

Stop wasting time on fads & fantasies

The photograph of Rita Saffioti, adorned in her AC Milan scarf and kicking a soccer ball (*News*, 11/12), continues a boring and somewhat annoying trend.

Good governance is not driven by fads and fantasies. We don't want an overpriced, one-off soccer game.

We don't want a second-rate rugby team. We don't want a racing track or amphitheatre at Burswood. We don't want a ferry disrupting Matilda Bay. We don't want more ghost trains to Yanchep.

None of these are driven by a solid business case other than being scribbled on a lunch bag whilst driving around Perth.

Governments are elected to allocate scarce resources for the greatest common good.

I would have thought a rock-solid business case is staring this Government in the face in a number of areas — more houses, more hospitals, better schools and community wellbeing.

Labor's political legacy won't be enshrined by a crowd of people eating a \$15 hot dog and watching a one-off soccer match.

Please stop these brain snaps and govern responsibly for the common good while our State still has the money. This is what wins elections.

John Nelson, Claremont

Time for a bigger fridge

I hope Irene Sanderson (*Letters*, 10/12) has got that bigger fridge, because we now have a multimillion-dollar bid for an AC Milan soccer match, and we have the worst emergency waiting time in Australia.

Jenni Zaccaria, Kardinya

Use pollie perks wisely

It is easy in the midst of the latest outrage about travel expenses (*News*, 11/12), to lose sight of the history of politicians' financial remuneration.

Modern parliamentary democracy arose from the reforming ideals of the Chartist movement in England in the mid 1800s, although it took many years for their demands



Rita Saffioti in AC Milan garb.

to be realised. One of the key demands of the Chartists was that politicians should be paid, so that ordinary working folk could stand for parliament without impoverishing themselves.

Claiming for travel expenses to allow for family gatherings is reasonable in this context, especially when considering the impact of political life on children and spouses.

The devil of course is in the detail, and it behoves our politicians to use these entitlements sparingly and for their intended purpose only.

If they do not, public backlash might lead to a rolling-back of these measures whose noble purpose is to ensure that a career in politics is open to all so that truly representative democracy can flourish.

Don Robertson, Daglish

It used to be a calling

It appears some politicians are kept in their work by the entitlements and conditions of employment, not by a desire to serve their country, which is only what one would expect of dedicated people.

Shame on those who abuse their privileges. There was a time when setting a good example was one of the key requirements of a leader, however that obviously has gone out of the window.

John Bandy, Scarborough

Morality would help

Perhaps if Ms Wells and many other politicians, including the Prime Minister, had moral compasses, Dr Chalmers may

not need to scrap electricity rebates and Mrs Bullock may be able to reduce interest rates.

Gordon Berryman, Como

At least it's action

The just-implemented children's social media ban has elicited much coverage and diverse opinions.

However, whether it's mainstream media, social media or anecdotally there is one constant thread: that being someone will say "waste of time, the kids will get around it anyway" as Ewin Armstrong (*Letters*, 11/12) has.

I agree that many will. However, if we apply that principle consistently then you would remove drinking restrictions for those under 18 because many still get around the restriction. Just as I and, I would wager, many fellow West readers, did in our youth.

Yet having that law in place makes it difficult to get alcohol as children. Whilst many of us did manage to obtain a sly drink, it was opportunistic or involved much effort so happened infrequently. Consequently the damage to health and developing brain was minimised.

The restrictions on social media will play out the same. Many will get around it, but access will be less frequent, giving the brain and emotional problems inflicted by constant doom scrolling a break.

Don't let the perfect be the enemy of good.

Enzo Leone, Marangaroo

Too many downsides

I agree with Lorraine Finlay (*Opinion*, 11/12). Prohibition has never worked so why should a social media ban be effective? Teenagers will find a way around it, possibly moving to more unsafe sites, neurodiverse and queer folk lose the vital support of their online communities, and everyone will be subject to constant surveillance and mass data collection — a huge security risk. Sounds like Big Brother to me.

Anne Martis, Dalkeith