

PERTH PARKING MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT REGULATIONS (NO. 2) 2009 —
JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON DELEGATED LEGISLATION

1242. Hon LIZ BEHJAT to Minister for Transport:

I refer to the debate on the disallowance of the Perth Parking Management Amendment Regulations (No. 2) 2009. Why did the minister not respond to Hon Ken Traver's question during that debate about whether the minister had had any conversations about these regulations with any members of the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:

It is groundhog day! I thought I might have to hold myself back in anticipation of next March to address this question, so I thank the honourable member for asking it just now. There was a debate yesterday on the Perth Parking Management Amendment Regulations (No. 2), which Hon Ken Travers sought to disallow. Unfortunately, I was not here for part of that debate because I had urgent business elsewhere, which the Leader of the House was aware of and about which I expressed my regret to the house. Nonetheless, like everyone else, I am dispensable, and life goes on, so it was open to Hon Ken Travers to ask the question about this, which, as he said, he put on notice yesterday. Hon Peter Collier was here to answer questions and did answer questions on my behalf. It strikes me that if, on the day that we are about to debate a relevant disallowance motion, a member was going to give notice of a question about what contact I or my staff had had with a standing committee, he would ask that question before the debate is brought on. However, that question was not asked. Other questions were asked by Hon Ken Travers of the minister standing in for me; but, apparently, this question was not important enough even though, within a few minutes of question time yesterday, we were about to move onto that matter. Curiously, now that the horse has bolted—in fact we cannot even hear the clip-clop of the hooves, it is so far down the street. As it turns out, Hon Ken Travers has asked me an identical question asking why I did not answer his question during debate. I do not get to answer that because that question does not come on until the house resumes, presumably in March. Therefore, I am very glad Hon Liz Behjat has asked me the question, because I do not want hanging in the air some sort of accusation that I have somehow avoided providing information. That is what is sought to be done today, and that is offensive. However, that is the sort of tactic we get from people who are prepared to make accusations by innuendo during one's absence from the chamber. I think that is quite pathetic. Let me answer the member's direct question, and maybe it will take some of the sting out of this awfully important matter, which now has been treated in this way when it would not otherwise be addressed for four or five months.

I notice the uncorrected *Hansard* from yesterday at pages 56 and 57—it is the uncorrected edition so we cannot rely on it, but it is probably a very good guide—where the remarks attributed to Hon Ken Travers relate, apparently, to a question that I failed to respond to. That is even though I had a written answer ready to go at his request. The question was, "But the question to the Minister for Transport is: has he spoken to any other members of the committee? I am sure Hon Alyssa Hayden would not necessarily know." Apparently Hon Alyssa Hayden interjected and then, reportedly, Hon Ken Travers went on to say, "The person who could answer would be the Minister for Transport, but, unfortunately, he is not here." There we have it! The reason I did not respond to that question when I arrived shortly after to give my speech was that I had not been here in the place to hear it asked. However, if Hon Ken Travers so desperately wanted to hear the answer, he could have asked the question of which he had given notice, and for which I had an answer ready—which I am happy to give him a copy of any time he likes.