance can be directly attributed to the use of this system. One of the first points which strikes one, is the view, which is unimpeded in all directions, and gives one an entirely new idea of flying in enclosed machines. The Aero Syndicate Limited, of 7, St. James's Street, S.W.1, have no doubt produced one of the most fascinating machines at present available for the private owner, and provided the production type is robust, with fittings which will stand up to wear much in the same way, as one expects those in a car to do, and that the machine will definitely fly with full load on one engine, we should imagine that there might well be a very good market for this type.

## CORRESPONDENCE

[The Editor does not hold himself responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents. The names and addresses of the writers, not necessarily for publication, must in all cases accompany letters intended for insertion in these columns.]

### WHO WILL OBEY WHAT?

[2359] Last week you published a letter from one Sandy McTavish, in which he offered further suggestions for the elaboration of a scheme I proposed in your columns on December 19, under the title of "I will obey."

I was glad to see that this article raised some interest, for I feel very strongly that now is the time when something serious should be done about the whole matter. If action is taken now we may be able to take full advantage of the coming season and I hope, educate the large numbers of the younger generation of airmen who will be taking to the air for the first time, on lines which should ensure safety for both them and ourselves.

There are one or two points in that letter which I should like to deal with if I may be allowed sufficient of your valuable space.

He refers to the fact that at some air-meetings there were as many as one hundred aircraft present, a fact which called for careful organisation and whole-hearted co-operation of all concerned. In the last words lies the crux of the whole matter and for such a scheme as I have suggested to be of the slightest use just that co-operation and nothing else will make it a success. Unfortunately few people seem to realise the importance of such co-operation and I well remember an occasion last year when there were many more than one hundred aircraft at a meeting. During the programme everything went smoothly and the organisation was perfect or as nearly so as we may expect from a nation of individualists: after the show was over, however, matters became hectic solely through lack of co-operation.

Actually what happened was that certain officials were entrusted with the safe dispatch of the large number of visiting aircraft, and they decided that the machines should taxi out in a particular direction in order to keep clear of those machines actually taking off. All the visitors showed that decent sense of co-operation which was hoped for, but some of the local instructors who wished to get on with joy-riding refused to follow the route, cut straight across the machines taking off and placed less experienced pilots in positions which caused considerable anxiety to those in charge. One can quite sympathise with those who are expert and who wish to gather shekels from the crowd on such occasions, but to do so in defiance of the officials they themselves have asked to take charge is merely being boorish and undoubtedly makes visitors feel that they are not wanted, besides creating

dangerous circumstances which, had those instructors thought on less selfish lines, could have been avoided.

It is this type of lack of co-operation which will break my scheme unless it is stamped out at the very beginning.

Your correspondent refers to the present and future traffic congestion around London.

Here, again, it is a question for co-operation. We have already been given a specified route for aircraft flying between Stag Lane and Heston, yet what percentage of light aircraft ever use that route? It would almost seem as if we never put any weight on official rules and regulations. Hence, my suggestion of appealing to people to make their own and to make the adherence to them a matter of common decency.

I feel Mr. McTavish is a trifle too hard when he talks of the Air Ministry "despising its unlovely brother in a bowler hat and disdaining to compromise with commercial operators." (Why bowler hats? I only know of one commercial operator who flies in such head-gear and he resides in the North not in London!)

There are already reports as to a Committee which has been formed to go into the whole question of the regulations affecting civil aviation and the commercial side is well represented on that committee, so I do not think we need be unduly pessimistic.

The real issue, however, will still lie in our own hands, and unless we engender an attitude, such as I previously suggested, in the minds of existing and embryo pilots there is little doubt that we shall rapidly be engulfed in a wave of bureaucratic legislation such as our Socialist Government thinks necessary for the safety of democracy.

"DAEDALUS"

London, S.W.1.

### MOUNTAIN AIRCRAFT

[2360] In the Editorial Comment of yesterday's issue of FLIGHT, *re* "Mountain Aircraft," you suggest the use of semi-rigid airships or multi-engined planes for this work, but would not the Autogiro be the ideal craft?

I would be glad to know what there would be against the use of this machine for such work.

I may mention that I have no connection with the Autogiro Company nor any other aircraft company.

LOUIS MANN.

London, N.W.9.

December 13, 1930.