

Comments on proposed regulations published in Canada Gazette, Part I, Volume 158, Number 51: Regulations Amending the Air Passenger Protection Regulations

Submitted to: Canada Gazette, Part I via the on-line commenting feature

Submission type: Public

Name: Commenter 35

Date: 03/05/2025

Issues

Could you please consider adding a definition of “passenger”. The definition was deleted in the last round of updates and there is now ambiguity as to the individuals for whom compensation is required. For example, we were recently given \$700 per person in compensation for a cancelled flight by Air Canada. There were seven passengers - six adults and one infant in lap. Air Canada did not provide compensation for the infant, yet that infant is a “passenger” and was inconvenienced as much as, or more, than the adults. The infant was separately ticketed by Air Canada and had a separate boarding pass. Air Canada said that compensation was not required under the existing regulations.

I can understand a possible argument that the infant didn’t pay a fare, but the compensation requirements are indifferent to the amount of fare paid. A person could have a flight cancelled after paying a very small fare but they still get the full compensation, even if that compensation is greater than the amount of the fare paid.

I trust that this comment is helpful and will be taken into consideration in the review of the proposed amendments to the regulations.
