

-----Original Message-----

From: Vanzella [mailto:vanzed@webone.com.au]

Sent: Thursday, 4 September 2003 8:51 AM

To: Carter, John Gordon (REPS)

Subject: aviation security

Dear Sir

I understand that you are the secretary for the Public accounts and audit Committee into Aviation security and would like to make comment as an ordinary citizen.

I would like to state that I do hold a commercial pilots licence but only use it for business and that I travel reasonably frequently for both business and pleasure.

1. I am concerned that there are many vested economic interests always pushing for more stringent and restrictive practices that will bring little security from determined terrorist, deranged or criminal actions. Since New York it is my understanding that most actions have been foiled by attendants and passengers who have serious vested interests in not allowing such an event to easily occur. I would prefer to see this money spent on security for rail passengers in the western suburbs of Sydney etc where there is real fear and actual violent occurrences nearly daily. What is it about aviation that makes these passengers more precious than late night rail commuters? Probably a belief that air passengers have more ability to pay.

2. As with all security systems the operators get bored after time and this is when events will occur. Terrorists are not stupid. It is easy to get through Xrays as I have found out when I have inadvertently left my nail clippers on my key ring. The only real way to stop anything is a full strip AND cavity search!! even then, as prison warders will tell you, things will get through. How long will aviation last under these conditions?

3. Aviation is a discretionary event that actually value adds but is not necessary to daily life. There are more and more bureacratic imposts driven by governments, privatised assets such as airports and do gooders who think more about their status rather than the economic realities of running a business. General aviation in Australia has withered under this onslaught for little economic benefit. I believe airlines should not have to pay for this security it is a national issue there is no accountability if the Federal government can proscribe measures and make someone else pay! Do banks pay for the police?

4. Security is important but I would suggest what we have now is more than sufficient to stop ad hoc events. Ten times the security would stop events because there will be no aviation. There are and will always be risks but to live in a reasonable society we must live with them. I believe more efficient and clever use of current resources along with no access to cockpits and passengers more than determined to do their bit will make those inclined look at easier and more succesful ways. If they want to bring an aircraft down a shoulder launched missile would be an option. However the main use for a

large aircraft is as a weapon and if this is denied then it should be enough. I would make a suggestion from observation though that the international air freight system has great scope for mischief.

5. As for smaller aircraft to regional areas they are usually carrying minimum fuel for costs and more passengers and probably wouldn't do as much damage as a truck full of ANFO which would be far easier to arrange! Another point is that increased costs here would result in loss of services that are marginal at the best after the bloated Airservices and CASA systems have been fed. All that would happen is more long distance country road traffic where a travellers probability of being maimed or killed is infinitely greater than by terrorist action!

6. To make a point I am amused that after the hoo ha of our gun buy backs and the supposed safety that this bureaucratic intervention would give us. Murder rates and methods are still the same and all criminals now seem to have easy access to handguns.

7. I am rarely driven to write but the peripheral players who seem to be benefiting from this are not increasing my sense of security only eroding the lifestyle my family and myself enjoy. Which means that terrorism is winning by creating dissent and paranoia while doing very little. We must all take some chances and live with risk, that is life. The Federal government has many resources and I would question the proper, efficient and more important the smart use of them. Visibility only stops idiots.

Thank you for your time
Denis Vanzella
90 Dunstan St Curtin ACT