

PROCEDURE AND PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE

Report on Person referred to in the Legislative Assembly

MR BLOFFWITCH (Geraldton) [3.46 pm]: I have for presentation the Procedure and Privileges Committee report on a person referred to in the Legislative Assembly. I move -

That the report be adopted.

The report is as follows -

The Speaker of the Legislative Assembly referred to the Procedure and Privileges Committee a letter from Mr Gervase Purich seeking to use Standing Order 114 to respond to statements made on 17 October 2000 by Ms A J MacTiernan MLA.

The Committee has agreed to the attached response proposed by Mr Purich.

In accordance with Standing Order 114 the Committee has not considered or judged the truth of any statements made in the Legislative Assembly or in the submission.

Recommendation

Your Committee recommends -

That a response by Mr Purich in the terms specified in the Appendix to this report, be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Question put and passed.

[See paper No 557.]

Mr BLOFFWITCH: The response reads as follows -

Response by Mr Gervase Purich

Agreed to by Mr Purich and the Procedure and Privileges Committee

pursuant to Standing Order 114

In reply to statements made by the Member for Armadale, Ms Alannah Joan Geraldine MacTiernan, during the second reading of the Building Legislation Amendment Bill 2000, on Tuesday 17th October 2000, about myself, Gervase Purich, I reject outright the claims made.

The contrary is true. I perform a lot of work for project building companies, and have done so for the last 20 years. Builders use my services, because I provide cost effective, practical design solutions which do not cost an “arm and a leg” both to the builder and in turn, the homeowner.

Providing cost effective and practical design does have a long term benefit to the community, as it makes housing more affordable.

If inquiries were made with my clients, they would reveal that on numerous occasions when problems arise with buildings, we give advice to the builder on why he is wrong, and what is required to fix it. Unfortunately, there is no platform to air these cases as the problems are resolved to everyone’s satisfaction and everyone gets on with their lives.

Not only do I reject outright, and take issue with the assertion that I invariably find there is no problem with the home, but I am extremely confident that my clients would do likewise. Structerre Consulting Engineers could not have survived for 20 years as it has if they were not objective and honest in their dealings.

The fact is that in Building Disputes hearings, and for that matter any court hearing, there are always experts on both sides presenting their viewpoint.

This is especially so in engineering which is a science-based art, not a pure science. The fact that there is a difference of opinion does not imply that one is not impartial.

The information about concerns raised about my impartiality is substantially flawed. I, and people like myself have, through our endeavour and diffusion of clients, caused the cost of housing to become more affordable. Due to the competitive nature of the industry, those savings are subsequently passed on to the consumer.

Should a person be concerned about the performance of an Engineer, there are means by which a complaint can be lodged with the Institution of Engineers and action or sanctions of substance can be applied. This only transpires if there is substance to the allegations. If not, they are thrown out.

GERVASE PURICH