

Rick Langtree, 80 deane street, charters towers, 4820.
(07)47874890.

Dear Mrs. Hull and Committee members,

Thank you for your invitation and the opportunity to revisit this topic. Upon reflection, I find my opposition to the current policy intensified.

Justice is the key word. Substance abuse is not sensible conduct, but crime is something else and so is a consistent approach. Legislated penalties, substantive in terms of assets or personal liberty, are intrusions that can only be pardoned relative to the villainy of acts to which they are a response. Justice based on deterrence is a contradiction in terms. There is no such thing as paradox, only skewed perspectives. Punishment should fit the crime, not precede it. The initiator is guilty of the assault.

From that perspective, the billions invested tend to be inappropriate use of public money - part of the problem, not a solution. It also alters the problems' social etymology.

Further sapping the cause of justice and broad public confidence, the drug situation presents excessive temptations to various individual authorities - a liability.

The use of some drugs is the basic matter of disputation, a crime of such guile, the rules of justice must be bent in its pursuit, to the extent that confiscation overrules exoneration in court, so stealthy a wisp it may as well not exist - and that may be the fact of the matter.

Here is but a seed. Its ramifications cast doubt even beyond the issue of narcotics legal or illegal-ised to the fired tensions, culture shock and values-manipulation ruling a society that can't decide whether it is free or permissive.

Please excuse the fragmented rush. Abruptness is not intended. The

threads are long.
Yours sincerely,
Rick Langtree
July 15 2002