

WA POLICE — COURT ACCOUTREMENTS

798. Mrs M.H. ROBERTS to the Minister for Police:

I have a supplementary question. If, as the minister says, she raised this matter with the Attorney General back in January when she received the letter, why has the Attorney General gone into the media saying that what the union did last month was just a stunt, and that the union should have raised the matter through the appropriate channels? Is that not what the union actually did?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY replied:

The member for Midland is referring to the union having said that it was unhappy that the Attorney General had not met with it. The union did not ask me to arrange a meeting with the Attorney General; it asked me to raise it with him.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Midland!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mr Speaker —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Midland, I call you to order for the first time.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I raised the issue with the Attorney General who had told me that he cannot direct the courts as to how to run their jurisdictions.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Midland!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As a result, the union had complained that the Attorney General would not meet with it, but in fact the Attorney General had never been requested to have a meeting with the police union. I believe that that request has now been made of the Attorney General and that he is willing to meet with the union and discuss that issue. However, he still cannot direct the judges and the magistrates as to how they run their program.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Nobody said they can.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is a little bit rich, member for Midland. The member is over there complaining all the time on her side when we try to bring in mandatory penalties and she says that we are interfering —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Has the minister finished answering the question?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes.