



**PRIME MINISTER**

TRANSCRIPT OF DOORSTOP, EASTFIELD PHARMACY, THE MALL,  
SOUTH CROYDON, 9 NOVEMBER 1989

E & O E - PROOF ONLY

PM: Well what we've done is to put a package and I've written a letter to Jim Matthews, the National President. That framework must stand and the .... implications of it. Now, if the Pharmacy Guild will accept that, come in and talk with us, well I've said that provided that basic .... of the budgetary implications are maintained, sure, we can talk. And if they come in we would want to see the pharmacists have two members on the Trust which would administer the new provisions which are regarded as important by pharmacists, professional allowance and may I say .... just having just had the opportunity of being in here and having spelt out to me the sort of professional services that are provided by pharmacists I'm all the more reinforced in the necessity for this professional allowance concept. So they would have two people on the Trust helping to administer that, they'd have a majority on that. I've also given the undertaking that at the first opportunity that arises there would be a person with experience in retail pharmacy go on the .... Pharmacy Remuneration Tribunal. So those things can be done and we can talk about these issues within that basic framework.

JOURNALIST: Do you consider \$60 million to be enough or will there be more -

PM: \$60 million, \$60 million is on top of what the Tribunal decided and .... think that that provides a very substantial advance and we've got to operate within that framework .... I think the pharmacists understand. We haven't got a bottomless pit. I mean, we just can't .... everything you want and they .... I think they do recognise that, you know, can't go on with a 25 percent markup concept especially in regard to the high cost drugs. But really, the .... thing to do would be, as the pilots, and say alright, we regard that framework as sound .... come in and let's talk about it.

JOURNALIST: Mr Hawke, evidence was given in court today that you and Sir Peter Abeles struck a deal about how to handle the pilots' dispute before the pilots took industrial action. Is that true?

PM: No, of course not and the matter is subjudicy at any rate. But by now you ought to have realised that the untruths that have been told in this on the part of the pilots, they're just mountainous. I mean, they seem to forget that it was in February of this year that they put out, in written form, a publication telling their members to prepare for a long battle. They prepared for it in February.

JOURNALIST: Did you discuss that with Sir Peter before the pilots took industrial action?

PM: Discuss what, I mean -

JOURNALIST: Did you discuss the dispute with Sir Peter before the pilots took industrial action?

PM: There was no dispute before there was industrial action. At any rate .... understand this matter is ....

JOURNALIST: .... chemists your best and last offer?

PM: I've answered that question.

JOURNALIST: Mr Hawke, the next one and the big one, when is the election?

PM: Not to be announced here. Wouldn't you like that .... wouldn't you love that too? But I think it's likely to be in 1990 sometime.

JOURNALIST: January 1990?

JOURNALIST: Mr Peacock ....

PM: Well Mr Peacock is all over the place in this matter isn't he. I mean; after all, they created the Tribunal, not us. I've said in terms of pharmacists' representation that when the opportunity arises, which I think is .... before very long, we will see that there is pharmacists' representation on the Tribunal.

JOURNALIST: Andrew Peacock is actually sending letters to individual pharmacists Mr Hawke, urging them not to back the Government's package and saying that they'd do a lot better under the Liberal Party.

PM: I just ask you go and have a look at the graph of pharmacists' income under the last Liberal Government of which Peacock was part. Have a look at what happened to their income under them, have a look at what's happened to their income under us. I tell you now, just give you .... guarantee - I wish I'd been as certain as .... you know, knowing the winner of the Melbourne Cup - under the Libs pharmacists' income went down, under us it's gone up. Just do the two graphs. So if the pharmacists believe the Liberals on what would happen to their income under them, they'd believe anything and I don't think they're that silly.

JOURNALIST: (inaudible)

PM: You're quite right .... 12 percent under us over the next two years ....

JOURNALIST: Are you concerned .... against you whenever the election is?

PM: I'd rather they weren't making those threats, but I think we can work these things out.

ends