

TUNG TRAN

**219. Mrs M.H. ROBERTS to the Minister for Police:**

I refer to the minister's refusal to answer questions yesterday because of non-existent police negotiations and a need to somehow protect the state's interest in those negotiations.

- (1) Will the minister now admit that there were no negotiations underway, and no impediment under standing order 91 or any other standing order, and that the minister had no reason, other than perhaps her own incompetence or untruthfulness, for not answering those questions?
- (2) Can the minister now advise the house of the full circumstances surrounding this case, including why it took the police 12 months to drop the charges?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY replied:**

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for Midland for the opportunity to clarify my statements made yesterday in Parliament in response to her question about Mr Tung Tran. I was going to rise under standing order 82A after question time, Mr Speaker —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Midland!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Standing order 82A would have been the appropriate standing order, as I have been advised.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** You misled the house!

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Midland, I call you now to order for the second time, I believe.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I have not misled the house; I have never misled this house, and I will never mislead this house.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I reiterate: I have never misled this house.

To go back to the comments that I made in Parliament yesterday, I said that there is a potential for some negotiation between Mr Tran and WA police so that both parties can understand the particular circumstances around how that case got to the point it did before the charges were actually dropped.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Midland!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** That is what I said. With the benefit of hindsight, the word “negotiation” was probably not the best word to use. “Discussion” is probably a better word, because what WA Police is currently doing is reviewing the entire interaction that it had with Mr Tran over that 12-month period, reviewing the time line and having a look at the police actions and what actually led to the point in time when the charges were dropped. My understanding and my expectation of WA Police was that they would then take that review and have discussions with Mr Tran to explain all of those circumstances, because it has not been clear to Mr Tran or his team why those charges were dropped, and I think it is in the public interest that Mr Tran and his lawyers are informed. I do not want to pre-empt or influence that review process with police. It is currently underway. I will be informed of the outcome of that review once it is concluded.