

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS
AND STATUTES REVISION**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE TAKEN
AT PERTH, WEDNESDAY, 7 MAY 1997**

**Hon M.D. Nixon (Chairman)
Hon Muriel Patterson
Hon P. Sulc**

TREVELYAN, MS JOLIN ANNE
Concerned Citizen
residing at 97 Tyrell Street,
Nedlands, examined:

The CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. On behalf of the committee, I would like to welcome you to today's meeting.

Accordingly, I advise you that these proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and that a transcript of the evidence will be provided to you for your information. I ask that, once you have received this transcript, you read it, make any amendments you feel are necessary in relation to a question of fact, and return it to me for alteration. A final copy of the transcript will be sent to you for your own records.

I also advise you that the committee may make your evidence public at the time of its report to the Legislative Council. If the committee does decide to make your evidence public, it will first inform you of this determination.

At this time, I would ask you whether you have been shown an extract of Standing Order No 358 concerning the entitlements of witnesses appearing before the committee.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes, I have.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you fully understand the meaning and effect of these provisions?

Ms TREVELYAN: I think so.

The CHAIRMAN: Finally, I would also like to point out that all evidence and documentation provided to the committee is covered by parliamentary privilege. Would you please state your full name, contact address and capacity in which you appear before the committee?

Ms TREVELYAN: My full name is Jolin Anne Trevelyan and my address is 97 Tyrell Street. I do not really know the capacity in which I appear before the committee other than as a concerned citizen. Is that a category?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I believe that is what you are. How do we address you?

Ms TREVELYAN: As Jo.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you for being part of the group that submitted the petition. You are probably aware that we began looking at it last year, but that was before prorogation, so we had

to leave it. We thank you for re-opening the matter.

We believe that the issue is of public interest and that is why we have taken it on board. We have read your written submission. Would you like to start by outlining your particular concerns and explaining why you think the matter should be examined?

Ms TREVELYAN: Being a concerned citizen, I should perhaps state briefly why I have become involved in this issue. An Aboriginal woman who is a close friend of mine invites me to the meetings that Aboriginal people hold on this topic. I am also a close friend of Christabel Chamarette, who unfortunately cannot be here today because she is in the south of France. In addition, I had a personal experience that made me realise that, leaving aside the rights and wrongs of the situation, how dicey an operation the issue is.

I would like to take a little time to relate my experience. I was driving along Riverside Drive with my former husband at about 8.30 pm on a Thursday night. It was then late-night shopping night. I was in the passenger seat and we were approaching the city. To my right coming down the hill, I noticed a police car with its lights flashing. It was not moving very fast as there was a lot of traffic. Because at the time there had been a lot of news about police car chases, my husband, being the driver, was aware and he saw a car in front of the police car. I do not think I would have seen that car. My husband stopped, even though he had a green light. The traffic on the other side of the intersection was not so lucky. It kept going and the car being chased collided with the traffic. Fortunately, it was only a minor accident. The car rolled over and the police arrested the guy in front of us. I do not think anyone was injured.

That incident made me think. One of the perceptual difficulties is that, at night time, one's attention is drawn to the lights on the police car and not to the car in front. You perhaps make a decision about where the police car is and not where the car in front of it is. For an innocent bystander, that is a very easy thing to do. It is an involuntary perceptual response.

I have another anecdote to relate. I wanted to make these points, but they do not relate to my main argument. A friend of a friend of mine was crossing a road when she noticed a motorcycle in the distance. The road was narrow and cars were parked on either side. She assumed that she had time to cross the road. Her next recollection was that the motorcycle was right in front of her. It collided with her and she lost her leg. She made an assumption, as the result of a quick glance, that the motorcycle was travelling at a certain speed, but it was not travelling at that speed. I must stress that people have little experience of traffic hurtling at them at 140 kmh, whether or not the vehicle concerned has flashing lights. I want you to keep those points in mind as a perceptual context for the comments I am going to make.

I have prepared a summary of the points I want to make as I did not want to take up too much of your time. In addition to attending meetings, I have carried out research at the university crime unit. I have looked up the facts and figures in other studies. The more we look at the statistics, the more we realise that there are definitional problems. The statistics are inconsistent and incomplete. In presenting my summary today, I thought I would pick out the main statistics, as it is easy to become confused.

My main concern is to stop car chases, particularly in relation to stolen cars. I have not carried out much research into car chases that do not involve stolen cars. I believe such chases involve traffic offences or a suspicion of some kind. From what I can gather, there is no evidence that the chases involve police chasing criminals from the scene of a crime. The main reasons why the police chase cars are for traffic offences, because the cars are stolen or because they suspect something. I want to deal mainly with the stolen car aspect.

My first point is that death or injury is not an acceptable outcome for stealing cars. That is a big hurdle for the general public. Whenever I try to discuss the issue with people, the common response is, "Well, if they didn't steal cars, they wouldn't be killed." That is a huge barrier. People cannot even get beyond first base. In a just society, it is not acceptable to me that that view should be the end of the matter.

Hon P. SULC: It is a de facto death sentence.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes, that has been mentioned. There are no statistics on injuries. Since 1991, there have been 16 deaths as a result of car chases, and that information was supplied from a question on notice tabled by Hon Jim Scott last November. Since then, another person has been killed, so that makes 17. That includes bystanders as well as the people involved in the car chases.

The West Australian reported that at least 20 people have died since 1991. That is an example of the inconsistency in the definitions and statistics. There is also a high risk for people not involved in the chase. At least seven people not involved in the car chases have been killed since 1991. The year 1991 is a kind of mark, because that is when the Blurtons were killed. Actually, I am not sure whether it was 1991 or 1992, because they were killed at Christmas. However, I am sure that the figure includes the Blurtons. No police officers have been killed in car chases in that time. I have studied Hommel and it would appear from that that there is no record of police officers being killed in chases. I am not suggesting that that is not a good thing, but it is an indication that the effects are not being spread as one would expect from normal car accidents.

High-speed pursuits are not a solution to car theft. According to the RAC, in 1995 some 16,613 cars were stolen, of which 14,800 were recovered. Only about 2,000 were not recovered. In that same year, there were 240 car chases that were not aborted and another 222 that were aborted. It is clear that only a very small percentage of cars that are stolen are chased. High-speed pursuits are not a solution to getting back vehicles in better condition. Although there are no accessible figures on the damage to cars, I have read studies carried out in South Australia and it is clear that there is a range of damage, the most common, of course, being damage caused when the car is broken into before it is stolen. Some cars are not damaged beyond that, but others are burnt out. Not all cars are badly damaged. Although figures are not available in relation to damage to recovered cars, in 1995 there were 170 crashes as a result of car chases. There were crashes in well over half the chases. High-speed pursuits are dangerous and they are not a solution.

Car chases are not a deterrent to car theft. In fact, they are an incentive. That point must be common knowledge. From attending meetings, I am aware that the kids will confirm that point. Another general concern is that car chases provide a huge barrier in the way of reconciliation and

improving relationships between Aboriginal people and the police. I know the police are trying in many ways to improve their relationships with youth, Aboriginal people and the white population, but things like car chases cause enormous dents in that effort.

I want to bring to your attention comments made at the meetings I have referred to. I have attended many of these meetings and comments like these are made consistently. These comments may not necessarily have anything to what we might call the truth. The police will have a very different view of such accidents. However, this is how Aboriginal people perceive the problem. I want to stress the cultural aspect, and I believe that there is no smoke without fire.

The kinds of comments that are made repeatedly include the statement that the police ram them during the chase; a number of police cars are involved and they sometimes chase cars up the off-ramps to the freeway. The police cars act like sheepdogs and chase them on to the freeway ramp. When the public reads about incidents like that, it reads about a stolen car going the wrong way down the freeway. People naturally feel reassured that the police are chasing the stolen car and trying to stop it. However, that may not be what actually happened.

One consistent comment is that when the police catch them, the police comment on how they took a corner or how they performed during a chase. Mothers have also commented on that. By the time the parents get there, they have heard what the police have said. They are describing the pursuit like a game instead of as a method of apprehension. I presume that comments like that are made when there has been no crash or significant injury. A couple of parents have quoted examples of the police goading or inviting kids to steal cars. They have approached kids in a shopping mall and said, "Are you going to steal a car tonight?" I do not want to comment on the truth of such statements, but that is how the Aboriginal people perceive the issue.

In conclusion, police pursuits involving stolen cars would seem to have very little to do with car theft. It would seem to have a lot to do with a culture that has grown up and which has very dangerous outcomes for the people involved in chases and, in many cases, also bystanders.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Have you read the recommendations to the New South Wales Police Service?

Ms TREVELYAN: No. Unfortunately I have not read them.

The CHAIRMAN: The recommendations contain a definition of pursuit. It might be useful if we agree that that is the kind of thing we are talking about, as we will then know what we are talking about. Under the heading, "DEFINITION OF A PURSUIT", the recommendations state:

RECOMMENDATION 1: The New South Wales Police Service amend the definition of a police pursuit of the driver of a motor vehicle in the Commissioner's Instructions and other policy and educational materials to:

- (i) specify that a police pursuit of the driver of a motor vehicle occurs when a police officer chases and attempts to stop a motor vehicle and the driver refuses to obey the police officer, following which the police officer decides to pursue for the purpose of stopping the motor vehicle or identifying the motor vehicle or the

offender driving the motor vehicle;

The advantage of using that definition is that if an ordinary person is driving 5 kmh or 10 kmh above the speed limit and a policeman notices it on his radar detector, he can drive up behind the person who may be travelling at 80 kmh in a 60 kmh zone and flash his lights, and if the person pulls to one side there is no problem. A pursuit occurs when, instead of pulling over, the person puts his foot down and the police start to chase that person at a great rate of knots. Are you happy that that is probably a fair definition of a pursuit?

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes, I think so. I do not know what constitutes “attempts to stop”. Would flashing the lights be an attempt to stop?

The CHAIRMAN: I would have thought that would be the case.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: That usually stops us.

Ms TREVELYAN: It would certainly stop me.

The CHAIRMAN: If we accept that definition, it allows the police to go about their normal business and stop most offenders.

Ms TREVELYAN: I do not have qualms about the police stopping people.

The CHAIRMAN: It would appear from your evidence that the police are relatively safe as they must be skilled drivers because they seem to enter into pursuits and, on your evidence, no one has been killed as far as you are aware.

Hon P. SULC: No police officers have been killed.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, no police officers have been killed.

Ms TREVELYAN: According to the Hommel report, their injuries seem to be significantly less.

The CHAIRMAN: You are saying that the police try to force an accident to stop the person. Is that what you assume?

Ms TREVELYAN: Ramming could be a tactic.

The CHAIRMAN: Ramming is even more extreme. Are you alleging that the police purposely chase to cause the pursued vehicle to crash?

Ms TREVELYAN: I have not come across much that has been written about this, but it seems that the police sometimes ram pursued vehicles. They do not always ram them. They always want them to stop, but sometimes there seems to be an element of the chase itself and pitting their skills against the skills of the young drivers. That is the point I was trying to make when I referred to police officers commenting on the kids’ driving skills.

Hon P. SULC: They are escalating the game, so to speak.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes. Once the police start a pursuit, whether or not they are pursuing a stolen vehicle, the pursued driver commits many traffic offences almost automatically. I can understand from the police officers' point of view that there can be a desperation to continue the chase because the further they go, more crimes are committed right before their eyes. Escalating the game is a good point.

The CHAIRMAN: Would I be over-emphasising what you have said if I said that you have suggested that the people who steal cars quite enjoy the chase -

Hon P. SULC: It is a motivation for stealing a car.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is a motivational thing. One of the reasons they steal cars is to have a bit of fun with the police.

Ms TREVELYAN: That can be the case, but it is not always the case. Sometimes the person who steals a car just wants to get from A to B.

The CHAIRMAN: You are almost suggesting that the police sometimes enjoy the chase so they are not particularly perturbed if a chase occurs. Is that what you are saying?

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes, that is right.

The CHAIRMAN: They almost encourage each other.

Ms TREVELYAN: The drivers of the police cars involved in chases often are not much older than the kids they are chasing. I would not describe it as a youth phenomenon, but -

Hon P. SULC: This is from anecdotal evidence.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes, but it is consistent anecdotal evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: In your report you say that the purpose of the pursuit is usually in response to a car theft, but not always.

Ms TREVELYAN: According to police annual reports, that involves perhaps 50 per cent or 60 per cent of pursuits.

The CHAIRMAN: You said that sometimes police believe these people have been involved in another crime. If someone was caught in an act of terrorism or if someone was escaping from a bank hold-up, should police chase people in those circumstances? Is there a difference?

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes. I thought I also said that I have found no evidence that that happens very often -

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, you did say that.

Ms TREVELYAN: - if at all. What I meant to say - and I am not sure whether I said this - is that people assume that is why the police are chasing cars. There might be a general feeling that the crimes are so serious that the general community might accept the risk of a car chase and all the dangers involved in that. However, I am saying that the majority of car chases occur in response to car theft, which involves things like property.

The CHAIRMAN: Suppose the police were to apprehend a bank robber just as he left the premises. Should the police chase that bank robber?

Hon P. SULC: There appears to be the suggestion of a sliding scale, depending on the seriousness of the offence as opposed to the danger to the public.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes. I have not really considered bank robbery. Speaking purely off the top of my head, I suppose I would agree with Hon P. Sulc, but I still believe the police must weigh up the risk to life and limb as distinct from the risk to property.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you be happy with a set of guidelines which outlined when the police should enter into a pursuit?

Ms TREVELYAN: I have thought about that. I am not sure whether I would be happier to tell the police, "Don't chase stolen cars," and leave the rest to them, or whether we should have guidelines. I am not sure about that. I do not want to make prescriptions for the police, but, because a car is stolen, that is not a good reason to chase it.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: You said earlier that the lady had only a second or so to decide whether to cross the road and she did not realise how fast the motorcycle was travelling. Would not that apply to the police as well? They have only a split second to decide whether to chase a car.

Hon P. SULC: No, because they can hang back at any time.

Ms TREVELYAN: I agree.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: The figures show that many chases have been aborted, and that suggests that the police have recognised the danger.

Ms TREVELYAN: I agree. The figures have fallen since 1990, when there were something like 700 car chases. The police have certainly tried to reconsider. However, the problem is that there is no information on what sort of cars they chase and when they chase. I can understand their argument that if they issued guidelines for chases, the car thieves would know how to avoid those guidelines.

The figures seem to go up and down according to the political situation. As there are no guidelines, we do not have a firm base to measure things by. It is like a football game - not when

the goalposts are being shifted but when there are no goalposts, and someone says that "This is a goal" and "That is not a goal".

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: Do you recognise that a car is generally a person's second highest capital asset - second only to a home - and that it is a very traumatic experience for a car owner to lose a car by having it stolen? People would expect the police to apprehend a car thief. Even if the car is damaged, at least the owner can put in an insurance claim. Should that not be taken into consideration?

Ms TREVELYAN: Quite clearly, many people share that view, and that is why people tell me, "They get what they deserve." However, that is not the kind of society I want to live in. I understand that people make an outlay on cars, but there might be another way around the problem.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: I want to point out another aspect. I owned a car that was stolen some years ago when there were two children in it. Believe me, I did not feel too kindly towards the driver of that car. One of the children was two years old and the other was six, and they were put out in the middle of a highway. Only the quick thinking of the six-year-old meant that the baby was carried out of danger. The older child recognised the danger and managed to get his bearings. The driver showed no remorse for the dangerous situation that he put those children in.

Ms TREVELYAN: I understand and appreciate that. That is a complex point. I do not know whether a police car chase would have helped in that situation. Presumably, the police would have known that the children were in the car and they would not have rammed it.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: The police did know that the children were in the car. My first concern was for the children, not for the car.

Ms TREVELYAN: Of course.

Hon P. SULC: The recovery rates suggest that high-speed pursuits are not causing the vast majority of cars to be recovered.

The CHAIRMAN: And when they are recovered, they tend not to be in very good condition.

Hon P. SULC: Yes. There is a balance there. On a rough calculation, 1,794 cars were not recovered out of a total of 16,613 that were stolen. That means that just under 90 per cent are recovered which, compared with other forms of theft, is a pretty good rate.

The CHAIRMAN: I want to clarify a couple of points. Do you believe that proper records of police pursuits should be kept with full statistical information?

Ms TREVELYAN: Absolutely and with definitions. The big problem is defining what is and what is not -

Hon P. SULC: Transparency is an issue.

The CHAIRMAN: In relation to another point that you raised, many of the young people involved are Aboriginal youths. The statistic in the submission is extremely high.

Ms TREVELYAN: All but one of the deaths involved Aboriginal kids.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you think most of the cars are stolen by young Aboriginal people, or do the police tend to chase cars that are stolen by young Aboriginals?

Hon P. SULC: I would like to add to that. I would be interested to know the composition of drivers in the aborted chases. I have seen some of the figures compiled in South Australia by Fay Gale, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Western Australia. They show the different levels of Aboriginals in the justice system.

Ms TREVELYAN: I do not believe such a breakdown would be possible because, if the chases have been aborted, the police have not caught the offenders.

Hon P. SULC: But they may have been observed and there are things like fingerprinting. I would be interested in that as well.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes. That is interesting. I am not suggesting that only Aboriginal kids steal cars, but a culture has grown up between Aboriginal kids and the police which involves car chases. Also, cars with Aboriginal kids tend to contain several of them; there are not just one or two people. One statistic in the annual report suggests that the number of offenders caught - that is different from offenders who are arrested, and that is contained in another set of statistics - has increased from about 1990 until now. As I have said, there is a problem with definitions and so on, but that statistic suggests that the police might be targeting cars full of kids in order to have so many offenders per car chase. That suggests also that the police might be targeting Aboriginal people. I do not know whether it is because they are Aboriginal or whether it is a sure way of increasing their offender apprehension rates.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: Does not the age element also come into that?

Ms TREVELYAN: Sixty per cent of those whom they catch are juveniles. To be legalistic, there would appear to be a tendency.

The CHAIRMAN: Jo, you said that the police tended to act like sheepdogs and chase offenders on to freeway ramps.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Was it to the on-ramp or to the off-ramp?

Ms TREVELYAN: The off-ramp. However, we will not pick that up in the news. What we pick up in the news is that the police chased a stolen vehicle going the wrong way down the freeway.

I am suggesting that one reason for that might be that they had been chased on to it in that way. Also, Aboriginal people consistently say that one car will start chasing and then more will join in. So there is not just one car but two, and they act as a team. That is a little different from just one car chasing them.

The CHAIRMAN: If you accept that the police should apprehend cars, two cars are probably more effective than just one. It comes back to policy.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes, but if people stop willingly, they will stop willingly if there is one car, not two.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right. If they are not going to stop willingly, two cars are probably better than one at forcibly stopping them.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes. I guess that is right. I am not sure of the number of cars, but I know that it can exceed two.

The CHAIRMAN: Another question - it is dealt with in some reports - relates to vehicle immobilisers. One of the suggested methods of stopping vehicles is a way of puncturing all its tyres. The only trouble is that it seems more appropriate on freeways than on ordinary suburban streets. In other words, if somebody is on a long run, one can put a car up in front, lay out a barrier which, when they drive over it, punctures all their tyres and they are easy to apprehend without too much damage.

Hon P. SULC: Have you ever handled a car with punctures at high speed?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, presumably, the tyres deflate all together.

Hon P. SULC: There is no traction whatsoever. It is not a nice experience. I have had two simultaneous front blow-outs.

The CHAIRMAN: In the report it appears that because all the tyres deflate gently it is very effective and not particularly dangerous.

Ms TREVELYAN: There is one other relevant point. Parents often will say that the police often knew who the kids were when they were chasing them. The police will not have as much evidence, but they will be able to obtain fingerprints and so on. We find that older cars that are easy to break into are stolen. On the whole, luxury cars are not stolen by kids because they cannot get into them; they will pick something fairly easy. There are still many cars around to be stolen - as you know, 16,000 - but gradually there will be more sophisticated methods of preventing them from being stolen. I do not accept that they are doing anything such as immobilising; I think that they probably have other methods such as recognising the kids in the first place.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: Can anything be done to deter kids from stealing cars in the first place?

Ms TREVELYAN: Parents have actually said to their kids, "Please don't steal cars; the police will kill you." That is how they summarised it. If there were an accord with the police that they would not chase them, there would be more parental cooperation and parental leverage. The parents want to stop their kids stealing cars, because they do not like their kids being injured or killed. There is great room for cooperation and extending the work that has been done in other spheres, but there is an awful lot of work to be done to build a trust base. At the moment, there is not a lot of trust in this matter.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: Just in the past four weeks, a youngster said, "This is our land, so they are our roads and I have the right to take any car I want."

Hon P. SULC: It is not the parents saying that.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: No, but I am very concerned about that attitude.

Ms TREVELYAN: That attitude will be furthered, not stopped, by car chases and so on. For example, the other day I was walking along a quiet street in Fremantle and I noticed my friend's grandson looking distraught, and I said, "Hi, Stub. What's the matter?" He said, "Oh, nothing." I said, "You don't look too happy," and he said, "Yeah; the cops just came." I said, "Why?" He said, "The other kids and I were just running and having a game outside here and the shopkeepers saw us running and they called the cops." The shopkeepers saw Aboriginal kids running outside, thought that they were stealing, and called the cops. That is not his first such incident, and, by the time he is 18, he will have had many. I have three kids, and so far they have had only one unpleasant incident with the cops. There is just no comparison with the experiences of Aboriginal kids and middle-class white kids.

Hon P. SULC: I must say that the anecdotal evidence of young Aboriginals would tend to back up that claim. One case in particular that comes to mind involves a young bloke I know who had just been swimming and who walked into a shopping centre to buy something to eat. He had blurry eyes because he had been swimming in a chlorine pool. He was hungry. A policeman saw him with a lot of food in his hand and with blurry eyes, and, in the middle of the shopping centre, strip-searched him for drugs.

Ms TREVELYAN: If they were one-off incidents, we would say, "Well, that is unfortunate," but for those families they are continuous.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: My next question follows on from that. How many of those kids do you think are affected by drugs? Is that part of the problem?

Ms TREVELYAN: I do not know. I could not comment on that. They cannot afford drugs. If they took anything, it would be glue, for instance. They do not have access to the necessary funds to take other drugs.

Hon P. SULC: I work as a counsellor or group facilitator at Holyoake, where I talk to the youth people, because I work in adult services. There is a high incidence of glue and inhalant use.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: There is also the use of paints. That has been a problem in Albany.

Hon P. SULC: Amphetamines and so on are basically too expensive for those kids to access. That is more of a middle-class drug problem. What do you think of, say, other forms of surveillance, for instance tracking a car by helicopter to maintain a watch or by police cars staying back far enough to monitor the car until the police are able to apprehend it safely without engaging in a chase?

Ms TREVELYAN: That sounds less dangerous than chasing, but I cannot comment on its effectiveness. Anything would be better than a chase. You would have to ask the police whether that was possible, but you might be able to recommend that option.

Hon P. SULC: How do you think offenders would react in such a situation? Would they engage in other dangerous activities?

Ms TREVELYAN: I do not know. I suspect that they lack driving skills. The car is a symbol of manhood, so I suspect that that option would remove some of that element. The kids are quite smart, so they might invent a new game, but I cannot imagine what it might be.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that there are tracking devices. I do not know how expensive they are, but, theoretically, if every vehicle had a tracking device, the police could follow it until it ran out of petrol and then go and pick it up.

Hon P. SULC: There are civil liberties issues in that.

The CHAIRMAN: It could be done voluntarily.

Ms TREVELYAN: It would be the car owners who wanted to do that.

Hon P. SULC: Cars with such a facility or even those with immobilisers -

Ms TREVELYAN: They tend not to be stolen.

Hon P. SULC: Yes.

Hon MURIEL PATTERSON: Think of the husband and wife aspect.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a clear conscience.

Hon P. SULC: No comment.

The CHAIRMAN: I have exhausted my questions. Do other members of the Committee have any further questions?

Hon P. SULC: Not at the moment. I thank Ms Trevelyan for her submission; it has been very

helpful.

Ms TREVELYAN: I would like to thank you for taking the time to listen to it. I know that you have lots of things to do.

The CHAIRMAN: We will certainly continue to examine the matter. We have made a start, as you are aware. We have already visited various police forces to see how they handle the matter and to see whether we can come up with some recommendations to solve a very difficult problem.

Hon P. SULC: As I have said, it is fairly detailed.

Ms TREVELYAN: Yes, it is very complex. We could be confused because of the definitions, and every set of figures is different. The figures that I quoted from the RAC are slightly different from those in the police section of the annual report - not substantially different, otherwise I would not have used them. It is a difficult problem.

Hon P. SULC: If we need to make further inquiries, do you mind if we come back to you for more information?

Ms TREVELYAN: That would be fine. Christabel will be around, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ms TREVELYAN: Thanks very much.

[The witness retired]

THE COMMITTEE ADJOURNED
