

# EDITORIAL

## Is the Air Show a Lost Cause?

**I**S THERE any future in the air show? Each summer since the war a series of flying spectacles have been staged with good intentions but frequently with more enthusiasm than showmanship. It is now quite apparent that the community air show is losing its grip, and the reasons are not obscure. It is fair to assume that by now very few citizens get a thrill out of seeing an aircraft take off and land. A spot landing competition is not exactly calculated to quicken the pulse of the average spectator. The cross-country flying and navigation contest has even less audience appeal. Flour bombing and balloon bursting, if well staged, sometimes work up a flicker of interest. The parachute jumper usually lands at least a mile away, and the "crazy flying" stunt is getting pretty stale. Low-level aerobatics can be depended on to whip up the interest momentarily, but these events don't sell aviation. Finally, comes the RCAF display. The Vampires sweep past, invariably at "more than 600 mph," and the Harvards parade in close formation. That's it.

Before the next air show season rolls around it would be wise for local committees to re-examine this whole question. There must be novel ways to attract public attention to the airport. Perhaps it would be smart to admit that flying contests, while excellent incentives to better airmanship, are not exactly crowd-rousers. It is probable that the energy pumped into local air shows could be used more effectively in publicity campaigns, demonstration rides and other sure-fire selling methods. There is not much future in convincing Joe Citizen that aviation is a specialty of the most daring, the most upside-down, the fastest or the most aerobatic. Let's concentrate on luring the man-on-the-street into the air.

## The Importance of a Name

**S**ELECTION of the name "Canuck" for the CF-100 twin-jet warplane is singularly unfortunate. A triumph of original Canadian design, the most powerful fighter in the world is stuck with a label remarkable only for its lack of originality. It is not only the fact that the well-known lightplane Fleet Canuck has been carrying this name for some years. But there is nothing in the name to stir the imagination or symbolize the unique qualities of the aircraft which will defend our skies. According to our information, the name Canuck was imposed by top brass decision, much to the disappointment of the Avro Canada employees, who regard the aircraft with understandable pride. It is hardly conceivable that our American neighbors would choose a name like "Yank" to describe their proudest warplane.

The choice of a name might seem unimportant. Yet the inspirational value of the Battle-of-Britain Spitfire, for example, could hardly have been realized with a name like "John Bull." In our opinion, Canuck does not

measure up to the picturesque tradition of such as the Shooting Star, Lightning, Black Widow, Sabre, Vampire, Hornet, Attacker, or Venom. It would not be difficult to suggest a number of better names than Canuck. Thunderbird, Nighthawk, Algonquin, Caribou, or Tornak (Eskimo spirit of fire and thunder), for example, are at least appropriate to the CF-100's distinctive qualities.

## A Case of Confusion

**T**HE community of Brampton is almost within the landing circuit of Malton airport. This proximity lends reader interest to a recent editorial in the Brampton Conservator condemning a turnstile which extracts a dime from every spectator admitted to the observation ramp on the roof of the airport administration building. But for the same reason, the ignorance of fundamental facts revealed by the editorial is surprising. Referring to the turnstile, "designed after the pattern of those one-legged bandits, the parking meters," the editor comments:

"The Trans-Canada Airlines, who operate the Malton airport, have overlooked nothing in the matter of revenue-producing devices. In fact, the penny arcade has nothing on Canada's great airline when it comes to extracting dimes from John Public. . . ."

The fact is, of course, that TCA is a rent-paying tenant and has no responsibility for the operation of Canadian airports. The major airports, including Malton, are on city-owned land extended and developed for air use with federal funds. Malton is operated by the Dept. of Transport. Some airports, such as Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver, are operated by the municipalities. It is just as well to keep these facts straight.

As for the "one-legged bandit" at the entrance to the observation ramp, there is a good argument in its favor. The taxpayers who make special use of a public utility should expect to pay a reasonable tariff for its use. The fact that a municipality owns a street railway system supported by taxpayers does not entitle taxpaying citizens to ride free. On the other hand, it would be good promotion to encourage public interest in aviation rather than clogging it with a turnstile. We would favor the latter argument. However, it seems to us that the turnstile debate is of secondary importance to public understanding of broader aviation problems and policies. The sort of confusion spread by the Conservator editorial certainly does not clear the air.

CANADIAN AVIATION



Editor