

Committee Secretary

Senate Standing Committees on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport

PO Box 6100

Parliament House

Canberra ACT 2600

Thank you for allowing me the chance to make a submission, I hope you will be able to take it into consideration. I agree with many of the existing submissions in firm opposition to this bill.

The outcome of the House Infrastructure and Communications committee report tabled yesterday was alarming, as are the governments responses to questions and other submissions.

As many of my points have already been raised in other submissions, I will try to limit this to issues that I feel have been missed or not fully addressed.

- Part of the governments reasoning for removing an opt out option is that Australians would not find a US style opt out pat down acceptable and that such a pat down would be required to 'match' the body scan. This reasoning is flawed. No other country with an opt out has the "enhanced pat down" as the US TSA does. Their opt out pat downs are no different to the frisk search currently used in Australia. The only reason the US pat down is as intrusive as it is, is due to the way TSA operates. The US intrusive "enhanced pat down" is designed to intimidate and punish the passenger for daring to opt out. TSA routinely engages in retaliation on passengers who don't unquestionably follow their secret always changing "SSI" rules. A US style pat down would not be required for someone opting out in Australia.
- The government claims it is cost effective to ban opting out. One has to question the cost effectiveness of spending \$28 million on machines that are easily bypassed, don't work as advertised and in fact provide less security then current methods and other available new technologies.
- The UK is the only country currently using full body scanners without an opt out option. Sometimes the metal detectors are set to alarm on all passengers. At London Heathrow and Gatwick, passengers are selected for scans at random as they come out of the normal security line. There have been so few objections to these forced scans because the passenger has no other option and often doesn't have the luxury of postponing a flight.
- There has never been an independent study of the body scanners. They have only been tested in operational settings. ARPANSA and other similar bodies around the world have only gone over the scanners specifications from the manufacture and provided an analysis based on what the manufacture says it does, not what the scanner actually does.
- Roughly 10% of the people approached during the Sydney trial refused. Has anyone considered that the people who did take part in the trial only did so because of the way it was presented? Perhaps they took part because of the "wow" factor. Some people may have felt intimidated into taking part. Just because someone took part in the trial, doesn't mean that they agree with the scanners.
- The government has at no point provided any reasonable explanation as to why the scanners are needed in the first place.

- There are better, more effective technologies available such as Explosive Trace Portals (a walk through version of existing ETD swabs) or Passive millimeter detection.
- Any threat to aviation is going to come from outside Australia. Why then, do passengers departing Australia need to be treated as criminals in order to leave the country?
- If the government insist on having body scanners to "protect" Australian aviation, they should be deployed overseas for flights to Australia, not for flights departing.
- The "underwear bomb", which the government claims shows the need for the scanners, can't even be detected by the scanners.
- The L3 Provision ATD scanners proposed by the government require an operator to select a gender for each scan. Not everyone is the gender they may appear to be at a quick glance. A female being scanned as a male (for example) will then be in an uncomfortable situation when the scanner alarms. The same applies for other medical situations which will cause an alarm, such as cochlear implants, some types of pacemaker, colostomy bags. Some manufactures of medical implants, such as insulin pumps, recommend that they do not go through these types of scanners as they will damage the medical device.
- The continued actions of the Australian and other governments in producing and acting on fear, which is the base reason for this bill, only gives terrorist what they want. A terrorist does not want to kill people, they don't want to blow up aircraft, they want to spread fear. Spreading and acting on fear is exactly what this unnecessary bill does. By allowing this bill to pass, you will be allowing the terrorists to win.

To summarise, the proposed scanners are not effective and are not needed or wanted in Australia, there are more effective technologies already in use or readily available. Should these scanners be installed, an option to opt out for a pat down is required. Without an opt out, Australia's international reputation and tourism industry risks substantial damage.

I hope you will be able to take this submission into consideration. Thank you for your time.