

## RALLY AUSTRALIA

### *Motion*

Resumed from 23 June on the following motion moved by Hon Norman Moore (Leader of the Opposition) -

That this house, in expressing its amazement that a Western Australian government would relinquish the rights to hold Rally Australia in Western Australia, calls on the state government to immediately acknowledge that its decision was a temporary error of judgment and advise the world rally governing body -

- (1) that this state wishes to continue holding the event in Western Australia into the foreseeable future; and
- (2) that commonsense will prevail in the future.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I notice the notice paper reads, "Continuation of introductory remarks Hon Norman Moore".

**HON NORMAN MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition)** [4.16 pm]: The notice paper is not quite accurate in that respect, Mr President, because I am about to conclude my comments on this matter. When I last spoke on Rally Australia I was relaying to the house the advice that had been provided to me under freedom of information. The reason I made an FOI application on this matter was that the answers that were provided to the house by the Minister for Tourism made it very difficult for interested observers such as me to understand the decision-making process within government in respect of Rally Australia. The questions that I asked, and the answers that were provided to me, suggested that the decision to terminate Rally Australia was made by the board of the Western Australian Tourism Commission. The best place to look at what the board of the Tourism Commission may or may not be doing is the minutes of its meetings. I therefore made a request under freedom of information for the minutes of all meetings of the Tourism Commission board that recommended or endorsed the decision to end support for Rally Australia. The information that was provided to me under my FOI application demonstrates that there is a problem. That problem is with either the FOI process, or the minutes of the Tourism Commission board - members can take their pick - because all I got was a series of pages that had been blacked out. Even though I can understand the reason that so much of the minutes has been blacked out, I want to demonstrate to the house what we get when we ask for this type of information under FOI. My FOI application sought the following -

1. Minutes of all meetings of the Tourism Commission Board that recommended or endorsed the decision to end support for Rally Australia.
2. A copy of the confidential file note made on 4 March 2005.

What was provided to me was the minutes of the seventh commission meeting for 2004. The minutes show the date, the commencement and conclusion times and the venue. The names of those present have been blacked out, as have the apologies, the observers and the minute taker. The minutes then state that the chairman opened the meeting at 8.42 am. The remainder of that page, and the next four pages, is blacked out. Perhaps I just do not know the right questions to ask; we will find out in due course. We then get to item 5.7, which reads as follows -

#### **5.7 Discussion Regarding Future Major Events - no paper**

*Madeleine Bertelli, Executive Director, EventsCorp joined the meeting for this discussion.*

- Madeleine Bertelli provided the Board with an overview of Events Corp future major events.

#### **Resolution:**

**The Board notes this discussion.**

There are then more pages that have been blacked out. We then get to item 7, which reads -

#### **7. MATTERS FOR NOTING**

##### **7.1 Synopsis of Telstra Rally Australia (TRA) Board Strategic Planning**

- Discussion was held on the contents of the papers, however, no specific issues were identified for noting.

#### **Resolution:**

**That the Board notes the TRA's Board's vision for the next five years.**

That is interesting, because we have since found out that the vision went for only two years. We then get to 7.2, which reads -

**7.2 Financial Report - Telstra Rally Australia**

- Discussion was held on the contents of the paper, however, the Board raised no issues outside those covered in the paper.

**Resolution:**

**The Board notes the Financial Status of TRS and future options for TRA.**

The next two pages are blacked out. We then get to 12, which reads -

**12. CLOSE**

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 12.31pm.

Signed as a true and correct record

There is then more blacking out. It then reads -

ALAN MULGREW

CHAIRMAN

TOURISM WESTERN AUSTRALIA

It is dated 6 September 2005.

That does not tell us a lot, other than that EventsCorp had a vision of five years for Rally Australia at that time.

The next information that was provided was the minutes of the Tourism Commission meeting of 6 October 2004. I will not go through all the information that is provided other than that which is relevant. It reads -

**3. STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION**

**3.1 Interim presentation on major event, on a matter listed for decision at the 15 October Board Meeting.**

- The CEO provided a presentation regarding potential future event strategies.
- The item was presented to determine whether Board members require further information to make a decision on 15 October.
- Board Members put forward several queries, which the CEO will investigate prior to the Board meeting on 15 October.

That is all that is provided in the minutes of a meeting of 6 October. The important point to note from that is that the board was provided information via an interim presentation on major events. It provided advice and information to the board to enable it to make a decision at its meeting of 15 October. Members should remember that date because it is quite important in the overall scheme of things. I expected that the next board minutes I would receive under freedom of information legislation would be the minutes of 15 October. However, the next board meeting minutes I received were dated 4 March 2005. I do not know what happened at the meeting of 15 October other than what I learnt in response to a question I asked the other day when I was advised that the board met but it did not discuss Rally Australia. It seems odd that on 4 October the board was given an interim presentation by EventsCorp on the future of major events for those members to be aware of issues so that they could make a decision on 15 October; however, no discussion on Rally Australia occurred at that meeting.

I gather from the absence of minutes being provided to me, no further discussion was held within the board itself, at least on the future of Rally Australia, until the meeting of 4 March 2005, which, interestingly, was after the election. I will shortly make some assumptions about that process.

The fourth point of the minutes of 4 March meeting reads -

**4. MAJOR EVENT STRATEGY**

The Board had a discussion regarding the major event strategy.

**5. CLOSE**

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 10.00am.

What an extraordinary set of minutes! The board had a discussion regarding the major event strategy, yet no decision is recorded. No information is provided about the major event strategy. The minutes contain no reference to any decision. I am trying to find out when the board made the decision to end its association with Rally Australia. The minutes do not say that the board recommended the closure of Rally Australia. Part of that meeting was focused on a file note dated 4 March 2005 from the chairman, Alan Mulgrew, the subject of which was "Board Meeting 4 March 2005: Agenda Item 4 (Major Event Strategy)". We should bear in mind that agenda item 4 in the minutes simply said no more and no less than "The Board had a discussion regarding the major event strategy." The file minute provided to the board reads -

1. Madeleine Bertelli presented the proposed strategy regarding Telstra Rally Australia. The presentation covered:
  - Performance of 2004 events
  - Proposed course of action - a managed exit
  - Legal advice
  - Transfer/sale strategy
  - Timeline
  - Risks
  - Political
  - Financial/Economic
  - Management
  - Media and stakeholder strategy
2. The Board endorsed the following:

This is in the file note but not in the minutes.

It reads -

**Proposed course of action - a managed exit**

- March-April: Confirm intent to run event in 2005 and 2006 to all stakeholders.
- March-April: Begin transfer/sale discussions with potential brokers. Manage media issues.
- November: Conduct 2005 event.
- December: Give formal notification of 2006 as last event.

**Transfer/sale strategy**

- Approach a consultant to broker event. (State Supply Commission have approved sole supplier status).
- Engage a consultant on commission basis (Note: the Board discussed potential quantum of commission and the merits of using an individual due to their relationship with CAMs. The final decision would need to be brought back to the Board for endorsement, to ensure the probity and commercial aspects had been addressed).
- CAMS and FIA also share in net profits in recognition of their intellectual property.
- If no agreement can be negotiated with consultant, approach CAMS directly to broker, or go to tender with an event management company to vendor the event.

**Media and stakeholder strategy:**

- Proactive media strategy - individual, targeted media briefings rather than respond to a leak - aim to avoid story being 'event stolen' by another State. Follow with media statement.
- Identify possible 'media supporters' for decision.

I do not know who they would be. It continues.

- Ensure strong third party endorsements - TCWA, ATEC (WA), AHA, Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Tourism Task Force.

- Ensure sponsors (Telstra, Qantas) are well prepared to make public comment.

The chairman, Alan Mulgrew's name is at the bottom of that note.

The important issue is that a presentation was supposed to have been made to the Tourism Commission board at its meeting of 15 October 2004. For reasons unknown to me, it was not discussed, assuming that the minister's answer to my question the other day was correct, and I have no reason to assume it was not. There is no reference to Rally Australia in any further minutes of the Tourism Commission board from 15 October until 4 March. I can only assume the board met on a number of occasions during that period and for reasons best known to the board, on which I can make an assessment, it decided not to discuss Rally Australia in a pre-election environment. I would be interested to know whether the board was directed by the minister or whether board members took it on themselves to go down that path.

On 4 March, after the election, a meeting was held of which a file note was provided, I presume, to all the members of the Tourism Commission board about agenda item 4, the major event strategy, which I have just read out. The recommendation, which was not endorsed or referred to in the minutes of that meeting, seems to me to be - given the strategy - that the Tourism Commission board did not want to proceed with Rally Australia but that it would run it in 2005-06 and manage the exit on the basis that the formal notification of the 2006 event, being the last event, would be made in December 2005. We have not reached December 2005 yet. I would be interested to hear from the Minister for Education and Training when she responds in this debate about the fact that, for some reason or other, on 21 March - a couple of weeks after the 4 March board meeting - the Minister for Tourism made the decision public. When asked who made the decision, the Minister for Tourism said that the decision was made by the Tourism Commission board. There is no reference in the board's minutes to its having made that decision. I thought, and I am sure that all other members have the same view, that if a decision of this magnitude were to be made, it would be at least recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

If I had not asked for this file copy as part of freedom of information, I would not have been given that either. I would have received only the minutes of the meeting of 4 March, which contain no reference to the decision to get rid of Rally Australia, albeit in answer to my questions the minister advised me that, at its 4 March meeting, the Tourism Commission board had recommended to him that EventsCorp should get rid of the event. Subsequent to receiving this information from the Tourism Commission board through my freedom of information application, on 23 June I asked the Minister for Tourism to table the paper titled "Synopsis of Telstra Rally Australia (TRA) Board Strategic Planning", which was discussed at the Tourism Commission board meeting held on 20 August 2004. I also asked whether the minister would table a copy of the proposed strategy for Telstra Rally Australia presented to the board meeting on 4 March by Madeleine Bertelli; and, if not, why not. I asked for copies of two documents referred to in the information that I have been able to access through FOI. The answer states -

Tourism Western Australia is still in confidential transition discussions and cannot release this information at this stage.

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich:** That is fair enough.

**Hon NORMAN MOORE:** It is not fair enough, minister. When she sat on this side of the chamber, moaner, and asked questions about these issues day after day, week after week, moan after moan, she got very offended by the amount of information that she thought she was not getting. I had the same problem on this occasion that she had on many other occasions, moaner. I think that members on both sides of this chamber would love to know why the decision was made to get rid of Telstra Rally Australia. Some of the minister's colleagues are very anxious to know the answers to these questions. Why does the government hide behind this commercial-in-confidence -

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich:** You invented it. That was your catchcry.

**Hon NORMAN MOORE:** The minister has an extraordinarily short memory. She was not here during WA Inc. She cannot remember the 1980s. I wish she could. I will tell her how to remember the 1980s. A royal commission was held into the commercial activities of government. I suggest that the minister read that royal commission report from start to finish and learn something.

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich:** Get over it!

**Hon NORMAN MOORE:** I have got over it, but I do not intend to stand here and listen to her say that we invented commercial-in-confidence. The Liberal Party never got an answer to a question in the 10 years that the Burke, Dowding and Lawrence governments were in office. They always used the argument that it was commercially confidential; they could not tell us that they were in bed with Laurie Connell or whatever companies they were in bed with during the WA Inc years. The Labor Party invented this particular excuse. Now, for some reason or another, the Labor Party is continuing to use it.

I hope that when the minister stands - I presume that she will - she will tell us when the decision was made to get rid of Rally Australia, who made it and why the Minister for Tourism made the announcement in March when the strategy was that it would be announced in December. I hope the minister will tell us the answers to those questions. Will she tell us whether the matter went to cabinet and whether cabinet agreed to get rid of Rally Australia? Was it the subject of a cabinet decision? I am sure that the minister can tell us that. I would also like to know why the matter was not discussed at the meeting of 15 October, given that on 4 October the board was informed that the matter would be discussed at that meeting. I would like to know why reference was made at the 6 October meeting to a major presentation to be given at the 15 October meeting, which did not happen. I would like to know why the matter was not discussed at the meeting of 15 October and why it was not discussed at any other meeting between then and 4 March. I want to know whether the Minister for Tourism directed the board not to discuss the matter and whether he directed the board not to make a decision about Rally Australia prior to the election. Again, as I asked a moment ago, why did the Minister for Tourism make the announcement in March when the strategy, as outlined under the heading "a managed exit" in the confidential file copy of the minutes of the 4 March meeting, referred to the matter being dealt with in December this year? Finally, I also ask where in the minutes of the Tourism Commission board meeting is there any reference to the decision to terminate the event. Why do the minutes not indicate that the board made the decision to terminate the event? The Minister for Tourism has relied on that having been the case in his answers to the questions I have asked. He has said that it was not his decision; it was a decision of the board. Why did the board not record it in its minutes? It is a very simple question. There are more questions than there are answers on this matter, and I hope I will get some answers before this debate is finished.

I conclude by suggesting to the government that it seek to keep Rally Australia. It should reverse the decision it has made, because it will run the rally in 2005, as it is obliged and always intended to do. To my knowledge, no-one else had made a submission to run the event in 2006, albeit discussions are taking place. Proposals are being put to the Western Australian government by businesspeople, particularly those who are interested in the rally itself, for a joint venture between the government and these businesspeople to run Rally Australia in the future. I recommend that the government take note of those proposals, try to make them work and do everything it can to ensure that Rally Australia stays in Western Australia for the foreseeable future. I return to the comments I made at the beginning of the debate. When the rumour was spread in 2000 by the Victorian government that Rally Australia would move to Victoria, I was the Minister for Tourism who had to argue that that was not the case. Apart from *The West Australian*, my biggest critic at the time was the current Minister for Tourism, Hon Mark McGowan, who criticised the then government for losing Rally Australia. The great irony of this debate is that about three weeks after he became Minister for Tourism, he said that we no longer wanted it. I want to know how he reached that decision. The information that has been provided to me so far is not satisfactory. The reason I have raised the issue in the house is that I hope the minister handling this matter on behalf of Hon Mark McGowan will give me the answers to the questions I have asked. I plead with the minister to understand that many people would like this event to stay in Western Australia. A proposition has been put to the government that will save it money. I understand that the cost of the event to the government has increased significantly over the years. In my day it cost the state government about \$2 million a year, and now we are told that it costs about \$5 million. That is a significant increase, but in the overall scheme of things it is a pittance. The event provides significant enjoyment and pleasure to many thousands of Western Australians. It provides an economic benefit that is greater than the outlay that the government must commit to provide. It is my view that the government can do a deal with the private sector to keep the rally in Western Australia, and I urge the government to go down that path.

The motion was a sort of tongue-in-cheek motion that was meant to demonstrate that this seems like a very silly decision. Everybody was amazed that the government would relinquish the event, bearing in mind the extraordinary lengths to which Western Australia went to get it in the first place and to keep it. The motion calls on the government to acknowledge that it was a temporary error of judgment. I think that might well have been the case. Certainly, the people who are interested in the event do not think it was something that people had worked on over a period; they think it was a temporary error of judgment. The motion also calls on the government to advise the world rally body that the state wishes to continue holding the event in Western Australia. We hope that commonsense will prevail in the future. Commonsense means that when we get these events, we hang on to them because they are darned hard to get in the first place.

**HON BRUCE DONALDSON (Agricultural)** [4.38 pm]: I was not going to speak on the motion, but I have listened with great interest to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. What he has outlined is of concern to me, because of the process that has taken place to get rid of the event in Western Australia. As he pointed out, the event brings a lot of enjoyment and pleasure to a lot of people. I say up front that I am not a petrolhead, but I have many friends who are. This event has created a lot of interest. The measurement of the return on investment has been very subjective in this issue. I am not sure whether the simple economic return can be used

as a basis for scrapping an event. Western Australia, particularly Perth, has been accused over a number of years of being dullsville. I think we are slowly drifting into creating the whole of Western Australia as dullsville.

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich:** I am trying my best to change that, honourable member.

**Hon BRUCE DONALDSON:** I know the minister's principles, and I know that she will put a very strong argument in cabinet to persuade the minister, Hon Mark McGowan, and the rest of the government to change their mind on this issue. In Western Australia, there is a tremendous amount of interest in mountain bikes among children. Many parks have been developed to which parents can take their little tackers to ride their mountain bikes. We also have dune buggies. Many people say they are not very happy with dune buggies racing around the Lancelin sandhills. However, I am aware of one person who has spent about \$100 000 on a dune buggy. That is an awful lot of money, but it actually has been spent in the community. Kids are also interested in go-karts, from the motorised ones to those without motors that just run down hills. Kids have that in their blood. It is inherent in all of us. There is the Barbagallo Raceway, the Kwinana Quit Motorplex, and the Ravenswood Raceway. Motor sport is something to which many people go to be entertained. Those same people could turn around and ask why the government can spend up to \$40 million to develop a new athletics stadium. Athletics has fallen away over the years in Western Australia; we do not have the runs on the board. Why should we spend \$40 million to put an extra 10 000 seats into Subiaco Oval? Why do we need to spend \$100 million on a stadium for certain sports? Yes, it is costing a lot of money to have this event in Western Australia; I recognise that. Another point is that I am not aware that the rally drivers or the companies that are involved in Rally Australia in Western Australia have ever said that they wanted to bypass Western Australia.

**Hon Norman Moore:** They all said that it was the best rally in the world.

**Hon BRUCE DONALDSON:** Yes, that is right, and a wonderful part of the rally is that people flock to the city and the forests to attend events that are part of the rally, both on the Perth Esplanade and in rough conditions amongst trees, gravel, rain and dirt, and they have a ball. This phenomenon is worldwide. Consider the number of people who attend races at Phillip Island or Bathurst, and the number of people who sit in front of television sets watching Formula One racing. I personally could not think of anything worse, but I am only one person, and for every one like me there are 100 who enjoy this kind of activity. If the event is losing money - really costing the state - that would have to be analysed. I believe the government's decision is a political one. If it is a political decision, the government should just come out and say so. Some of the figures are very rubbery and indicate that the government has been subjective about what money the event has put into the Western Australian economy. If a television station or *The West Australian* were prepared to run a poll asking whether people wanted to retain Rally Australia, I would bet that the answer would be an overwhelming yes. There are many people who may not be interested in car rallies but believe that it is something that keeps Western Australia on the map. It is a tourism promotion in itself, just like the Hopman Cup, and we need to look at the spin-off. People watch the event and talk about it around Australia and around the world, and that in itself has untold benefits to tourism in Western Australia.

I add my support to what Hon Norman Moore has been saying. This is something the government should revisit in the best interests of satisfying the wider community involved in the event in different ways. These events should be taken on a collective basis, rather than just focusing in on the activities of the Dockers or the Eagles football clubs, or Perth Glory, or the new Western Force rugby club. We are giving them a great deal of help. Telstra Rally Australia has provided a great opportunity for many Western Australians to enjoy something. If it were taken away from Western Australia they would lose that, because the cost of going from A to B is very significant for Western Australians. No doubt Victoria, New South Wales or South Australia would jump at the opportunity to host this event. It is the responsibility of the minister representing the Minister for Tourism in this house, Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich, to say to the minister and her cabinet colleagues that this decision should be reassessed. The process of Tourism WA has not identified this decision as a political statement. If it is a political statement, that is fine. The government is entitled to do that; it has the mandate, and has come back into government. However, it should not hide behind Tourism WA. That is what it is doing, and that has been well spelt out in the information presented to the house during this debate by Hon Norman Moore. I urge members of this house to get behind this motion. Hon Norman Moore is speaking on behalf of many people in the wider community who would like to see this event retained.

The government could get out of this quite easily by carrying out a poll. It should let *The West Australian* or one of the television stations run a poll asking whether we want to get rid of Telstra Rally Australia. I can tell members now that the answer would be a resounding no. People want to keep it. An opportunity should be provided for those people who are involved and interested in the event to come forward and say that they want the event to be continued. We are seeing Western Australia and Perth sliding into this dullsville image that is being put about by a lot of people who believe we are just getting rid of everything and that nothing is happening in Western Australia. We know that is not the case, but that is the perception that is being given to the rest of Australia and the rest of the world. I would like to see the Minister for Tourism, when considering the economic

benefits to Western Australia, take into account the advertising of Perth and Western Australia that comes from holding the event.

**HON MURRAY CRIDDLE (Agricultural)** [4.49 pm]: I support Hon Norman Moore's motion, not from the point of view of Telstra Rally Australia, but from the point of view of bringing sporting events to Western Australia of which Rally Australia is one. When we have these events, it quickly becomes obvious that the radio coverage and televising of the event spreads the word widely across Australia and around the world. It is cheap advertising. We can talk about \$2 million of advertising, and I understand that is what the event costs the government. Ironically, recently the Western Australian government provided \$2 million for the Australian Tourism Exchange event at the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre. The immediate spin-off from the multiplier effect of approximately 1 700 tourist operators and 630 companies was \$10 million. That is a remarkably good investment for the government to make.

The whole of the community in this country embraces sporting events. I am not a great petrolhead but I have had the opportunity to watch the cars whizzing around parts of the city and the south west. They certainly create a spectacle that people want to watch. There is nothing like people who want to get behind the wheel of a car and have a bit of a whiz around.

I understand the minister made this decision very quickly upon becoming appointed to his position. I know that negotiations with some of the companies takes quite some time, and good negotiating skills when meeting with private enterprise are necessary to embrace all the people who want to be involved. I imagine that with this event a range of people would like to become involved and see the event fostered. Of course, small businesses will benefit enormously from the spin-off from an event like this. Therefore, from the point of view of not only the rally, but also the promotion of the state through radio and television coverage, without expense, this event should continue. I have seen these events on the television and they have certainly been reported around Australia on radio. There is nothing like that sort of advertising. I would like this government also to recognise some of the events that promote tourism and opportunities around the state.

I go back to my old portfolio and my responsibility for roads. Once a road is built into a particular area, people can then enjoy the outcome. A small investment of \$2 million is required for this event. The government has a \$530 million surplus, having manipulated that to a certain extent and having spent \$450 million through the Treasurer's Advance before the end of the financial year. It appears that the government certainly has the funds required to expend this money to get some really positive advantage for business in Western Australia. Small business, hotels and all types of companies benefit when people visit Western Australia. Opportunities like this do not present themselves every year. Sadly, we have lost some events; for example, the golf tournament. Obviously, these sporting events do become expensive to run, but in good times when money is available there is an opportunity to maximise the spin-off from these sorts of events. This is one of those events that could have been maximised.

I look forward to the minister's explanation of the reasons for the decision not to expend the money to continue with this event. Western Australia is one of those states in which we have an advantage. We have a climate that allows these events to be run without concern about the conditions the events will be conducted in. We have a great state and the opportunity for these things to happen. I will listen with interest to the reasons the minister made the decision not to go ahead with this particular event.

**HON LJILJANNA RAVLICH (East Metropolitan - Minister for Education and Training)** [4.55 pm]: The government will not support the motion. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that this is a cheeky motion in terms of what he is asking this house to do; that is, to express amazement that the Western Australian government would relinquish the rights to hold Rally Australia in Western Australia. Hon Norman Moore is the only member amazed - he spoke for three hours, Hon Bruce Donaldson spoke for about five minutes and Hon Murray Criddle probably did a little better than that.

**Hon Murray Criddle:** You know I do not speak for long. I get my point across quickly.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** That is true.

The point I am making is that if opposition members are so amazed at the profound impact that not holding this event will have on this state, surely they would be stirred up into action to voice their opinion to get it on the public record. However, it seems to be another quiet day at the ranch, particularly on the other side of the house. It is often a quiet day on that side, and nothing has changed. The motion calls upon the state government to immediately acknowledge that its decision was a temporary error of judgment. For goodness sake!

**Hon Simon O'Brien:** All right, it is a permanent error of judgment on your part.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Really, what a stupid motion to ask the government to admit that it was a temporary error of judgment. It is like saying one was temporarily insane for a few minutes when this decision was made.

**Hon Norman Moore:** That is another explanation I did not put there.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** When we were on that side of the house -

**Hon Norman Moore:** Groan.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** I do not remember that. I was always very constructive.

**Hon Murray Criddle:** Do you agree that the budgetary situation is different from what it was five years ago?

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** At the end of the day, I admit that it is up to the government to determine where it puts the money in the interests of the Western Australian public. There are competing priorities. The idea that we would admit to a temporary error of judgment - there is no temporary error of judgment.

**Hon Norman Moore:** Put that to one side and say it is a mistake.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** It is not a mistake. It was endorsed by the Western Australian Tourism Commission board, and I am sure it thought it was a very sensible decision. Hon Norman Moore may not think that. I make the point that when I was on that side of the house and the opposition was in government, the number of times that I expressed dissatisfaction about a decision that had been made, and there were many of them, the then government's continual response was, "When you are in government, you can govern."

**Hon Norman Moore:** That is right, but you must accept criticism when you make the wrong decision.

**Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH:** Hon Norman Moore may not like it, but we are in government and we will govern. Members opposite may not like that, but it will not change. Obviously members opposite do not like it because they bring forward motions like this. Although members opposite might think that commonsense will prevail, I am sure that the minister believes he has exercised very good judgment by supporting the board, and he has made a very sound judgment in respect of this matter.

I do not doubt that there are people who are revheads, but like Hon Bruce Donaldson I am not one of those people. I cannot think of anything more boring than an idling motor. Having said that, there are many people who enjoy this sport. I think my colleague to my right may be a bit of a revhead. I know that he gets enormous pleasure from motor sports and rallies.

The state government has confirmed that it is seeking an end to its contract with the motor event, Rally Australia, in 2006 in light of concerns over the economic liability of the event. Hon Norman Moore made an interesting point that the costs have gone up. Obviously that needs to be a consideration. This decision was communicated to the event's contracted party - major sponsors, volunteers and the Western Australian public - last month. Rally Australia no longer delivers a sufficient return to Western Australian taxpayers and the event will be discontinued in this state. This decision is not without its supporters; it is like any issue that is of interest to the community and/or particular stakeholders. People have a variety of opinions about decisions made by government.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 3558.]